

## LPP2 EXAMINATION TOPICS

13th July 2016 hearing. Comments by John Hayter, resident of Bishops Waltham

### Respondent 408914723

## LPP2 EXAMINATION TOPICS

13th July 2016 hearing. Comments by John Hayter, resident of Bishops Waltham

Respondent 408914723

### Matter 3:

#### **i) Are policies DM1 - 5 reasonable and realistic, clear and consistent with national policies/guidance and do they establish suitable and appropriate criteria ?**

##### **DM1 Location of New Development.**

- Takes no account of **NPPF94 requirement to mitigate as well as adapt to climate change**. The unjustified assumption is made that all sites outside current and extended by allocations settlement boundaries have a higher carbon foot print than those inside. This failure is inherent in the failure to use carbon footprint as an allocation selection criterion.

- There are no *countryside* policies, only policies for outside defined settlement boundaries. Delete from last para *countryside policies will apply and*

##### **DM2 Dwelling Sizes**

- CP2 and NPPF 50 require a range of *dwelling types, tenures and sizes*. DM2 considers only size and not types and tenures. CP2 also requires *taking into account local housing needs and a majority of 2 and 3 bed houses* which thus restricts CP2/DM2 to developments of 5 or more dwellings for arithmetic reasons.

- DM2 seeks to require planning permission by restriction of development rights or situations where this exemption has already been fully utilised but the policy cannot be met for proposals to enlarge 4 or less existing dwellings and there is no other CP2 or NPPF provision that requires this.

- The requirement is measured by area and thus the number of bedrooms is not a criterion. *Bedroom* is open to changes that may not require planning permission by

adding or removing internal walls, use of roof space etc. Its unnecessary use stifles innovation and the distribution of space between bedrooms, living, kitchen and bath rooms.

- The size limits reflect *the general size of housing in the district.* (LPP2 6.2.9)  
Refusal of permission on those grounds could be breach of the Human Right to have children or discrimination on race or creed grounds where the culture is to live in multi but related family households.

- Account also has to be taken of NPPF47 local housing density requirements and its impact on carbon footprint.

Suggest amend DM2 :

- Title *Dwelling types, tenures and sizes.*
- Define *types* in the supporting text as *number of floors comprising one household dwelling and number of households dwelling is designed for.*
- Retain the current GOI definitions as *small, medium and large* and insert the explanation in the supporting text.
- Delete references to number of bedrooms from the policy
- Restrict DM2 to 5 or more new and/or enlargement proposals.

Require:

- Provision of small, medium and large dwellings with majority of medium plus large.
- 40% affordable housing
- Site design density and renewable energy generation such that the carbon footprint per dwelling is no higher than the average of the last 3 years for similar dwellings.
- Adjust the design and number of dwellings if necessary to achieve viable delivery of the AH and carbon footprint requirements.

### **DM3** *Small dwellings in the Countryside*

- There is no LPP1 or NPPF requirement or justification for this policy that conflicts with the NPPF 50 and LPP1 CP2 requirements to supply a mix of *types, tenures and sizes.*

- For those who work in rural areas providing a local home where possible is especially desirable by reducing the commuting carbon footprint. The range of house sizes needed is no different in rural than urban communities and no exception is provided for affordable housing.

- DM3 and supporting text should be deleted.

### **DM4** *Protecting Open Areas.*

- Policy LPP1 CP7 already provides this protection *throughout the district.*
- DM4 and supporting text should be deleted.

In any event :

- Policy only applies to open areas *within defined settlement boundaries*. This gives no protection to the many open areas in settlements without defined boundaries that are often in-fill sites where development is permitted or those serving a settlement with defined boundaries but the open area is outside.
- The *within defined settlement boundaries* restriction should be removed.

**DM5 Open Space Provision for New Developments**

- Policy CP7 only requires this provision for new housing developments. The requirements for *other forms of development, such as business parks or residential care homes* should be removed.
- CP7 applies to all housing development regardless of size. The DM5 reference to *sites below 15 dwellings* should be deleted.
- CP7 also has a requirement *improving public access for all to existing facilities and educational provision*. DM5 has no public access requirement whatsoever. Improving public access to existing facilities reduces the deficit in the local facilities and thus the amount of new provision thus enabling the development to viably deliver more affordable housing.
- Neither CP7 nor DM5 has the proviso that the cost to the developer of open space provision must not reduce the viable amount of affordable housing.
- DM5 i) to iv) can all be met without public access and making an exception for public access should be the preferred way of improving viability.