NDP Survey 2014 **Questions and comments**

Respondents 74

Question

2 **Do you think the Settlement Boundary should be changed and if so how?**

Responded

Y	22	N	29	N/O	10	Of total	82.43%

Include Storridge and more information on boundaries

Develop site between school and 4103 and develop community shop and café

Community facilities rather than housing in Kingsbridge

On map

Do not understand implications

Not sure what effects this would have

As present provided infrastructure allows or improved for drainage / runoff or other problems

Include some between 2 sides of village eg E of Bumpylane, also land N of school

Areas away from flood risk and with good access

Need to fulfil housing allocation - Pixiefield would do that in one!

Why is my property cut in half?

Boundary should cover entire parish so growth can be spread rather than concentrated

Very difficult to comment without more information

Should include field behind Pixiefields - most obvious site for new housing. Need for more low cost housing.

Already a little development outside boundary and moving it would encourage inappropriate development

Conservation area should be kept

Extend boundary from school to 4103 to include new estate, school car park and shops etc

probably not

Whatever I feel Pixiefileds will be further developed at some stage.

Fill in area between to create focal area

Increase boundary on W side of village

Certainly in my case (ref letter 4/4/14) - are there other anomalies?

Change would spoli village as we know it. Propreryty increases must be resisted.

Historical bounaries should be reviewed to enable the changing needs and desires of the community to be facilitated in conjunction with imaganitive planning for the future. not the past

I do not understand the settlement boundary as it stands, cutting across properties. Why is it not the same as the Conservation Area?

Land immediately east of Bosbury Road could be developed.

It should allow for further development and particularly` in fill`. I will provide a copy of my suggested amendments to plan direct to Chair. Where properties like mine, Stoney Villa have been cut in half by the existing settlement boundary this MUST be rectified as it is undemocratic and unjust. From Inset Map 11 this affects also Church House, the house next door to the Village Hall and the end of Rectory Lane. However Bandini`s full extent is included allowing infill far closer to the AONB ! This makes no sense and is undemocratic. It should also be extended to include the school and grounds, I will submit a plan to chair.

If the village is to grow then the settlement boundary will have to change.

I do not believe the current boundaries should change. This would involve developing on green land potentially exacerbating local flooding isues. Housing growth should be via infill and redevelopment of existing sites where possible.

The village is big enough & does not need to spread into 'green belt'

Only to accommodate the scheduled increase of housing

Changed to permit infill if necessary between 2 sides of village

As we live some way from the village itself it is not for us to comment

I would like an answer as to how the proposed boundary was decided. It is clearly unfair as proposed. Some properties are cut in two others left in tact. Why is this? Why does the settlement boundary further divide and segment the village leaving no room for improving village amenities and services. Why was the map that I was given with the questionnaire so inadequate? Surely it is the responsibility of the planning bodies to give all the villagers a clear and unambiguous plan to study. I had to search the internet for a better plan - gives the impression we are not supposed to notice the detail! Now I have the larger scale map to hand it is obvious that more thought clearly needs to be given to the settlement boundary in particular the area between the church and Buryfields. The current settlement boundary not only strangles this opportunity but also unfairly and undemocratically provides some home owners the opportunity to develop while denying others by having their property cut through or even excluded - hardly fair or democratic.

The settlement boundary reflects a point in time and may need to be adjusted to reflect recent changes but the in principle boundary is still valid.

It will have to change but it should be progressive and controlled. Not 60 houses on one site!