

28/07/17 11:10

## Comment Receipt

<b>Event Name</b>	Tendring District Local Plan - Publication Draft - Section 2
<b>Comment by</b>	Mr and Mrs Strutt
<b>Comment ID</b>	LPPuD61
<b>Response Date</b>	28/07/17 11:04
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Policy SPL 2 SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARIES ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

**Please specify which section of the Publication Draft Local Plan your comments relate to by choosing one of the following:** Section 2 Tendring

### Legally Compliant

*Please see guidance notes for an explanation of legally compliant.*

**Q1) Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant?** Yes

### Soundness

*Please see guidance notes for an explanation of the tests of soundness.*

**Q2) Do you consider the Local Plan is sound?** No

**If you do not consider the Local Plan is sound, please specify on what grounds:** . Justified

### Duty to Co-operate

*Please see guidance notes for an explanation of the Duty to Co-operate*

*Please note that any non compliance with duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.*

**Q3) Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Co-operate?** Yes

**Enter your full representation here:** Representations on behalf of Mr and Mrs Strutt, Tendring Local Plan Publication Draft - Section 2. The respondents object to the Local Plan Publication Draft, (Section 2) as the approach taken to the formation of the settlement boundary in Great Bentley is not justified. As land and property owners in Great Bentley, the respondents believe that the Council should make some small, but sensible amendments to the proposed settlement boundary for Great Bentley. The modest amendment would include the respondent's land to round off the settlement in a sensible and logical fashion. The respondent made similar representations to the last version of the Local Plan, which were misunderstood, resulting in some alteration to the settlement boundary, but not going far enough to include the respondent's land. To help explain the amendments proposed by the respondents, a plan is submitted with these representations, which illustrates the settlement as published in the Publication Draft document, alongside the respondent's suggested amendments, which are considered to be the most effective alternative to the Council's proposed settlement boundary. It is noted that since the Preferred Options version of the settlement boundary, the land associated with planning approval 16/00133/OUT, now forms part of the settlement on the proposed Publication Draft Map for Great Bentley. With the approved application land included, the settlement boundary now leaves a small and narrow strip of land not included within the settlement, resulting in an illogical and unjustified gap between the established and developed part of the village and the new extended residential extension of the settlement to the north. The respondent therefore, takes the view that this small land parcel should also be included within the settlement, as a modest additional inclusion into the village, thus rounding off the development boundary with a more comprehensive and clearly defined edge. The suggested change in the boundary would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, nor would it intrude or cause any material harm to the wider landscape character. The respondent's land if not enclosed within the settlement will be sandwiched between two fingers of residential development, where there is no obvious planning or landscape reason for the land to remain undeveloped. The inclusion of the respondent's land would allow for a planning application for a modest, low density housing development, which could be accessed either from the north or the south. Any development here would be compatible with the character and appearance of the area and would be as sustainable, as the recently approved development to the north and the existing housing development to the south. The modest amendment proposed by the respondents are clearly set out in the attached plan.

**Please specify the changes needed to be made to make the Plan sound/legally compliant:** See plan emailed to the Council as there is no upload facility provided

**Do you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination?** Yes

**If Yes - you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination. please outline why you consider this to be necessary**

To explain to the inspector why the settlement boundary should be altered

**Did you raise the matter that is the subject of your representation with the LPA earlier in the process of the preparation of the Local Plan?**

Yes

**If Yes - which stage?**

. Preferred Options

**Do you wish to be notified?**

- . When the document is submitted for independent examination?
- . When the Inspectors Report is published?
- . When the document is adopted?

## **Representations on behalf of Mr and Mrs Strutt, Tendring Local Plan Publication Draft.**

The respondents object to the Local Plan Publication Draft, (Section 2) as the approach taken to the formation of the settlement boundary in Great Bentley is not justified. As land and property owners in Great Bentley, the respondents believe that the Council should make some small, but sensible amendments to the proposed settlement boundary for Great Bentley. The modest amendment would include the respondent's land to round off the settlement in a sensible and logical fashion. The respondent made similar representations to the last version of the Local Plan, which were misunderstood, resulting in some alteration to the settlement boundary, but not going far enough to include the respondent's land.

To help explain the amendments proposed by the respondents, a plan is submitted with these representations, which illustrates the settlement as published in the Publication Draft document, alongside the respondent's suggested amendments, which are considered to be the most effective alternative to the Council's proposed settlement boundary.

It is noted that since the Preferred Options version of the settlement boundary, the land associated with planning approval 16/00133/OUT, now forms part of the settlement on the proposed Publication Draft Map for Great Bentley. With the approved application land included, the settlement boundary now leaves a small and narrow strip of land not included within the settlement, resulting in an illogical and unjustified gap between the established and developed part of the village and the new extended residential extension of the settlement to the north.

The respondent therefore, takes the view that this small land parcel should also be included within the settlement, as a modest additional inclusion into the village, thus rounding off the development boundary with a more comprehensive and clearly defined edge. The suggested change in the boundary would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, nor would it intrude or cause any material harm to the wider landscape character. The respondent's land if not enclosed within the settlement will be sandwiched between two fingers of residential development, where there is no obvious planning or landscape reason for the land to remain undeveloped.

The inclusion of the respondent's land would allow for a planning application for a modest, low density housing development, which could be accessed either from the north or the south. Any development here would be compatible with the character and appearance of the area and would be as sustainable, as the recently approved development to the north and the existing housing development to the south.

The modest amendment proposed by the respondents are clearly set out in the attached plan.

Map - Great Bentley

