

Matter 4: Settlement Boundaries

Item 6.4 Specific Settlements

Map reference: J6 and J7 on the Hullavington framework Boundary Map

Dear Sir,

I am writing further with additional relevant information and activities, which have taken place since my previous objections and are relevant to Matter 4, Agenda Item 6.4 (but also relevant to Agenda Items 6.1 and 6.3)

I have covered previously that this site in Hullavington (reference J6 and J7 above) has been treated inconsistently in this process and certainly not in line with the specific guidance published by Wiltshire Council.

The key irrefutable criteria is:

That the land in question (currently in the Settlement Boundary) only had building on one side until recent years – but in the last four years it has been consistently developed on two other sides and now has had building on three sides, clearly linking it more to the built form (rather than the rural form) – at a time when it strangely has been identified for removal from the Settlement Boundary.

A stone wall separates it from the open countryside on the **only** undeveloped side (this same stone wall also runs linearly behind other neighbouring residential properties), clearly defining the land linked to the built form and forming a clear physical boundary with the open countryside beyond.

The documented approach that Wiltshire Council stated would be applied to the WHSAP, stated that it would NOT solely be a desktop exercise, but that a local planning officer would also be consulted.

This clearly didn't happen as:

- A) A pre-Application – **reviewed by the Planning Officer familiar with the locality** - stated that the land in question could provide sustainable development and add positively to the local Housing stock in Hullavington.
- B) Perhaps more importantly, a planning application for two new homes was subsequently submitted in April 2018, ref: 18/03185/FUL for two new homes on the same development site that is proposed for removal from the Framework Boundary. The Planning Officer (Kate Clark) once again recommended approval (despite the proposed Settlement Boundary changes).
- C) The application was called in to Committee Review for very questionable reasons and the Committee review was delayed from April/May 2018, until July 11th 2018, which just happened to be the day after Wilts Council voted to progress with the proposed Settlement Boundary changes (10th July 2018)

- D) Most notably, during the North Wilts Committee debate (on 11th July 2018), one Councillor stated: **“If we hadn’t voted to move forward with the proposed Settlement Boundary changes, we would have had to go back to the beginning of the process”**.

Surely, this can’t be an acceptable approach and a reason to progress?

I found it a shocking statement to declare publicly, as that type of approach would certainly not be acceptable in the Private Sector. It indicates a lazy approach and lacks diligence, fairness, consistency and thoroughness. It must surely be Unsound?

If there was any issues/disagreement in any part of the proposed way forward (re proposed Settlement Boundary changes), these should have been resolved before progressing to formal Review. Otherwise, how can the approach taken by Wiltshire Council be considered as sound? Members of the Wiltshire Planning Office such as Simon Smith were present at this meeting, when the Councillor made the statement above.

- E) More recently, the Planning Inspector, Andrew Dawe, appointed by the Secretary of State, has also reviewed the same site referenced above (still currently planned for removal from the Hullavington Framework Boundary) and on 22nd January 2019 he published his findings which granted the Planning Application. His reasoning and decision is visible on the Wiltshire Planning Site under the above application (18/03185/FUL) as once again - from a skilled independent - the site was viewed as sustainable and clearly more linked to the built form.

I therefore wish to strongly object to the removal of this specific site in Hullavington and more widely, that the application of the published criteria, has clearly been incorrectly applied in this particular example, or not even applied at all.

There is a lack of physical logic on the ground to exclude the site (when it is included currently) and this is particularly true given the Planning Department’s and Planning Inspector’s professional support for the land’s suitability for sustainable development, evidenced by the Case Officer’s recommendation to the Committee, to accommodate new dwellings. See link below:

<https://unidoc.wiltshire.gov.uk/UniDoc/Document/File/MTgvMDMxODUvRlVMLDExNzg2NTc=>

The Planning Inspector’s review of this particular site is shown below:

<https://unidoc.wiltshire.gov.uk/UniDoc/Document/Search/DSA,886722>

I therefore respectfully ask the Inspector to strike the request to remove this particular site in Hullavington from the proposed Settlement Boundary changes and perhaps more widely, consider whether a sound process has been followed by Wiltshire Council at all – with respect to Settlement Boundary changes - as opposed to a somewhat lazy and incomplete approach, pushed forward simply to conclude the exercise, to ‘avoid having to go back to the beginning’ and without executing an appropriate detailed review and working subsequent professional resolution for each site.

If you would like any further information or support with regards to the above, or require any oral submission, please contact me as below.

Yours Sincerely,

Kevin Hamilton