

**Tingewick Parish Council**

**TINGEWICK TOWARDS  
2030**

**Report of the Community  
Consultation Working  
Group**

**January 2012**

# INDEX

	<b>Page</b>
<b>SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>PRE-CONSULTATION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>ANALYSIS OF RESPONDENTS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>RESPONSE ON DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</b>	<b>7</b>

## TINGEWICK COMMUNITY CONSULTATION WORKING GROUP REPORT

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction

The Working Group was set up by the Parish Council to seek residents' views on the future development of Tingewick at the request of Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC). Following a number of events and publicity in Tingewick News under the banner 'Tingewick to 2030' around 450 questionnaires were distributed to households in Tingewick Parish in the first weekend of December 2011. 236 were completed either on-line or by hand, of which 11 were completed by additional members of households. This means that overall a household response rate of 50% was achieved, which can be regarded as a very good response for a survey of this type.

#### Response to Development Issues

##### Implications of Population Changes (Qs 12-14)

Around 70% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that some development should be permitted to cater for growth and/or changes in the age structure of the population (Qs 12 and 14) and 87% agreed or strongly agreed that better local services would be required to support older age groups. The results were remarkably similar between the over- and under-55s, although slightly more over-55s (75%) agreed or strongly agreed with Q14.

##### *Recommendation of the Working Group:*

*It is recognised that additional facilities will only be provided if the community can demonstrate sufficient need/demand. In view of responses to other questions (see below) it seems unlikely that the community's expressed desire for only a limited amount of new development will lead to a substantial increase in demand. However, it is desirable that there is some flexibility in future planning policy. Therefore, in exceptional cases, such development may be allowed, subject to proper consultation with the people of the parish. The Parish Council should also press relevant authorities to provide additional facilities other than through the development process.*

##### Infll Housing (Qs 16-17)

There was clear support for the continuation of existing policy regarding infill development. It is interesting that of those who thought the policy should be changed, 44% thought the maximum size of any development should be increased, whereas 56% thought it should be reduced.

##### *Recommendation:*

*In view of the clear support for current policy it is recommended that existing planning policy permitting infill development of up to 5 dwellings be continued, although it has to be recognised that this is unlikely to provide sufficient development to support an increase in facilities. Having said that, it will be noted that most respondents are generally satisfied with the current level of provision of community facilities (see below).*

##### Extending the village boundaries (Qs 18-21)

Answers to questions 18 – 20 indicate that over half were against development outside existing village limits, of which a half again 'strongly disagreed'. A third of respondents agreed that village boundaries should be extended; 11% were unsure or didn't know. Even amongst those that agreed some expansion was acceptable only 18% supported development of more than 35 private houses. If expansion were to occur, the east was seen as the most favoured area for development, with 39% agreeing or strongly agreeing.

*Recommendation:*

*In view of the clear lack of support for expanding the village, particularly for housing aimed at a wider housing market than just meeting local needs, it is recommended that AVDC be advised that the Parish Council does not wish to see land outside current village limits allocated for new development. However, it would wish to see a continuation of current policy allowing for exceptions for affordable housing (see below.) and, in exceptional circumstances and subject to proper consultation with the people of the parish, the possible approval of other development.*

**Social Housing (Qs 22-25)**

There was little support for a large increase in affordable housing, but nearly half expressed the view that the number should reflect demand. Overwhelmingly, opinion was that it should meet the needs of Tingewick (62%) or Tingewick and surrounding villages (31%) only. This suggests that only schemes developed under the 'rural exception' policy would be acceptable (as now) rather than affordable housing achieved as part of private development.

*Recommendation:*

*A continuation of the current rural exceptions policy for affordable housing to meet the needs of Tingewick and surrounding villages only is recommended. There is little support for affordable housing provided as part of private housing development in view of the low level of development favoured and the difficulty of controlling occupation to local needs only.*

**Private Housing (Q26)**

The analysis indicates that if further development takes place, there is little enthusiasm for more detached housing, with only 11% thinking the proportion should be increased. There was greater support for an increase in the proportion of non-detached houses (18% of respondents), flats (21%) and bungalows (29%). Over a third of respondents, however, felt that proportions should be left to the market to decide, which is probably a realistic assessment since developers will only built where they see a demand.

