

## BURBAGE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – SUBMISSION VERSION

### **REPRESENTATIONS MADE BY NAME AND ADDRESS REDACTED – MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC 01**

I have studied the Plan4Burbage submission plan in detail, and would like to make the following representations

1. I fear that the Plan understates the value of the green open spaces that lie to the east of Burbage, specifically fields that lie to the east of the three closes that are Illminster Close, Sherborne Road and Dorchester Road.
2. Policy 1 of the plan clearly states that only development within the designated Settlement Boundary will be supported. The fields in question are clearly outside of this boundary and therefore this is to be applauded
3. On the map on Page 35, spaces 21, 22 and 23 (which are to be found in the fields defined in 1) are designated as “Important Green Spaces”, and as such “being of local significance for history, archaeology or biodiversity, as having extant features with visible expression, and as being special to the community”. Accepting that the four “Local Green Spaces” are of critical importance, the descriptions applied to the Important Green Spaces are scarcely of any less impact in relation to the Community. Policy 7 implies a potential acceptance of development in these spaces, under certain conditions. I see no good reason why these spaces should not also be given a “development will not be supported” status. In general terms, giving developers any “chink” in our armour must be avoided
4. The map on page 35 has a series of arrows purporting to illustrate “protected views” to the east of Burbage (and in reverse). I would suggest that the arrows are not comprehensive enough to visually cover all views from various points to the east of Burbage, and it could therefore be argued by developers that some parts of these fields do not have important views and can thus be developed, in the absence of any compelling written definitions
5. Moreover, Policy 10 states that ***“The vista to the east of Burbage, originating at the historic centre, will be protected. Development that harms this important view or vista will be challenged”***. This compounds the problem of the map arrows, in that only a narrow set of views are defined, i.e. from the historic centre. This unfortunately ignores, therefore, the considerable value put on views from the ends of the three roads listed in 1) above. This value can be evidenced by the more than 200 objections to the Planning Application by Jelsons in 2014 (14/00475/OUT), and the many verbal submissions made by residents at the subsequent Public Enquiry following the rejection of the Application
6. It is therefore worth re-examining the details of the Appeal Decision made by Sian Worden (Government Inspector) on 4 May 2016 following the Public Inquiry in

December 2015 and February 2016 (Appeal ref. APP/K2420/W/15/3004910). In para 36, in relation to the views from the existing housing in the closes she states ***“the appeal site with its enclosing hedgerows and glimpsed views to the countryside beyond, has landscape value”***. She continues, in para 37, ***“From the extensive residential area to the west, the open countryside, and especially the appeal site, is glimpsed from Salisbury Road, and seen clearly from Ilminster Close, Sherborne Road and Dorchester Road. It is clear from the number of objections to the scheme from local people that any of them value living close to the rural area. To my mind, the appeal site contributes to the identity of Burbage providing, at least for those who can see it, a reminder that they are in a village”***.

In para 38, looking from the opposite direction from Aston Lane, she states ***“From these locations I consider that the proposed development would be perceived as bulging out from the clearly defined existing urban edge and encroaching into the currently undeveloped parcel of open countryside between Burbage and the motorway”***. She concludes in para 42 ***“that the proposed development would not protect or preserve the open landscape to the east of Burbage, contrary to CS Policy 4”***.

7. There is a clear judgment, made by a Government Planning Inspector, and in the light of significant written and verbal submissions from local residents, that confirms the high value of the visual amenity looking from Ilminster/Sherborne/Dorchester roads across the adjoining fields. Thus I would strongly entreat Plan4Burbage to significantly “strengthen” Policy 10 to ensure that the visual amenity from existing homes to the north of the historic centre is given a clear and equal standing.
8. I am also puzzled by the use of the term in Policy 10 “will be challenged”, where elsewhere the phrase “will not be supported” is used. Is this significant? Is it a stronger expression, and if so, what does it mean in practical terms?
9. I sincerely hope that you will find my representations to be of use in producing a final Neighbourhood Plan that will be supported by as many residents of Burbage as possible. I am keenly aware that there may well be a new Planning Application by Jelson in regard to these fields in the near future. The possible absence of a five-year housing supply may reduce the weight given to a Neighbourhood Plan, but certainly does not remove its influence entirely. It is therefore important to make our plan as comprehensive and watertight as possible. Local residents (including the group of “activists” of which I was a member when fighting the Jelson application) have experienced expensive QCs being very adept in challenging the wording and aspirations of local planning documents. It was always the prime intention of the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that future developments conform to what residents want to see in their village, within the parameters set by the NPPF, so I urge you not to be fearful of making the suggested changes, even at this late stage

**Name redacted - MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC 01**

11 October 2019