

Housing

A) WISHES OF THE LOCAL RESIDENTS

Some considerable time ago an extensive survey was conducted to ascertain the views of village residents on a number of aspects relating to a revised NDP. One important section of the survey concentrated on housing, including the scale and size of new housing developments. The conclusions were as follows:

1. Individual dwellings or sites of less than 6 dwellings were definitely preferred.
2. A significant number of responses wanted no further housing additions.
3. There was little or NO support for sites with ten or more houses.

The PC must support the strongly held prevalent view that developments of 6 or less properties is what the village desires/favours - or why bother to carry out the survey if its findings are to be totally ignored? Over the 20 year life of the plan 6 new houses a year would match the MSDC target (as yet to be confirmed) of 122 new houses. The Parish Council exists to SERVE the village not to impose its own contrary views on the villagers.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE PROVISION OF MORE AFFORDABLE HOMES

A) The national view on the best location for new affordables (to rent or buy) a) They should be near major centres of population b) They should be near major centres of employment e.g. business and retail parks c) They should be located on or very near major public transport routes.

Fressingfield meets none of these requirements and so is a poor location for yet more affordable housing.

B) Current Fressingfield Situation

According to the data there were 7 'families' on our waiting list for affordable accommodation. 3 new affordables on the School Lane site have been allocated so that leaves four families left on the list (who holds this list and who determines who is eligible to join it?). There are NINE new affordables available on the Red Farm site BUT much more worryingly numbers 2 and 3 Gull Road(just off the Laxfield Road) are empty and number 3 has been empty for MORE THAN TWO YEARS!! This does not support the view that we do not have enough affordables, quite the contrary. The need in Fressingfield in fact is very limited indeed.

C) Evidence in the AECOM REPORT

The PC organised a very expensive AECOM Report to review the current housing situation in Fressingfield. This report concluded that ' The long term need for affordable housing would be met over the long term period without the need to build any more affordables' - this through natural wastage i.e. families moving on (see earlier comments on Gull Road tenants). What was the purpose of an expensive, professional and detailed survey if this important conclusion is to be ignored by the PC??

D) It is totally misleading to include in the review a statement that

' a number of residents stated that they knew people(friends or relatives) who had had to move out of the village because they could not find suitable accommodation. This implies that they could not AFFORD to stay here - BUT it neglects (deliberately?) to differentiate between those who found it too expensive and those who could not find SUITABLE accommodation. Because of this failure(to differentiate) the statement is misleading and valueless and should be removed (point 7.33)

E) The vast majority of villagers wish to see developments of 5/6 houses.

The PC is clearly at odds with this view as it wishes to see more affordables built and to ensure these developments must be bigger than 10 houses (two of 10/15 houses are identified in this revised document) or builders do not have to build affordables, which are the least profitable for them! So the PC is going directly against the wishes of the village by looking at these larger developments which will require builders to include 3/5 affordables in these larger builds.

CONCLUSION

The Parish Council is supposed to SERVE the community and support its wishes NOT force its own (minority) view onto the people of Fressingfield. More affordables are unnecessary AND against the peoples wishes, this section needs rewriting to accord with those wishes.

John Kelsall