**BMSDC JLP Consultation Advice Q26 – Q28**

**Rural Growth**
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**Rural growth and development Q26 – Q28**

**Objective - Delivering growth, services and facilities in rural towns and villages.**

* Sustainable development: at the heart of planning? This is not a recommendation to build but to build wisely. There has to be a realistic prospect that houses are needed and suitable for a given location
* It would appear from the surveys done that Rural housing is needed primarily by the expanding local resident population, immigration from other council areas either retired or willing to endure a long commute and workers brought in by commercial opportunities.
* We have a generation of young people looking for affordable properties.
* The immigration relies on other councils failing to attract/retain residents and suffering a loss at our gain.
* Brexit is a realistic factor to also reduce this movement.
* And finally the employment commercial bonanza anticipated by BDC is dependent on commercial migration from other councils. ‘Build it and they will come’ from ‘Field of Dreams’ is a fair representation of my thoughts on the optimism in this JLP, in the previous chapter it actually suggests an element of optimism.
* It is also interesting that small and individual developments which complement the county character have come forward successfully whereas the larger strategic site’s drag on. This is surely an indication that individual development is for need, and therefore gets done. Whereas national developers build for profit and will hold off until they feel they can get the maximum return with no consideration for need.
* Perhaps a consideration to be made overall in this JLP is a limit on development at a level that does not dramatically change any community.

**Options Rural growth**

**Option RG1 – A Policy Criteria based approach**

**Continuation of the Babergh Core Strategy CS11 Policy Approach using criteria based policy to assess each case on its individual merits;**

* The present policy is too restrictive in that what appears to be perfectly acceptable infills and small extensions to village boarders which would complement their character without oppressive change have been blocked by planning policies when large estate developments that would be oppressive and change the character and local community have been promoted.
* Case by Case approach might be appropriate but only if the bias is towards small or individual development.

**Option RG2 – Allocations with flexibility for small scale infill.**

**Allocate sites in towns and core villages to provide certainty on the principle and potential scale of large development. For hinterland villages review the current defined boundaries and have criteria based approach to enable proportionate development in hinterland villages and infill development in hamlets and clusters of 10 or more dwellings.**

* Proportionality is key here, The JLP proposes a 9% Housing need over 20 years
* A limit on development per Parish would allow for variations in need without being unfairly excessive in any one area.
* Limiting to 10 houses in a group is perhaps over restrictive unless such a restriction was loosely based where an area has scattered housing.
* Parish Councils can identify the best areas to build in their parish and perhaps the facilities they need most for consideration within the 106 assignments.

**Options – Hamlets**

**Option HG1 – continuation of the current approach which would classify hamlets as open countryside in the settlement hierarchy;**

* Some limited growth would appear appropriate, even desirable where grown up children want new housing close to their families in their own communities.
* There is a reasonable argument for proportional development to match proportionate need, and a proportionate responsibility for expanding families housing needs.

**Option HG2 - Include a policy in the new Joint Local Plan which would support appropriate infill development in ‘hamlets’ (considered to be a nucleus of at least 10 dwellings fronting the highway) which will not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the cluster, would not consolidate settlements or result in ribbon development. Proposed policy criteria could be as follows:**

* This does not just have to be within a defined hamlet, it could also be scattered housing but in a general location.
* A proportionate increase in housing naturally matches a developing micro community as children grow older and want their own homes within that community.

**Q 26.    Which option for the policy approach to rural growth do you think is most  appropriate?**

* Possibly RG2. However, it could go further if you support rural development at a proportionate level.

**Q 27.    Are there any other approaches to distributing development in rural areas that we  should consider?**

* Why limit development to Hamlets of 10 or more.
* One new home in every ten is close to the 9% housing need identified.
* Provided proportionality and design sympathetic to the character of other buildings and the landscape was employed proportionate development would appear to be what is fair and needed.
* Families have children who grow up and start their own families.
* Generally that happens to us all so why should the burden of development not equally fall on us all.
* But wherever it falls it should be done with every effort made to preserve the best of the local landscape, views and ecology.

**Q 28.    Do you support the approach proposed for hamlets? If not please explain?**

* Yes, but as in Q27 above it may be better not be restricted to Hamlets of 10 houses or more.