To All members of the NPAC

We, the undersigned are extremely concerned about the errors and omissions in the Housing proposals in the draft NP and that they do not reflect the views of a majority of village households.

1. The NPAC failed to consider or comment on the planning application for 9 houses on a site south of, and excluding most off, the original SHLAA site at “The Berries”.

2. No account has been taken of the possible contribution that “The Berries” original SHLAA site and other infill sites can contribute to Swinford’s housing allocation.

3. The allocation of 48 houses has no explanation as to how this was arrived at. In two consultations in the village about 1/3 of responses did not want any more houses and about 1/3 wanted no more than 30, i.e., the minimum of the range of options, if the village had to have any development. The proposed 48 is contrary to this view.

4. In addition a majority of responses wanted a number of smaller developments, not one large one. The NPAC has opted for one large site to meet the remaining requirement of 39 dwellings (excluding the planning permission for 9 houses at The Berries) which is the opposite of the wishes of the village.

5. HDC has confirmed that they are still examining 4 options for housing allocations and the final figures will be released in June. None of these allocate 48 houses to Swinford, and the preferred option of the HDC LP Task Panel would only allocate 36 houses to Swinford. If the “The Berries” planning permission is deducted this leaves a residual of 27 – not much more than 50% of the current NP proposal if potential infill is allowed for.

6. The majority of respondents also quoted a lack of a shop and bus service as the reason for not wanting any, or only limited development. They also said that if we had to have more development it was important to have these facilities. The draft NP does not address these issues and is silent on any S.106 contribution to village services and affordable housing.

7. In the supporting documents there is no reference or record of which landowners were met by the NPAC, no Agendas, and no minutes. We request copies of these under the FOI Act.

8. There is no evidence that the NPAC examined or considered housing sites other that the original SHLAA sites. There are a number of other infill or “rounding off” sites that are arguably less damaging to the form of the village than the one proposed.

9. The Housing proposals have no credibility because the area and capacity of the Lutterworth Road site is wrong. The NPAC appear to have relied entirely on HDC information and have not checked it themselves. It should be fundamental for the NPAC, or its paid Consultant to ensure accuracy in the Plan as this will ultimately be a legally binding Document...It is no good blaming HDC, it is not their Plan and they are not producing it.

In the light of the above serious omissions and failures of the draft NP we request that the housing proposals be re-examined and revised so that they are:

A) Accurate
B) Accord with the wishes of the majority of the respondents to the consultations and
C) Incorporate reasoned justifications for the number of houses and their location once the final HDC allocation is known.