

COMMENTS ON THE POSSIBILITY OF A SMALL DEVELOPMENT OF AFFORDABLE HOMES IN BURY

The following are all the comments made in response to the question “Would you be in favour of a small development of affordable homes for local people?”

Those in favour of a new development

- I have two children currently looking to get on the housing ladder in the local area and another child a few years down the line
- We were extremely lucky to have a wheelchair accessible flat and have it adapted for my mother's needs. Would love to see more affordable housing in the area. With universal credit due to roll out soon, many will become homeless and need the housing and support such as from Axiom - now Longhurst
- The local people should be given financial assistance to stay in the area
- Such a development would be an asset to the village
- More people mean more revenue for the local community and potential development for services and infrastructure
- We need long term rental options. As a recent ex-army family we had had to rent 3 houses in 3 years for various reasons. The first was a fraudulent landlord asking us to sign a new doc 6 months in, to say someone else owned the house, the second sold the house after a year and a bit and the third would only rent if we paid £100 over the asking rent as we had 2 small dogs and only 1 was allowed initially
- Development could be managed in the area to suit the community needs instead of mass development where housing is out of most people's incomes
- Providing homes that local people can afford is crucial for our village and its identity. Otherwise young and old will move away
- I would welcome provision for people who wish to live near family and/or are working in the local area but who lack the resources to purchase a property at market rates
- It would appear decisions on housing have already been made. However local people need housing so I am in favour if current development plans can be adjusted

Concerns about scale, location, tenure and infrastructure:

Tenure, local connection and perpetuity

- But if too large, social problems can generate. A sensible 'mix' with 'affordable' housing should be considered for private buyers not all rented
- I would strongly support this, but the phrase 'local connection' would need to be clearly defined to avoid unfairness
- So long as they are not sold on to outsiders in a few years, particularly for rental profit
- I only agree to local people having the affordable homes as there is nothing for new people around Ramsey/Bury. It would be good to keep families near each other. But I do have adult children that will require housing
- If they are "affordable" based on the average wage/cost of living in the area and not starting at £250,000

- As long as they are for local people to live in and not as 'buy to let' properties bought for people for investment and personal basis

Location

- The airfield would be a good place for such a development
- Any new housing or buildings should be confined to brown sites only and not encroach on the green belt area at all
- Provided it is in an area suitable to receive it, such as the old RAF site, not on farmland or green belt. It should also come with relevant infrastructure, improvements - housing should not be built in isolation. Not all of the development should be for those with links, if this rule were in force now, I wouldn't be here, nor would many of those who now reside in the village. The village also needs to stay a village, not merge with Ramsey.
- Maintain parish boundaries. Use brown field sites
- Just leave some green areas please
- The RAF Upwood development if it ever comes to fruition with over 600 properties would be an ideal place to site such a development
- Provided that the development is small and that it is built on brown field site, not green field
- Yes, if the development is on the old RAF base and not if the development is in fields. Suitable infrastructure improvements should also be made. Bury High Street is a very busy rural road
- Depends where the buildings are to be built!
- Such developments should only be approved as part of an overall approach to housing within Bury. Small scale developments should be avoided, focus instead should be focused on existing identified brown field sites within the overall Ramsey spatial planning area and NOT disproportionately on Bury Village. Such an approach should be part of an overall plan and piecemeal developments should be avoided. The look and feel of Bury as a rural village should be protected at all costs.
- Completely in favour of new homes being developed BUT they must be eco-friendly & energy efficient (e.g. properly insulated) to avoid high utility bills. Also avoid developments on/near areas known to be prone to flooding.
- But space recycled would be better than building in fields, ie. Upwood old RAF
- We are in favour of a small development of affordable homes but we are not in favour of homes being built on 'green field land', especially where there is 'brown field land' available

Infrastructure

- On condition that the road, transport, schooling and health infrastructure was improved to accommodate the extra people
- Please before building homes, consider the availability about roads and transport and especially buses

- Yes, if they are needed for local people but there are too many houses being built in Bury/Ramsey and facilities are suffering under the strain i.e. doctors, schools and there are cars parked everywhere
- Small and very much dependent on where this would be built and how the increased number of people would impact local services, schools etc. Also, how the building would affect the rural nature of the area. At times irreversible damage is done to the environment and little, if any concern for environment/nature/conservation is shown. This too is very important especially as this time
- As long as it is a small development as there are only two doctors' surgeries, one dentist which are in Ramsey and they are full also the schools may have trouble taking extra pupils. The roads and surrounding area are not built to take much more traffic. Do not forget Bury is a village not a town
- So long as all infrastructure, traffic, parking, draining, accessibility issues are fully addressed. Not development on green field sites when brown field are available. Not on productive farm land
- The main issue is the infrastructure
- But no further development until (1) infrastructure improvement is made, roads, drainage, social facilities (2) public transport is available at useful hours (i.e. not preschool/post school etc.)
- As with any housing development, resources such as healthcare, schooling, roads and other facilities etc. should not be overlooked. Often people object to housing as there are not the facilities available for extra people. If the facilities are made available as part of the housing development local people would probably be less inclined to object.

