

17<sup>th</sup> July 2013

Refer: **South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Examination**  
**Report by Tim Cann, Senior Director, BNP Paribas Real Estate dated 7<sup>th</sup> June 2013**  
PT12/2395/O| received: 12 July 2012

Attn: Sarah Tucker, Case Officer

Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment  
South Gloucestershire Council Offices  
either  
PO Box 2081,  
South Gloucestershire  
BS35 9BP  
or  
Badminton Road  
Yate  
BS37 5AF

Dear Madam,

I have struggled to understand all the reasons and logic behind future housing needs of the nation and specifically South Gloucestershire. However the report provided by Mr Tim Cann of BNP Paribas has much more of a real all inclusive appraisal, which includes cohesive and coherent logic that any large company would be ill advised to ignore.

The construction industry has demonstrated for a number of years a policy of releasing a limited number of new homes and not building more on the same site until the majority of the tranche has been sold. This concludes that the supply of money to people that may be available to purchase a home is the constraint.

I do not agree with the reintroduction of under pinning the loan for a purchase of a property; in the past that has clearly increased property value, resulting in chasing an increasingly distant target of achieving the goal. The 20% repayment will be garnered either by larger mortgage repayments at some time in the future or upon the sale of the property, which will have an impact, particularly if the value of property has increased and they wish to upgrade; this is not viable logic unless salaries have increased significantly. Property values have decreased in the past and could do the same in the future, another potential impact of the 20% payment that home owners have enjoyed, but the government via the taxation demands will need to provide. Discounting the land value, the labour and material costs have a finite value which is not inflation proof, and which cannot be breached! The aspects for green eco homes are generally ignored as the basic costs to provide these are commercial suicide for the construction industry.

If people wish to buy a home, then the luxury of a car should not be possible initially. I know of few people prepared to walk a mile to catch public transport. I know that the Thornbury bus service to Bristol is far from reliable. All of this would logically conclude that affordable housing should be sited in an urban location, nearer to the city where buses are or should be more frequent. I have cycled regularly to Filton; not a 'safe' feeling. Therefore I do not have a logical clue why affordable housing should be sited in a rural location, when there is a huge development ongoing at Filton..

When I first heard the 'fact' that 40 units of housing stock was the rule of thumb, for each construction company on a site, I was shocked. How many infill homes are constructed by the local builders within South Gloucestershire? I would suggest that 40 units/homes is easily achieved, particularly if the planners were a lot more innovative and helpful. How many empty homes and buildings are there in South Gloucestershire? I could certainly name a number and suggest how many more could be integrated closer to both Bristol and Thornbury town centre, the urban area, where transport and jobs are specifically more available.

Why spoil the rural countryside before it is necessary? I clearly would have that last on my list of options for a significant number of reasons.

Economic growth can be achieved in many, many ways, both by local enterprise and national conglomerates. We are all selfish people; London clearly demonstrates posh houses and posh roads are a pattern that cannot be easily broken. Why should this not be replicated in towns and villages? Many people have made huge sacrifices to achieve their dream for it to be destroyed by illogical planning applications instigated by 'powerful' and illogical organisations.

Finally this charade of what will be built where has been ongoing for a very long time. I have yet to see the business case that would stack up to demonstrate that mortgage money is available, that customers applying for the mortgage are available and vetted as clients suitable and reasonably secure and able to continually supply the repayments, and therefore available and able to buy over 1000 new homes in South Gloucestershire this and the following four years.

I would like to point out that Park Farm development will, according to the rule of thumb deliver 400 homes and Morton Way North 200 homes in five years; that is assuming that each construction company can achieve 40 units in 2013 with half the year gone and no conclusion to this charade. A wider question should be addressed. Why must 7000 units be available in five years and only 10,000 in the following 10years? Apparently there is currently and likely to be for the foreseeable future a poor economic; I would therefore question whether it is a viable prospect to sell to the general public 7000 mortgage's to buy the 7000 houses in South Gloucestershire.

Regards  
SK Sears