

## Sproughton Parish Councils response to Inspectors Matters, Issues and Questions : Matter 5

The Parish Council has commented at one stage or other of the BMSDC JLP process to most of the issues raised by the inspector.

### **Matter 5 – Local Housing Policies** (*Policies LP01, LP02, LP03, LP04, LP05, LP06(1b and 1c), LP07 and LP11*)

5.1 a) Are the requirements of policy LP01 clear and consistent with national policy? Would they be effective?

b) On what basis was the threshold for a dwelling cluster set and is this reasonable?

c) Is the scale and type of development allowed in part c) justified and sufficiently flexible?

5.2 a) Are the requirements of policy LP02 clear and justified?

b) Is it necessary for the plan to be sound for the policy to be stronger on sustainable energy requirements?

5.3 a) Are the requirements of the LP03 clear and justified?

b) Is it necessary for the plan to be sound for the policy to consider the energy performance of the entire dwelling and specifically cover conversions of agricultural barns?

5.4 Are the requirements of policy LP04 clear and justified?

*These are strong and robust policies however they may be too restrictive for proportionate rural development needed to reduce rural house prices to levels affordable for rural workers.*

5.5 a) Is it necessary for the plan to be sound for policy LP05 to specifically deal with back-land development and loss of garden land? b) Is the wording in relation to heritage assets sufficiently clear?

*In relation to 5.5 b, LP05 is not just inadequate, it doesn't even mention heritage assets, only listed buildings. This policy should also include policy for conservation areas and adverse impacts on a village character, landscape views, views into a village and environmental/ecological impacts. So typically materials out of character with a village, altering the visual impact of the village and its sense of place in its natural surroundings and any physical impact on the surrounding environment, social or wildlife impacts.*

5.6 a) Is there robust evidence to justify the requirements of LP06(b)? Is part b) sufficiently flexible and does it take appropriate account of viability?

b) Are the requirements of part (c) clear? Is removal of permitted development rights for bungalows justified?

5.6 a. Developers should consider the viability of their proposals before presenting them based on the policies and rules applicable. The reason we have a shortage of such properties is that developers make proposals for developments that they then claim are unviable at later stages of an application. The policies should stand, and developers should know they will stand. It is then for them to present policy compliant proposals that are viable from the outset. If they don't consider there is sufficient profit, they should amend their proposals within the policy requirements or look elsewhere. It should not be for a LPA and the resident community to dissolve the standards that should be achieved just so that a developer can build a substandard development and walk away leaving a community to deal with the problem.

5.6 b. Absolutely, there is a growing need for bungalows and easy access homes for an aging population. Adding loft rooms or a second floor to a bungalow is an easy way of increasing the value of bungalows for resale by small builders and developers, but in doing so these bungalows become unsuitable and potentially too expensive for elderly retirees. Allowing permitted development would lead to a constant decimation of the bungalow stock our aging communities need at a time when very few are being built.

5.7 a) Would policy LP07 be effective in ensuring the needs for supported and special needs housing are met or should the plan allocate specific sites for such accommodation?

b) Is criterion 1(b) sufficiently clear and is its terminology consistent with the settlement hierarchy?

c) Is the decision to apply Building Regs M4(2) justified?

d) Is removal of permitted development rights for bungalows justified?

5.7 a. A policy is better than specific allocation as needs and proposals will develop and change over the JLP period.

b. No, they should be well connected or have their own good connection service but why is this only aimed at Urban and Core village sites? There are plenty of Hinterland Parishes with very good medical facilities and public transport access whereas there are core villages and some parts of the Urban areas that would present significant difficulties for access to medical care and transport. Also many such supported housing facilities are placed in areas away from busy residential or retail areas to provide peace and tranquillity their residents require. Policy LP07 1a should focus on the availability and access of services and facilities and not be restricted by hierarchy designations.

c. Yes

d. Yes for same reasons given above at 5.6b