Those against a new development:

Impact on character/ scale of Bury

- Had this survey been issued prior to the three proposed sites - Upwood Road, RAF Upwood and an ex hospital site in Bury - then we would have replied 'Yes'. However, as a small rural village the increase in housing these sites will bring already changes our small community
- Too many people and houses in the area already
- Housing has already been built in Bury and mainly purchased by outsiders to use as a base and off to the city to work - very few locals - not a village anymore
- No more development in Bury please. Otherwise it will be spoilt
- Could any plan include construction of small apartment type buildings of flats, rather than fully detached houses. (Bury increasingly urbanised)

Meadow Lane

- I am not against affordable homes in Bury. However, I am totally against any development in or near Meadow Lane. Due to road safety issues and other issues raised by residents in the street
- If this is about the proposed development of houses in Meadow Lane it will totally change the whole character of the area and not for the better

Concerns about social housing

- Bury is a very nice area and people pay a lot of money to live here. I would not have considered purchasing in the area, or paying the premium to live here, if there was social housing/affordable or shared
- No Bury is a lovely village with people taking pride in the area. Bury and Ramsey need to attract people who will spend money in the community to better the services that support it not be a drain on it!
- We live in a quiet area that is not overpopulated or ruined by non-suitable houses built cheaply, and unfortunately certain tenants that live in some of these developments do not wish to look after their properties and the area they are in
- The area needs money to attract new businesses both for employment & leisure. "affordable" homes are used by people with insufficient funds to achieve this & are likely to put a drain on limited existing resources
- I grew up in Ramsey, I worked and saved hard to be able to afford to live in Bury. We didn't get any help, we moved into a smaller less desirable home in Warboys first and continued to work towards our dream of living in Bury...because it's an affluent, clean and small village that I want my kids to grow up in...affordable housing opens it up to the masses and that changes the whole dynamic of our dream.

Infrastructure capacity issues

- There is no infrastructure to support people moving in i.e. schools, doctors, dentist, plus the general traffic would increase and the roads are already in a bad state
- The local amenities would need further strengthening as well as the public transport increasing and investing in. There are lots of properties in the area which have not sold and these are classed as affordable
- Bury is a very small rural village which currently has limited resources and amenities (buses, shops, schools) to support its current population. Without significant investment in amenities it would be unable to support an increase in housing and population. More housing is foolish!
- The only way such proposals can work is if there are similar investments made in infrastructure such as schools, road improvements, medical provision and employment opportunities. In addition, public transport services need major investment in order to reduce the reliance on motor vehicles. Just building housing does not help the community in any way
- It's all very well to keep building more and more houses, but there is no planning or provision for improvement to infrastructure to cope with the rise in population
- This is a village. Any further development would turn us into a town with no proper infrastructure i.e. decent roads. Our schools cannot cope with further additions and no shops. We love our village
- No more homes! Traffic is a huge problem already. Schools, doctors, dentist are full. These need to be addressed before housing. There are no shops anymore/car parking is another problem in Ramsey. Public transport limited
- Not enough room in schools, doctors etc. Access not good enough in and out of Bury
- Amount of traffic already a nightmare not least the blocking, by those parking on them, of the public pavement

- This household considers that if a development is approved that all the property should be built as affordable homes and not for commercial gain. These properties should be built for people in need. If built, has the following been taken into consideration? 1. Schooling, the schools in this area are completely full. 2. Development of shopping facilities. 3. Better public transport services. 4. Improved medical services. 5. Greatly improved roads. 6. Improved sewerage disposal as poor with blocked drains
- What is the definition of a 'small development'? There have been too many 'small' builds of under a hundred homes recently which do not address road issues, schooling or health need access. It is a trick of developers I feel

No need/ Better to build somewhere else

- We do not need any more houses in Bury! It is already too big for the village. Lots of development already in progress especially on the Upwood Road. Congestion within the village - I strongly object
- This is a nice village and there is no need for more people
- Bury does not require any additional developments to that in the HDC Local Plan - especially on rural exception sites
- There are too many current housing developments that already have permission - any further developments are unnecessary
- With houses being built in Upwood, Ramsey and Warboys I feel it's not necessary for any to be built in Bury. The fields around Bury where people can walk is what makes Bury appealing and being a small parish the extra traffic would have an impact on us all.
- I think the recent housing development in Ramsey has addressed this issue. More housing needed for elderly or lone people, eg. Bungalows

Location

- I do not agree with using good agricultural land for housing when there are brown field sites available within the parish
- Utilise brown field sites e.g. RAF Upwood base. No green development

Other

- A rural exception site should provide for 100% affordable housing not 60/40
- Any houses built under this scheme will eventually be purchased under right to buy - so no long-term benefit for village in my opinion
- The Village is lacking growth and local people need local housing. This needs to be a short/medium term situation to help them get onto the housing ladder. They should then progress and release the property in order that others can take the advantage.

Miscellaneous comments

- Although with current approved housing developments this should already be in the pipeline surely?
- To my knowledge we have 5 applications ongoing in Bury. Presume Q1 will be answered with these!

- Affordable housing is misleading. It gives the clear impression that affordable means "to buy". Why not say houses for rent?
- My health is dwindling. Needs to cash in house investment for care costs (future)