*Recommendation:*

*As seen above there is a clear lack of support for expanding the village, particularly for housing aimed at a wider housing market than just meeting local needs, and it is recommended that AVDC be advised that the Parish Council does not wish to see land outside current village limits allocated for new development. If, however, a proposal is submitted for small-scale infill development which is satisfactory in respect of other policies, attempts should be made to ensure that the mix of houses favoured in this section should be developed.*

**Sheltered Housing (Qs 27-29)**

Half of all respondents felt that sheltered accommodation was desirable or very desirable in Tingewick, and 30% (69 respondents) said they would seriously consider such accommodation, 15% (35) in the next 10 years. It is uncertain whether such numbers would make development viable, particularly as there are some who would wish to rent and some to buy.

*Recommendation:*

*It is recommended that the Parish Council should support a proposal for sheltered housing if sufficient demand was evident to make it viable and a suitable site could be found. Some suggested that such a facility would be better provided where more facilities are available. Therefore, a Parish Council response to the parallel consultation on the overall development strategy for Aylesbury Vale\* might support sufficient development at Buckingham for it to function effectively as a service centre for the north of the district.*

\* AVDC is currently consulting on how many jobs and homes should be created in the district as a whole and where broadly new homes should be located. Responses are required by 26<sup>th</sup> January.

### **Employment (Qs 31-32)**

Respondents generally thought more employment opportunities should be provided, with half agreeing they should be provided in the village itself and 58% in the Parish. However, around two-thirds of respondents thought only small-scale development was suitable (with another 20%) saying “possibly”). A much higher proportion (around 90%) thought there should be more employment development in Buckingham and elsewhere within a 10 mile radius of Tingewick.

#### *Recommendation:*

*There is a recognition of the need for local small-scale employment development. It is therefore recommended that sites in commercial use should wherever possible be retained for such use and planning policies should be sufficiently flexible to support proposals for further small-scale development, particularly at existing employment sites in the Parish outside the village, provided there are no unacceptable environmental impacts.*

### **Social and Community Facilities (Q33)**

Most respondents were generally satisfied with the current level of provision, and around a third thought no more would be required with further development. However, nearly a half did feel that more facilities would be required if further development did take place.

#### *Recommendation:*

*Given the low level of development seen as appropriate, there is no need to make specific allocations for new social and community facilities, although the Parish Council may wish to support proposals for improvements and further provision should viable proposals be made.*

### **Environment (Q34)**

There was overwhelming support for policies which seek to protect the character of the village and surrounding countryside. There were no major variations between the groups of respondents analysed. Perhaps significantly, there was virtually no disagreement in any of the categories by those respondents resident for less than 5 years.

#### *Recommendation:*

*In view of the overwhelming support for policies which seek to protect the character of the village and surrounding countryside it is recommended that existing environmental policies be continued, with the proviso that policies for protection of agricultural land without any special characteristics should not be so inflexible that they prevent development in all cases. In exceptional circumstances this may be approved, subject to proper consultation with the people of the parish.*

### **Other Infrastructure (Q36)**

The main areas of concern at the present time are parking capacity, public transport and lack of hi-speed broadband, all thought inadequate now by over half of respondents. Surface water drainage, road capacity and mobile phone coverage were also mentioned by over 35% of respondents. Over half felt more investment in core utilities and foul drainage would be required to support new development and nearly half thought the same about road capacity.

*Recommendation:*

*In the absence of support for large-scale development, it is unlikely that deficiencies in infrastructure can be tackled through the development process. However, where opportunities arise, the Parish Council should press relevant authorities to provide improvements other than through the development process*

## **TINGEWICK COMMUNITY CONSULTATION WORKING GROUP**

### **REPORT TO TINGEWICK PARISH COUNCIL**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The Working Group was set up by the Parish Council to seek residents' views on the questions raised by AVDC:

- Is the community interested in seeing future housing and/or employment growth over the next 20 years?
- What level of growth, and are there particular types or locations?
- Is infrastructure (social, community, physical) required to enable growth to happen?
- Anything else to be taken into account?

