

PF/15/1221 – Response from Binham Parish Council to the amended proposals dated 11 January 2016

1) Introduction

Binham Parish Council has been consistent in accepting the principal of building a mixed development on the site, hoping this attracts young families to the village. However the amended plans submitted by Broadland do not address the main concerns of the individual members of the Parish Council, and also many members of the public who have taken the trouble to reply to surveys, attend open “display of plans” events, and attend public meetings. The layout of the affordable housing is at a much higher density, compared with the average of existing properties in Priory Crescent. Not only are the plots sizes smaller, the parking areas are also inadequate. The impression created is of two separate and very contrasting developments. The Parish Council feel the claustrophobic conditions of the affordable housing will make harmonious relations within the area, and between new and existing village residents, difficult to foster.

At the Special Parish Meeting of 26th January the Parish Council agreed unanimously to oppose the amended plans.

It was further unanimously agreed that, to demonstrate our desire to be positive and engage in on-going discussions, we submit the financial basis of an alternative proposal.

2) Binham Parish Council’s proposal for 14 affordable and 10 market houses

An additional line has been added to the spreadsheet shown in the “Viability” section of Broadland’s “Overarching Planning Statement” on a comparative basis for the proposal for 14 affordable and 10 market houses.

	Total	Market	Afford.	% Aff	Sales	Land	Build cost	On cost	Profit	Subsidy
Baseline	19	8	11	57%	£3,990,000	£215,000	£2,695,445	£558,052	£520,275	£1,228
Existing Proposal	28	14	14	50%	£6,962,572	£335,000	£4,452,030	£895,047	£407,389	£873,106
Binham P.C. Proposal	24	10	14	58%	£4,987,500	£290,000	£3,543,715	£768,000	£349,191	£36,595

Assumptions Average sale price of market houses, £498,000
 Land price amended to reflect change in mix of houses (£15K open market, £10,000 affordable)
 Build costs apportioned and assumes market houses 50% more expensive to build
 On costs apportioned using average of Baseline and Existing Proposal figures
 Profit apportioned on basis of Existing Proposal figure

3) Justification for the reduction to 24 houses

3.1) Our understanding of an “Exception Site”, is a parcel of land usually on the edge of a village but not generally granted planning permission except for a number of affordable houses to fulfil the local need of that village. The funding will in this case be from the sale of market houses also allowed to be built on the site.

With the current proposals for a 14/14 ratio the sales of the Binham houses provides a surplus of £875K, representing 90% of the subsidy to build affordable houses in four other villages, not even adjacent to Binham. This seems contrary to the rules for an “Exception Site”.

This “exporting” of such a high value from Binham is resented by many present residents, particularly as it will result in an unbalanced overall development. The 14/10 proposal still generates a surplus of £36.5K to support affordable housing in the other villages.

3.2) By keeping to the 14 affordable houses Binham will meet NNDC’s quota for the village based on their assessment of local need.

3.3) Removing 4 market houses frees considerable land to amend the affordable house designs, increase plot size and provision of parking, allowing the two areas to be more compatible in appearance and comfortable in use. A good example is plots 19 to 24 the three linked houses looking “mean” when compared with the existing houses opposite.

3.4) Parking and traffic

We believed the car-parking areas marked with “V” were for visitors but we now understand they have been agreed with Victory Housing to provide spaces for the existing bungalows no. 27 and 29. The general design guidance of 1½ spaces for single and 2 for two and three 3 bedroom dwellings is inadequate for rural communities. This is particularly so with no allowance for visitors or delivery and tradesmen’s vehicles together with the roadway widths precluding safe on-road parking.

The common parking area for the affordable houses should re-designed, perhaps split into two areas, each allowing more space well in excess of 2 cars per house, for safe manoeuvring and designated marked areas being convenient to their appointed houses.

With the depressing projection from the study commissioned by Broadland of at least 50% of the market houses not being permanently occupied, the majority of new residents will be living in the affordable houses. They surely justify being provided with adequate parking and safe roads with assured access for emergency vehicles.

4) Other requests for commitments

The Parish Council request the items below are also part of the conditions.

4.1) Traffic safety

We are pleased that the sight-lines of the Hindringham Road/Walsingham Road junction will be improved.

The 30mph limit signs will be moved to comply with the recommendations from Highways.

The junction work to be completed before any significant construction traffic arises and most traffic to then use the new access road from the Walsingham Road to the construction site.

4.2) Landscaping

While it would appear in that the fencing of the “green space” is being provided to prevent parking. We would like clarification of the extent of the fencing as it perhaps should extend on the north side as far as the “adopted footpath” to prevent any vehicle access from the present roadway.

We would request a clear long-term commitment from Broadland for the landscape maintenance of all the public spaces

4.3) Liaison committee

We understand this request has been passed to Broadland and we request a firm commitment if the construction goes ahead.

4.4) Planning gain

We would like to discuss this with NNDC and Broadland.