

**ryan king**

---

**From:** Phil Dowding  
**Sent:** 29 October 2010 09:38  
**To:** ldf  
**Subject:** Draft Housing Policy September / October 2010

Dear Sir / Madam

I received a Draft Housing Policy document for comment:

I have no issue with the outline - Interim Measures however there are number of issues that need clarification.

**Item 1.4** - ...while avoiding the worst excesses of 'garden grabbing' in smaller settlements....

The Planning Department has the overall veto on approving or not approving Planning Applications  
 The root cause of Garden Grabbing is a failure to pursue a balanced policy in the smaller settlements.

There have been continual refusals for single applications in the smaller settlements whilst at the same time the Planning Department has approved significant development with high density in the same village.

Example : Church Fenton Junction Pub  
 Replaced with three houses with tandem development  
 The original frontage has not been protected  
 The planning rules say this should be a single depth development yet its been overlooked

**Item 1.2 point 3** .....this must be balanced .....form and character of our villages

There is a contradiction between current policy and practice

The Planning Department makes strong statements about the retention of 'village character'

The 'character' has been built up over the years with the development of individual houses having different features which create the 'character'.

However in the last 10 years the approved developments have been high density clusters which do not contribute to the 'character' of the village

It seems the Planning Policies say one thing but the implementation is something else.

Example: Church Fenton

**Item 1.6** .....Residential development in smaller villages .....

This paragraph needs more clarification.

...Other than filling gaps in built up frontages or converting farmsteads(which are currently classed as greenfield) development on greenfield, land including garden land will be resisted

So it looks like a Farm in the middle of the village will be allowed to be developed on

Yet the open space which may be next to the Farm will be resisted in terms of planning permission.

I think there needs to be a clear distinction between a House with a garden, House with large plot of land associated with it and a field with frontage on to a street inside the village boundary

Lastly the Policies keep making statements about **sustainability** as a key factor in house building location.

If people choose to live in a village it is not because of work in the village, its to do with the quality of life.

House developments in Tadcaster, Selby , Sherburn are all very well but there is no increase in jobs - people are still commuting to other locations

Yours sincerley

P N Dowding  
Summerville  
Main Street  
Church Fenton  
Yorshire  
LS24 9RF