The group was chaired by Dave Roy, a former Parish Councillor and also a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute. Other members were: Lorraine Carter, John Clucas, Cllr Morag Collins, Nick Fordy, Alistair Houghton-Brown, Jackie Nash, Cllr Peter Smith.

#### **PRE-CONSULTATION**

The group met for the first time on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2011 when it agreed that the group would be called the 'Community Consultation Working Group', with the following terms of reference: 'To seek the views of the people of Tingewick parish on the amount and type of development that would be appropriate over the next twenty years, and to inform the Parish Council of the results so that they can inform AVDC of the 'community view.'

It was further agreed that the group's publicity is branded under the title 'Tingewick Towards 2030'

The Working Group identified its first tasks as:

- providing information on the localism agenda to Tingewick residents and the role of the group in answering the questions set by AVDC; and
- responding on the contents of a draft 'Fact Pack' prepared by AVDC.

To meet the first of these, a small exhibition was prepared for the village fete held on 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2011. Four exhibition boards set out the key points of the Government's Localism Bill insofar as they related to neighbourhood planning, AVDC's intended programme of work with Parishes and the Parish Council's response in setting up the Working Group. A further board asked for views on issues the Working Group should be considering. Similar information was printed in the August edition of the Parish magazine – 'Tingewick News'.

The fete exhibition was visited by just over 50 people. Issues raised included: affordable/ starter homes, infill versus village expansion, a need for bungalows, maintaining a population to support local services, provision of high quality employment opportunities, and engaging young people in consultation.

A second meeting of the group was held on 2<sup>nd</sup> August, 2011. The draft Fact Pack prepared by AVDC was discussed and comments subsequently sent to the Council. It was seen as a useful starting point for preparing for consultation. It was agreed that exhibition/participation days would be held on the weekend of 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> November which will be linked to distribution of questionnaires. A public meeting to explain why AVDC and the Parish Council are carrying out the consultation and the questions to be answered would precede this on 26<sup>th</sup> October with an AVDC Officer attending. The Village Hall was booked for these events.

Preparation work for the exhibition was divided between the group's members into the following topics: Process, Population Trends, Housing, Employment, Environment – Built and Rural, Physical Infrastructure, and Social and Community Infrastructure. The first task was to prepare discussion papers which identified, for each topic where relevant, the policy context (national and local), current situation and recent trends, issues arising, potential options, and arising from this the questions to be raised with the community. Meetings to progress this work and determine the format of the public meeting, exhibition and questionnaire were held during September. Unfortunately, progress was slowed a little by the resignation of group members Lorraine Carter, Nick Fordy and Alistair Houghton-Brown (because of other commitments) and Cllr Morag Collins (emigrating). Advertisements for the public meeting and exhibition were placed in Tingewick News, which also carried a further article on the work of the group.

The public meeting held on October 26<sup>th</sup> comprised presentations from Roger Newell (AVDC) and Dave Roy (Chair of the CCWG), followed by a Q & A session. Although, disappointingly, only 14 members of the public attended, the questions demonstrated genuine interest in the issues around future development and how the Parish Council might respond.

The exhibition on the weekend of 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> of November was attended by 53 people. Exhibition boards gave a general introduction to Localism and the Vale of Aylesbury Plan, followed by information on Population Change, Housing, Employment, Community Facilities, Environment and Physical Infrastructure. Each subject highlighted issues which would be included in the forthcoming questionnaire and invited comments on them.

