

Comments

Main Modifications to the Local Plan (18/02/19 to 01/04/19)

Comment by	Mrs Lynn Smith (1204502)
Comment ID	53
Response Date	26/03/19 12:46
Consultation Point	Policy HOU 05 - Small Villages and Hamlets Outside of Settlement Boundaries (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

To which proposed Main Modification does your representation relate? Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications e.g. MM1

Policy HOU 05 - Small Villages and Hamlets Outside of Settlement boundaries

Do you consider the proposed modification is:
(please mark the appropriate box)

If you consider the proposed Main Modification to be UNSOUND, please identify which test of soundness your representation relates to?	.	Is it justified?
	.	Is it effective?
	.	Is it consistent with national policy?

Please give us details as to why you think the Local Plan with proposed modifications is NOT legally compliant or sound?

Removal of the requirement for development to have the support of the Parish Council is at odds with NPPF 15. which states that; *'The planning system should be genuinely plan-led. Succinct and up-to-date plans should provide a positive vision for the future of each area; a framework for addressing housing needs and other economic, social and environmental priorities; and a platform for local people to shape their surroundings.'*

Parish Councils, democratically elected by residents, are one of the most important platforms available to local people to enable them to shape their surroundings.

To describe permitted development as 'appropriate' does not comply with NPPF 16.d, which clearly states that policies should be unambiguous. 'Appropriate' is an entirely subjective and therefore completely ambiguous term.

During the original public consultation phase of this exercise it was emphasised that, in order to protect the rural environment from over development, villages subject to HOU 05 (which have minimal infrastructure) would have less development than larger settlements which would be subject to HOU 04. This was the basis for removing the protection of a settlement boundary from the HOU 05 group but not the HOU 04 group. The argument being that for HOU 05 boundaries were no longer relevant

as, for the life of the plan, virtually no further development would take place in HOU 05 villages as they had mostly already met the 5% development limit (again, over the life of the plan). This limit featured in Breckland's pre submission documents for both the HOU 04 and HOU 05 settlements. Those settlements under the aegis of HOU 04 were further protected by a 5 unit development limit whilst the HOU 05 ones had a 3 unit limit. The removal of both the 5% total development limit and 3 unit per development limit from HOU 05 (whilst HOU 04 quite rightly retains the 5% limit) does not accord with the aim of preserving the rural environment and ensuring that smaller villages are protected from over development. Although the current draft *can* be interpreted to imply that there will be less development under HOU 05 than under HOU 04, the fact that the wording is so imprecise undermines this, and could easily lead to there being *more* development in HOU 05 villages than in HOU 04.

Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications to the Local Plan legally compliant or sound.

Restore the original wording in full, with the exception of the reference to local plan now being the development plan

Would you like to be notified of future stages of the Local Plan? Yes

How would you like to be notified? . By email to my email address