

Claire Rodway

From: Matthew Dickins
Sent: 23 September 2011 10:47
To: Joe Anscombe
Cc: Claire Rodway
Subject: RE: Musbury housing numbers-re16thSept email - UNCLASSIFIED:

Joe

Thanks for the email and I note the 9 figure (we have not taken a view yet but we might round numbers up/down – hope it would not cause concern if our plan says “approximately 10 dwellings” or something along these lines). I am copying Claire in on the response and I will ask her to collate village numbers.

With respect to the second part of the question I would suggest that submission at a later date would be relevant. The document we plan to consult on later this year is not likely to get into this level of detail.

Matt

From: Joe Anscombe [mailto:joeanscombe@gmail.com]
Sent: 23 September 2011 10:36
To: Matthew Dickins
Subject: Musbury housing numbers-re16thSept email

Matt,

This is to confirm that Musbury would like to submit the lower figure - 5% (i.e. 9) with the caveat that we can reserve the right to come in with an amended figure at a future point in time/when the plan is out for consultation.

Thanks for all your help and advice-Joe

PS-I don't know if there's a quick answer to this one-in the last couple of days we've had a proposal from a local resident re an EDDC site (Baxters Farm in Musbury) which could possibly become a windfall site at sometime over the next 15 years, the suggestion being that part of the site could be used as a Community Orchard. Would Musbury need to submit something now or could that be submitted at the date when the plot becomes a windfall? A brief answer would be quite sufficient.

**Input from Musbury Parish Council for LDF Panel meeting on 2nd August, 2011
re. Future Planning Policy for East Devon-Villages and Rural areas**

With reference to your document(combined ldf agenda 12/07/11)Spatial Strategy-Preferred Approach Doc. 2011-Section T Hub Towns and Villages (pps 29/30), we would support the following Alternative Approaches and Options

3 to allow local communities to assess their own settlements and allocate numbers and sites according to need.....with local communities suggesting the numbers and locations of any extra development.....

7 (toned down version)(i.e."to allow only that housing which the community identified as desirable due to the benefits it would bring),(combined ldf agenda 120711).

In support of this statement we include below the relevant sections of our November 2010 submission to the original Core Strategy Preferred Approach Report - these comments were submitted following a Special Parish Council meeting on November 22nd 2010 attended by Senior Planning Officer Frank Woolston . The meeting was well supported by parishioners and views were freely expressed and debated.

We wish to particularly draw your attention to the phrase in the submission" We would hope that the stated *flexibility over dwelling numbers to reflect size of settlements and local need* (DRAFT CS 20 page 93) is demonstrated."

Overview

Musbury wants to continue to grow and to thrive in tandem with its neighbours; it wants to be a village for the 21st century and wants to play its part in the future of East Devon. It cannot, though, carry more than its fair share

An extra 50 houses in Musbury would mean an increase of some 20% in the number of dwellings compared with 2-4% in some other proposed hubs. Musbury PC feels that this would be overdevelopment in the timeframe without significant investment in infrastructure. Indeed in April 2010 EDDC stated that *Extensive future residential expansion would ruin the village's character and encroach into the surrounding countryside. Therefore only small scale infill plots are likely to be developed.* (ref 3 below).

The PC seeks reassurance that the voice of its community will be heard on this occasion and that note will be taken of the points made below.

It also suggests that the Draft CS 20 should be reviewed to clarify the building expectations on hubs given their disparity in size, amenities etc. If 50 is a fairly arbitrary number and a starting point 'for discussion', it should say so. The *Flexibility over dwelling numbers* was not mentioned in either the consultation leaflet or the Summary consultation document. 50 has been understood by many residents to be a number set in stone, causing widespread concern.

We are encouraged by EDDC's commitment to evidence-based decisions (para 1.2) and the pledge to be *responsive to the views of Parish Councils* and to *understand what people have said to us through public engagement and consultation* (paras 5.2 and 5.8ff pages 23-24).

However, the two recent evidence-based submissions from Musbury - Musbury Parish Plan 2009, based on a survey with a 61% resident completion rate and the LDF Core Strategy Consultation Parish Council Feedback Form submitted May 2010 - both appear to have been disregarded, with regard to the scale of new development supported by the community.

(We are grateful that this original disregard is now being addressed-July 2011)

1. Numbers of homes

We subscribe to the inclusion of Musbury in the Hub Rural Settlement category due to our range of services and facilities and are pleased to see that in draft CS 20 *that loss of existing facilities will be resisted*. Indeed the overwhelming message from the Musbury Parish Plan was that the community considers Musbury to be very fortunate in this respect and is appreciative and protective of all our facilities which hub status will defend. Many residents stressed the importance of attracting and keeping young families in the village for its longer-term survival and most recognise that, over time, some change is not only inevitable but desirable. However Musbury is certainly one of the smallest communities in the proposed list of hubs with about 560 residents occupying some 275 dwellings. In terms of size and facilities it is in a different league from the towns in the hub group. Budleigh Salterton for instance, with 2735 dwellings, is almost 10 times the size. While the Report envisages about 50 dwellings per hub we would hope that the stated *flexibility over dwelling numbers to reflect size of settlements and local need* (DRAFT CS 20 page 93) is demonstrated.

The Musbury Parish survey asked "Do you think that Musbury needs more houses?" 55% of respondents were against the building of more homes, many stating that they thought that the village had reached optimum size and that significant development would destroy Musbury's rural character. 27% were in favour of building up to 10 new homes, 13% between 10 and 20, 5% more than 20. In the two submitted documents (refs 1 and 2 below), Musbury PC indicated that 15 homes is the scale of development that would be acceptable to this community over the next 15-20 years.

2. Types of housing

The Report states that, *New housing will integrate with existing settlements, in accordance with existing Design Statements. Housing numbers, type and tenure will be based on a needs assessment and will primarily meet local need. Where new housing is provided on the edge of settlements it should integrate with new employment and community facilities* (DRAFT CS 20 p 93).

In response, we would reiterate the evidence-based views previously expressed (ref 2 below):

At present the population of Musbury is an ageing one but Musbury PC would wish to maintain a mixed economy of housing stock that would encourage young families and single people to stay in the village and contribute to the local economy.

Currently 79% of houses in Musbury are owner-occupied with social housing accounting for about 15% Musbury's stock. In addition to the 38 dwellings owned by EDDC, Musbury also has 12 starter homes administered by a Housing Association. These were built on the understanding that they would be available to rent by young people living in, or with connections to the Parish. Despite initial assurances that the PC would have an input into the

allocation of these dwellings, this is no longer the case. The PC recognizes that many homes for rent were lost under the right to buy scheme, and although these 12 homes were built, rental availability is still reduced.

There is no indication in the Report that the proposed number of houses recommended in CS 20 is evidence-based. Any future development of affordable homes should be initiated by the clearly demonstrated and proven need for homes for those living and working within the parish or with close family links (cf *CCD Step by Step guide toward Developing an Affordable Housing Scheme within a Rural Community*).

The remainder of our original submission included evidence regarding infrastructure, traffic, transport and employment. This is available to inform the "finer grain concerns relevant for specific identified villages" that you plan for sessions in the future.