During November, the questionnaire and an accompanying booklet based on the exhibition text were prepared and trialled. The exhibition text and the 'Fact Pack' were placed on the Parish Council website and a link provided to an on-line version of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire and booklet was distributed to all households and businesses in the Parish over the weekend of 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> December. Instructions asked for on-line completion if possible to help with analysis. Paper copies were collected in week beginning 11<sup>th</sup> December with a final completion date (both paper and on-line) of 18<sup>th</sup> December. Spare copies of the questionnaire were made available through the village shop if individual members of a household wanted to submit separate questionnaires.

The questionnaire did not ask for addresses (unless people wanted to give them to be kept informed of further work). However, a numbering system was adopted which enabled questionnaires to be analysed by four principal areas, identified in this report as west, south central, south east and north east.

### **ANALYSIS OF RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE**

Around 450 questionnaires were distributed to households. 236 were completed either on-line or by hand, of which 11 were completed by additional members of households. This means that overall a household response rate of 50% was achieved, which can be regarded as a very good response for a survey of this type. The main points are summarised below.

- Nearly two-thirds of replies were from males. 17 respondents did not answer this specific question, possibly because they were giving a household response with both sexes contributing.
- Looking at the age structure of respondents compared with the estimated age profile of all residents in 2011, it is clear that those under 44 are under-represented whilst those over 65 are over-represented. Responses from those in the age group 45 – 64 would appear to mirror their presence in the population as a whole. Disappointingly no

responses were received from anyone under 24, but this may be that many in this age group are still living in households with parents.

- The overwhelming majority of replies came from owner-occupiers (83%) with nearly half owning outright (ie without a mortgage), a reflection of the age profile of respondents. 11% rented from a housing association or Aylesbury Vale Housing Trust, under-representing this sector which is estimated at around 17%.
- Nearly a fifth of respondents lived alone, and around a third of replies came from households with children under 18.
- Nearly two-thirds of respondents (142) were employed either full- or part-time, of which 37 were self-employed. 17% worked from home and 14% had no fixed location. For those working elsewhere, Buckingham was the most mentioned destination (17), followed by Milton Keynes (8), Bicester (6), Aylesbury (5) and Oxford (4).
- Over three-quarters of respondents had lived in Tingewick for over 5 years, with 56% resident for over 10 years. Most (66%) expected to remain for at least the next 5 years although 10% expected to leave. Reasons were broadly evenly distributed between those identified in the questionnaire, ie lack of services, lack of suitable housing, care-related, and job-related. There was no clear theme to answers given for 'other reasons', although vehicles and parking and changes in village character were each mentioned more than once.

## RESPONSE ON DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

### Implications of Population Changes

The questionnaire asked whether specific developments should be permitted to cope with the changing age structure, whether older age groups would require better local services, and should accommodation be provided to meet forecast population growth from within existing households? The results were as follows:

Q12. Do you think that specific development should be permitted to cope with the changing age structure of the village population?

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not sure/ Don't know	Response Count
12.2% (28)	56.3% (129)	14.8% (34)	8.3% (19)	8.3% (19)	229

Q13. Do you think that the increase in the older age groups will require better local services?

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not sure/ Don't know	Response Count
32.8% (76)	54.3% (126)	6.9% (16)	1.7% (4)	4.3% (10)	232

Q14. Should accommodation be provided over the next 20 years to meet a forecast population growth from within existing households?

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not sure/ Don't know	Response Count
13.7% (32)	57.1% (133)	15.0% (35)	6.9% (16)	7.3% (17)	233

To summarise, it can be seen that around 70% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that some development should be permitted to cater for growth and/or changes in the age structure of the population (Qs 12 and 14) and 87% agreed or strongly agreed that better local services would be required to support older age groups. The results were remarkably similar between the over- and under- 55s, although slightly more over-55s (75%) agreed or strongly agreed with Q14. Results across tenure and area of residence were also similar with the exception of those living broadly in the west of the village where there was less support for further development (around 60% agreeing or strongly agreeing in Qs 12 and 14). Those resident in the village for under five years were also less in agreement with further development (just over 60%).

