



**Lynn Bowring
Chair Great Alne Parish Council**

**Housing Development to
Meet Local Needs
How we did it in Great Alne
OR**

How we went from this....



To this....



And this.



A bit about Great Alne

- ❖ Local service village in Green Belt
- ❖ 250 households
- ❖ Includes conservation area and several listed buildings
- ❖ Primary school, parish church, pub and village hall (memorial hall shared with Kinwarton parish)

How did it start?

❖ Triggered by Village Plan 2009

- Based on input from residents
- Up to 20 new homes acceptable
- Identified need for affordable homes for local residents
- Triggered housing needs survey
- Survey result: 7 affordable homes needed

What happened next?

❖ PC/WRCC Programme 2010-2014

- Partnered with Warwickshire Rural Community Council, Rural Housing Enabler on board
- Progress reported at PC meetings
- Identified possible development sites (10 in all)
- Evaluated sites, with input from SDC planning officers
- Arrived at final short list of 2

Addition of open market homes

- ❖ Early 2014: changes to funding schemes spurred need for private housing element
- ❖ New survey on local need for open market housing
- ❖ Survey outcome - 10 new homes
- ❖ Conclusion: total of 17 new homes required
- ❖ PC asked RHE to approach owners of the shortlisted sites

Spanner in works! SDC Core Strategy

- ❖ SHLAA identified alternative possible site at south west of village
- ❖ SDC 'Call for Sites' triggered additional proposals
 - SHLAA site, 7 hectares, up to 50 homes now specified (maximum for LSV)
 - Two other sites, one previously shortlisted
- ❖ WRCC Proposal, late 2014
 - Shortlisted site selected on northern edge of village
 - 17 homes, of which 7 affordable
 - Funding available, housing association and developer identified, good quality outline scheme prepared

Parish Council Policy

- ❖ Development should:
 - Meet identified local need
 - Be of high quality
 - Be sympathetic to character of village
 - Minimise impact on existing residents
- ❖ WRCC proposal judged to meet criteria and should be supported
- ❖ SHLAA proposal not supported

Communication with Residents

- ❖ Progress reports at PC meetings and in quarterly newsletters
- ❖ February 2015: public consultation in village
 - WRCC proposals exhibited
 - Response generally favourable, some concerns expressed
 - Proposals adapted in light of feedback
- ❖ February 2016: more detailed proposals subject to second public consultation. Feedback again generally favourable

Next Hurdle - Planning Permission!

- ❖ Green Belt issues
 - PC support vital
 - Local need evidenced
- ❖ Residents' concerns acknowledged and addressed
- ❖ Section 106 agreement required
 - Eligibility criteria ('local connection')
 - Playground works
 - PC involved in discussions
- ❖ Planning application approved by Planning Committee February 2017

Where are we now?

Construction largely complete

❖ Local market homes

- 4 sold and occupied
- 5 sales agreed
- 1 unsold at end June

❖ Affordable homes

- To be handed over to WRCC end July
- Tenants allocated to all

What went well?



- ❖ Effective partnerships
- ❖ Support from RHE
- ❖ Choice of developer
 - Local company
 - Good track record
 - Listened and prepared to be flexible

And not so well?



Not much, apart from:

- ❖ Core Strategy issue
- ❖ Slow process

Lessons

- ❖ Demonstrably community-led
- ❖ Partnership working essential
- ❖ Evidence of local need must be sound
- ❖ Be clear about what you want
- ❖ Compromise may be necessary
- ❖ Patience needed (9 years and counting)
- ❖ Open communication, two-way, essential