Strategic Housing Options (Paper 2) Questions and Reponses

From Camrose Community Council

Growith Options.

1. Do you support one of the Proposed Growth Options? (If so, please specify which one). ***Yes – Option 6.***
2. Would you like to propose a different Growth Option? ***No***
3. Do you agree with the outcome of the Sustainability Appraisal? – ***Not entirely, as a Community Council, Camrose is committed to supporting an option to allow our villages and settlements to grow appropriately to be self supporting, interactive and thriving with an ability to raise and support families and services****.*
4. Do you support one of the Proposed Spatial Options? (1,2, or 3) – ***Yes- option 3 – Rural Community Focus****.*
5. Would you like to propose a different Spatial Option? – ***No***
6. Do you agree with the outcome of the Sustainability Appraisal? – ***In part. There is an accuracy in the SA, however, it does not reflect that people will always make choices and these will be based o a variety of individual circumstances. All 3 options discriminate against rural communities such as ours and do not consider the effects of stagnation and the likely premiums on homes which will put tem further beyond the reach of our young people and families, Every village/cluster should have the opportunity to grow appropriately. The issue of car journeys which is highlighted as a negative is a call for the Authority to be more imaginative in solving this issue by means other than supporting historically empty buses to operate.***
7. Do you support any of the Rural Housing Strategy Options**? - *Yes. We are very supportive of the concept of clusters and can point to 3 examples which cover our community area – Simpson Cross, Keeston and Pelcomb Cross. Portfield Gate and Sutton. Camrose and Wolfsdale. This affirms our support for option A on Clusters. We are broadly supportive of the use of boundaries for all settlements for market housing but consider option C allows the opportunity for smaller developments under 5 dwellings in smaller hamlets and some villages allowing for affordable dwellings beyond these boundaries.***

***We continue to be perplexed by the requirement for employment and tourism developments to be ‘well related to a settlement’. In many cases the occupants of houses do not support this concept and the users of the service, e.g. tourists, want to be away from towns and villages and to experience our beautiful rural countryside. Infill and rounding off is supported as a means to deliver for all settlements, Therefore, we suggest every settlement should have a boundary which compliments previous comments. We, therefore, support option E but it must be applied across the board,***

***We support option G in terms******of sustainable market housing****.*

8. Would you like to see any other housing options considered? – ***Our comments above conclude our thoughts.***