Among the supplementary comments on population change, a number of respondents queried the basis of the population forecasts, generally on the grounds that there would be a greater level of migration. Although there were requests for specific facilities for the elderly (health and improvements to the physical environment) others pointed out that better facilities were required for all age groups, eg employment and recreation facilities. Others were concerned that development would affect the character of the village.

### Infill Housing

The questionnaire asked whether the existing policy of small scale infill development with exceptions for affordable housing should be retained, and if not, what the maximum number of properties in each scheme should be, with the following results:

Q16. Existing planning policy allows small scale infill development of up to 5 dwellings. Should we retain the existing policy of small scale infill development with exceptions for affordable housing?

Yes	No	Don't have a view	Response Count
68.7%(158)	26.5%(61)	4.8%(11)	230

Q17. If you believe that the current infill policy should be changed, what do believe the maximum number properties in each scheme should be?

More than 20	Increased to 20	Increased to 15	Increased to 10	Increased to 7	Reduced to 3	Reduced to 1 or 2	Reduced to 0	Response Count
5.8% (6)	4.8% (5)	3.8% (4)	19.2%(20)	10.6%(11)	19.2%(20)	16.3%(17)	20.2%(21)	104

There was therefore clear support for the continuation of existing policy regarding infill development. It is interesting that of those who thought the policy should be changed, 44% thought the maximum size of any development should be increased, whereas 56% thought it should be reduced.

### Extending the village boundaries

The questionnaire asked whether village boundaries should be extended to accommodate an expansion in the number of dwellings, and also sought views on the scale of housing which might be accommodated outside the present village envelope and the maximum size of any single development. The results are set out below.

Q18. Do you think that village boundaries should be extended to allow increased development over the next 20 years?

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not sure/ Don't know	Response Count
4.7% (11)	30.2% (70)	27.2% (63)	27.2% (63)	10.8% (25)	232

Q19. How many new private houses (i.e. not "affordable/social" houses) would you like to see in the village over the next twenty years built outside of the existing village boundaries?

More than a 100	Up to a 100	Up to 50	Up to 35	Up to 20	Up to 10	None	Response Count
4.4% (10)	3.5% (8)	10.5% (24)	5.3% (12)	13.6% (31)	11.8% (27)	50.9%(116)	228

Q20. What is the maximum size of any single development outside village boundaries that you consider acceptable?

More than 50	Up to 50	Up to 30	Up to 20	Up to 10	Up to 5	None	Response Count
3.9% (9)	9.2% ( 21)	3.1% (7)	12.3% (28)	14.5% (33)	7.9% (18)	49.1% (112)	228

Q21. In which general directions (if any) do you think the village should be expanded?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Response Count
North	4.7% (9)	18.8% (36)	17.2% (33)	25.5% (49)	33.9% (65)	192
South	5.7% (11)	16.5% (32)	21.1% (41)	26.3% (51)	30.4% (59)	194
East	11.3% (22)	27.7% (54)	17.4% (34)	16.9% (33)	26.7% (52)	195
West	5.6% (11)	21.3% (42)	19.8% (39)	20.8% (41)	32.5% (64)	197

Answers to questions 18 – 20 indicate that over a half were against development outside existing village limits, of which a half again ‘strongly disagreed.’ A third of respondents agreed that village boundaries should be extended; 11% were unsure or didn’t know. Even amongst those that agreed some expansion was acceptable only 18% supported development of more than 35 private houses. If expansion were to occur, the east was seen as the most favoured area for development, with 39% agreeing or strongly agreeing. These responses were generally reflected across age groups (over- and under 55) and length of residence in the village. Interestingly, those living in the south east quadrant were equally divided between those that agreed and disagreed (each 44%). In terms of tenure, more agreed with development outside existing village limits (44%) than disagreed (38%).

It might be expected that replies to question 21 would reflect area of residence in the village and this is shown in the table below (where ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’ have been aggregated, as have ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’). It should be noted that to a large extent the views reflect the fact that many did not want expansion of the village in any direction. However, it is significant that a majority of respondents living in the south east area of the village still agreed that development to the east was the best option should extension of village boundaries be undertaken, although a majority in the north east quadrant were against this option.

