

ryan king

From: Phillip Mason

Sent: 20 October 2010 17:07

To: ldf

Subject: Consultation on Draft Interim Housing Policy September / October 2010

Dear Sir

In broad terms I approve of your proposed interim housing policy, however, it does contain some contradictions which may hamper your overall objectives.

Without providing some flexibility to the Development Limits the Interim Policy merely reduces the options and potential for development within the existing limits. This will result in fewer houses being built and aggravate the current housing crisis.

I support the policy of resisting infilling because I too believe that it destroys the physical character of our villages. However, at a time of critical housing shortage your Interim Policy does not appear to contribute in any way towards reducing the crisis. Shouldn't the focus at this moment in time be on introducing more enabling, rather than constraining, policies for house building?

Planning policy should be designed to serve the whole population, not just those who live in towns and cities. There is a proportion of the population that prefer to live in rural areas without the amenities enjoyed by city dwellers. This is not an absolute number, but a percentage of the population. As the population grows, so does the number of people looking to live in a rural environment. By artificially controlling the growth of smaller communities such as villages and hamlets you are denying this growing number of people the opportunity to aspire to a house in the countryside.

Allowing development in preferred towns while at the same time constraining it in villages will have the effect of reducing the proportion of rural housing stock. This will result in:

- Only the very wealthy being able to afford a rural home.
- A significant shift in the social mix of rural residents.

Houses and building are not the only defining characteristics of a village, having the right mix of people has a very large part to play also.

Regards

Phillip Mason