

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 November 2019 16:55
To: _WEB_Local Plan
Subject: FW: Housing targets and figures, SDC local plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 November 2019 11:03
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Housing targets and figures, SDC local plan

Apologies 244,000 houses built not 244,00 houses as my first email

Sent from my iPad

> On 22 Nov 2019, at 10:59, [REDACTED]
>
> Good morning all,
>
> In these times of political unrest, it is interesting how many figures come out and this is where I feel the council, has an obligation to answer through its local plan and also its decision making for all housing here on in.
>
> I was told by a councillor at the last PC meeting I attended about the planning issues on Penn Lane, that housing targets are such that we just have to put up with it sometimes.
> Well with 244,00 houses been built in the uk in past 12 months, zero of which are affordable (under the economic structure of average earnings to houses prices index), and zero were social housing, how are targets being met?
>
> Help to buy and right to buy schemes are at an all time high, where young people are getting 100% mortgages on a 30% of a brand new five bedroom'd house, so estates appear full? Building quality and sale rates are an all time low, so much so the government had to appoint the industries first ombudsmen last year and already he is inundated with historical cases, his work load can't even review the housing problems of this year.
> Recent flooding has shown, garden grabbing and building on flood plains, heavily and negatively impacting communities.....communities wanting answers, they said it would happen in objections to planning applications, sound familiar?
>
> Having recently watched the house of the year and seeing the impact of both affordable building methods (the winning house) sustainable housing and environmental impact all addressed, at affordable building rates. Surly the way the council and its local plan has been written, it see's itself heading towards this further, the time has surly gone for these bog standard styles of properties. Credentials for non target homes, should be of the tightest environmental build quality, or be as close to carbon neutral when complete and habituated, as we are building for the future, not just for now and it's targets.
>
> The council should be encouraging our communities to be thinking greener and more sustainably' ' deleting the image of [REDACTED] leaning on the wall stating 'if you've got a patch of land, we'll give you permission to build'.
>
> Cranleigh's planning, has sat personally badly with me from the start, as when I sat on the Kings Stanley parish council, I sadly saw and had to face the community when we lost all the social and affordable housing. Cranleigh's occupants have made it very clear locally that their personal connections to PC and DC councillors, means it's in the bag

for them and they do not have to follow any guild lines given to them to get it! Hence concerns following drainage and highways guild lines not being shown on revived plans. This is where I personally felt injustice for the community and the residents well being and so decided to ask questions around this planning application and it's right to be there. This surly is what the crooks of the objection process is and to date, there has been no grounds apart from the need to meet a planning target set down to the community to accept it.

>

>

> The fact that this case still remains awaiting decision, seems ludicrous. Looking at the houses currently for sale and the ones that haven't sold still are up for resale already from the new development in Kings Stanley, more of these executive style homes are not needed. If they were, they should only be constructed using the most sustainable methods or be passive once completed, meeting the highest of green targets.

>

> Targets and quotas are important, I know I was a teacher for many years.....but you can not justify meeting these targets, if it causes more harm the good in the long run. I reference [REDACTED] as an example and [REDACTED] on similar lines.

>

> As planners and councillors, you have a huge responsibility to your communities, they entrust their surroundings to you to protect and preserve but also develop for the good of all.

> So if there must be development, which there must, it must therefore, surly meet the needs of social, affordable or sustainable housing. If not any of these three, then there must surly be an exemplary piece of architecture, of such significance to benefit all the community. Having studied design for many years and taught it also, I can assure you that not single aspect of the design of either [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] denotes an architectural sympathy to its surroundings, let alone exemplary significance.

>

> So I say to you all, as I am, as are the community, aware that the councillor whom said, at the end of the day we just sometimes have to accept houses targets need to be met, that Perhaps these councillors need to come into more of your decision making with more empathy, for those facing the reality of your decision making on these applications process. Try actually living a day in their shoes, with your decisions, as these people know for sure, if these were proposed within five feet of your bedroom window, action and decisions would have been shut down by now and reassurances given that it isn't going to happen in the future.

>

> So I put to you all, that meeting target needs is no longer a viable case for allowing any future development within anywhere in Stroud valleys, especially within those PC's that have had to put up with large private developments, like Kings Stanley. They only houses that should be passed, are social, affordable or sustainable, we have to design and build for the future and SDC have an opportunity to think and act differently but allowing poor quality builds that negatively impact the communities for which they are proposed, well that surly is in total disagreement to all laid out in the local plan.

>

> Kindest regards,

[REDACTED]