Area of residence	Development to north		Development to south		Development to east		Development to west		Response Count
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	
West	24%	66%	14%	67%	42%	42%	24%	64%	66
South/Central	12%	70%	21%	68%	39%	48%	19%	63%	38
South East	23%	54%	27%	46%	45%	36%	33%	40%	57
North East	28%	52%	26%	50%	26%	52%	28%	50%	54

**Social Housing**

The questionnaire asked for views on how many affordable homes should be built over the next 20 years, whose needs they should meet, whether they should be for rent or shared ownership and size requirements. The responses are shown in the following tables.

Q22. What do you think the total maximum number of affordable/social homes built in the next 20 years should be limited to:

Up to 50	Up to 30	Up to 20	Up to 10	To reflect demand	Don't have a view	Response Count
4.8% (11)	7.0% (16)	11.9% (27)	22.9% (52)	45.4% (103)	7.9% (18)	227

NB: Four respondents stated that ‘none’ should be an option in Q22 and that would be their preference.

Q23. Should further social/affordable housing schemes for rent or shared ownership be built to:

Meet the needs of Tingewick only	Meet the needs of Tingewick and surrounding villages	Meet the wider needs of Aylesbury Vale District	Don't have a view	Response Count

62.4% (143)	30.6% (70)	3.5% (8)	3.5% (8)	229
-------------	------------	----------	----------	-----

#### Q24. Do you favour rental or shared ownership for social housing?

Much prefer rental	Prefer rental	Don't have a preference	Prefer shared ownership	Much prefer shared ownership	According to demand at the time	Don't have a view	Response Count
7.8% (18)	9.5% (22)	23.4% (54)	18.6% (43)	15.2% (35)	13.0% (30)	12.6% (29)	231

#### Q25. What size of houses do you think are needed?

	Essential	Very important	Important	Not very important	Hardly needed	Unnecessary	According to demand at the time	Don't have a view	Response Count
1 Bed	8.7% (18)	11.7% (24)	26.2% (54)	8.7% (18)	5.3% (11)	7.8% (16)	18.9% (39)	12.6% (26)	206
2/3 Bed	17.4% (40)	20.4% (47)	28.7% (66)	1.3% (3)	0.9% (2)	4.8% (11)	15.7% (36)	10.9% (25)	230
4 Bed	1.5% (3)	5.0% (10)	10.9% (22)	16.3% (33)	14.4% (29)	19.8% (40)	17.8% (36)	14.4% (29)	202

The tables show that there was little support for a large increase in affordable housing, but nearly half expressed the view that the number should reflect demand. Overwhelmingly, opinion was that it should meet the needs of Tingewick (62%) or Tingewick and surrounding villages (31%) only. This suggests that only schemes developed under the 'rural exception' policy would be acceptable (as now) rather than affordable housing achieved as part of private development.

Analysing results by age, tenure, and length of residence in the village reveals the following significant variations:

- Those in rented accommodation and those resident in Tingewick less than 5 years were more inclined to support allocation of social housing to meet needs in Tingewick and surrounding villages (43% and 46% respectively);
- Over 55s and those in rented accommodation preferred or much preferred rented social housing (24% and 34% respectively), whereas only 8% of those under 55 preferred or much preferred renting and only 10% of those resident for under 5 years.
- 55% of over 55s considered it essential, very important or important that 1 bed accommodation was required, and 85% of those renting thought 2/3 bed accommodation was required.

#### Private Housing

Residents were asked:

#### Q26. Do you think that the proportion of houses of various types in the village is correct or do you think it should change? Or should it be left to market forces?

