Responses received for Swinford Parish Council NPAC consultation Event 20th & 21st January 2017

Housing

Please look at the policies on the boards about the housing section of the plan. Quote the policy number and make your comments below.

The papers received recorded the following comments

One resident would prefer for development to happen on area 4 rather than plot 241 4 is the recommendation

One resident would like more time to assess and will respond shortly

One resident agrees to Lutterworth Road recommendation

Five residents agree with policies H1-H6

One resident would like assurance that the H2 policy will be done objectively with regards to parking as they feel the village is up to capacity. Covered in H3 with off street parking for 2 vehicles

One resident would like the point strongly made that the Glebe land is not to be built on. NPAC feel the point is made, to include as an internal limit to development to be checked.

One resident would like H2 to read a maximum of 39 dwellings not should provide for 39 dwellings, H4 5th bullet point they would like to know what is considered as important and who deems the importance? H5 asks should there be a restriction that if a resident of the parish buys at an affordable price, then it’s resale should also be at an affordable price if within a time period of say 5 years. Plus, the affordable housing should also be for that person to live in, not to be let out. To check the wording of maximum and minimum. These are standard policy wording for affordable housing

One resident would like for the affordable housing to be sold to people who qualify and occupy the house as a main residence, with restrictions of periods of occupancy of 5-10 years, if the house is sold within that period the same restrictions should apply to the new owners. GM to check with GK

One resident would like the parking issues and pedestrian access/safety a major consideration. Covered in plan

One resident feels that the village needs a greater diversity of housing not all 4&5 bed properties. Covered within Housing

One resident has commented that H5 it is critical that while housing is affordable, an enforceable code of conduct is applied to ensure village life is respected, with regards to noise and nuisance, H7 they feel swinford needs to retain it’s conservation area as this is the living heart of the village and feels that building on this will convert the village into a commuter housing estate. To check code of conduct, conservation is covered in plan.

One resident opposes the 2 houses being built on Mourant Paddock, they would like this area to be left undeveloped for the village and its children to enjoy unchanged. They feel it is important to keeps areas within the village undeveloped so that children can explore and enjoy nature in safety. Application has been approved by HDC

One resident feels that sufficient capacity for older people needs addressing not just young families. Covered in plan
One resident comments H2 it is not possible to build 39 houses on area 4 to the specification in the document. According to the spreadsheet showing the SNP questionnaire results and slide 3 form the SNP slide pack (sourced from the PC website) Area 3 Rugby Road was the preferred option. H6 we do not object to the development of area 4, but strongly object to the density of the development. H6 states that the density of the site should fit in with the aspect of the surrounding area, and should not disrupt the visual amenities of the street scene. The aspect and visual amenity are of open countryside, and the development would destroy both. The final bullet point in H6: Area 4 cannot be developed with 39 houses and keep to this design principle. Taking Lodge Cottage and Springfield as the adjacent properties to area 4, the density is 3 dwellings per acre. The new development would be 23 dwellings per acre (assuming area 4 is 1.2/3 Acres). The row of 4 houses opposite Springfield is widely held to be overdeveloped and to build dwellings on area 4 would require even denser development. SHLAA decided this site could take 39 dwellings, Your Locale have confirmed this, the village questionnaire concluded areas 4 & 5. DS asked if density could be specified?

One resident feels with regards to H1 they hope that the village remains as so and doesn't become a sprouting strip development, they feel the village is built up around a central core. H2 they hope that the housing requirement will fall as Lutterworth/Magna park expands, they hope that the development of A/SW/ASG/04 does not proceed. H3 they feel that infill must be developed in the character of its surroundings, they feel the village is suffering with parking issues presently this is unsightly and hopes that development will include onsite parking. H4 they comment given there is no public transport in the village are starter houses really logical developments? National policy with Government.

Six residents did not answer the Housing section.

I do not intend to comment in detail until a draft NP is available but would take issue with H1 which proposes 48 dwellings. The SHLAA consultation revealed that, on a return rate of nearly half the households in the village 61% said Swinford was not suitable for additional housing. If Swinford had to have more housing nearly 50% wanted less than 30. Why has the NPSG ignored the significant views of the village without any explanation or justification?

I recall that a majority of villagers wanted any new development to be a combination of small sites. The NP proposes one large site without any explanation or justification, and contrary to the views of the village why?

The NPSG appears to have failed to consider or comment on the significant development at The Berries despite it compromising the consideration of appropriate housing options for the village. The NP housing figures fail to take into account the remaining SHLAA infill site. Incidentally more villagers opposed the original Berries SHLAA site than supported it.

I understand that the NPSG examined a number of potential housing sites against a set of criterion and also met with landowners. There appears to be no formal record of these meetings and when I asked Graham Mold where the objective assessment of the housing sites was he said it was confidential. How does the NPSG propose to convince the village or independent examiner of the logic of housing policies H1 and H2 without providing substantive and logical justification?