	Increased a lot	Increased	Kept the same	Decreased	Decreased a lot	Left to the market	Response Count
Detached Houses	3.6% (8)	7.3% (16)	43.6% (96)	5.0% (11)	0.9% (2)	39.5% (87)	220
Non-Detached	1.9% (4)	16.0% (34)	41.8% (89)	1.9% (4)	1.4% (3)	37.1% (79)	213
Flats	1.4% (3)	19.3% (41)	25.0% (53)	10.4% (22)	8.0% (17)	35.8% (76)	212
Bungalows	4.1% (9)	25.2% (56)	28.8% (64)	4.5% (10)	2.3% (5)	35.1% (78)	222

The table indicates that if further development takes place, there is little enthusiasm for more detached housing, with only 11% thinking the proportion should be increased. There was greater support for an increase in the proportion of non-detached houses (18% of respondents), flats (21%) and bungalows (29%). Over a third of respondents, however, felt that proportions should be left to the market to decide, which is probably a realistic assessment since developers will only built where they see a demand.

The most significant variations in responses occurred in those currently renting, where 36% suggested an increase in flats were required, and a 42% increase in bungalows, compared with the average from the table above of 21% and 29%, respectively. Conversely, only 14% of those under 55 suggested an increase in flats and 23% bungalows, counter-balanced by over 42% saying 'left to the market.' Perhaps surprisingly, there was less variation in responses of over 55s regarding bungalows, with 34% suggesting an increase compared with the average of all respondents of 29%.

### Sheltered Housing

The questionnaire asked whether residents thought there was a need for sheltered housing and whether they would be likely to take it up. The results are set out in the following tables.

Q27. Do you consider there is a need for sheltered accommodation in Tingewick?

Very desirable	Desirable	Undesirable	Very undesirable	Better provided elsewhere	Don't know/unsure	Response Count
10.8% (25)	39.7% (92)	6.9% (16)	7.8% (18)	14.7% (34)	20.3% (47)	232

Q28. If such accommodation were provided in Tingewick would a member of your household seriously consider purchasing or renting such accommodation?

In the next 5 years	In the next 10 years	In the next 20 years	Not likely at all	Response Count
4.4% (10)	11.0% (25)	14.9% (34)	69.7% (159)	228

Q29. If there is a likelihood of a member of your household wanting such accommodation in Tingewick would they prefer to rent or buy?

Much prefer to rent	Prefer to rent	Prefer to buy	Much prefer to buy	Not sure/don't know	Response Count
7.4% (13)	14.3% (25)	34.3% (60)	8.6% (15)	35.4% (62)	175

Half of all respondents felt that sheltered accommodation was desirable or very desirable in Tingewick, and 30% (69 respondents) said they would seriously consider such accommodation, 15% (35) in the next 10 years. It is uncertain whether such numbers would make development viable, particularly as there are also some who would wish to rent and some to buy.

Unsurprisingly, there were differences between age groups' responses to Question 27, with 56% of over 55s considering provision in the village desirable or very desirable and 11% considering it better provided elsewhere. By contrast, only 42% of under 55s thought it desirable or very desirable and 19% thought it better provided elsewhere. These latter figures were to those resident in the village for less than five years. Interestingly, only 37% of respondents in rented accommodation thought provision desirable or very desirable.

Again unsurprisingly, 38% of over 55s said they would consider sheltered accommodation in the next 20 years if provided in Tingewick, compared with only 19% of under 55s. Nearly half of respondents to Question 29 who were owner-occupiers said they would

prefer to buy and 15% prefer to rent, whereas for those currently renting 46% would prefer to rent and 26% prefer to buy.

### **Addition Housing Comments**

Q30. Do you have any other comments or suggestions about the type, quantity or location of housing to be provided?

Additional comments referred to the issues set out below. In some cases they added to or emphasised issues already covered in answers to questions but additional points are summarised below.

**affordable housing (7 comments)** – should not be expensive to rent or buy or this defeats object of building it; a Council house should be built for every private house built; shared ownership gives greater responsibility for the owner to look after their property; social housing should be occupied according to the number of residents within it; lower income people find it hard to afford villages in terms of increased travel and shopping costs.

**effects on the character of the village of new development (15)** – new housing should be in keeping with the village; people who choose a rural location accept there will be compromises as regards services; no village should ruin its outlook by extending its boundaries; villages should remain small communities; whilst there are existing empty dwellings any argument for increased greenfield development should be vigorously resisted; the point of a village is its rural character and not an opportunity to mimic an estate suited to a town. There was a particular comment about the poor quality of the integration of the West Well Lane/ Barton Road development – “Whilst the houses themselves have some (debatable) design merit the Highway’s requirements make any integration completely incongruous, out of keeping with the local character and detailing of the fabric of the village, most of all demonstrated by the crass, cheap and ugly street lights.”

**sheltered housing (10)** – although some supported sheltered housing or other housing for the elderly, others comments included: it would only be useful if there was a great improvement in local amenities; it needs to be within walking distance of shops, Village Hall and pub, otherwise in a more populated area; is probably better located nearer to services, eg in Buckingham where there are amenities to support the needs of that population.

**other types of housing required (9)** – there were needs for low cost housing so youngsters living in the village are able to afford to stay; more accommodation for the disabled; plots for self-build schemes; self-contained apartments for 1 or 2 people but with a proper warden on site.

**whether there is sufficient demand for new housing (7)** – despite the range in house sizes very few are being sold which reflects that there cannot be enough demand to build any new houses; no developer deems the demand to be great enough to develop a very large house on Main Street into affordable flats; commercial economics will not support any new shops; there are too many empty houses already.

**roads and parking (4)** – infill housing must make parking the number one priority; new houses will only encourage increased traffic flow; roads can only cope with the population now.

**sites and location of new housing (4)** - potential sites mentioned were: the White Hart, the PSP Auction site, behind the houses on the north side of Main Street, south of Stowe View; Water Stratford Road opposite the Recreation Ground; spare land on Buckingham Street. A further comment was that development to the west would have no natural boundary till you get to Little Tingewick and development of that scale would be totally out of place.

One further comment was that Tingewick should not cater for needs of other counties.

### **Employment**

The questionnaire asked whether there should be more employment development in the village and/or surrounding area and of what type? The responses are summarised below.

Q31. Do you think that there will be a need for more places of employment over the next 20 years to 2031?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure/don't know	Response Count
In Tingewick Village	16.8% (35)	32.7% (68)	27.4% (57)	6.7% (14)	16.3% (34)	208
In Tingewick Parish	15.3% (32)	42.6% (89)	24.9% (52)	4.8% (10)	12.4% (26)	209
In Buckingham	35.8% (77)	55.3% (119)	2.3% (5)	0.9% (2)	5.6% (12)	215
Elsewhere within a 10 mile radius of Tingewick	35.2% (75)	54.5% (116)	2.3% (5)	0.9% (2)	7.0% (15)	213

Q32. If there is new employment development in Tingewick Parish what type do you think would suit?

	Yes	No	Possibly	Don't know	Response Count
Small employment buildings*	64.7% (141)	8.7% (19)	20.6% (45)	6.0% (13)	218
Large employment buildings*	7.2% (14)	66.2% (129)	20.0% (39)	6.7% (13)	195

\*small = employing less than 10, large = employing more than 10

The tables show that respondents generally thought more employment opportunities should be provided, with half agreeing they should be provided in the village itself and 58% in the Parish. However, around two-thirds of respondents thought only small-scale development was suitable (with another 20%) saying “possibly”). A much higher proportion (around 90%) thought there should be more employment development in Buckingham and elsewhere within a 10 mile radius of Tingewick.

The results were broadly the same when analysed by age group and length of time resident in the village. In terms of area of residence residents in the east and south east were more in favour of more employment in Tingewick itself as were those in rented accommodation (both 60%). Regarding types of employment, the only significant variation was that respondents in rented accommodation were more likely to be in favour of large employment buildings with 46% answering ‘yes’ or ‘possibly.’

### Social and Community Facilities

Residents were asked whether they were adequate for the existing population, additional facilities are required to meet changes in the population, and if further development takes place, does Tingewick need more social and community infrastructure to support it?

Q33. Which of the following do you think might apply in Tingewick?

	Need more now without new development	Have enough now, but will need more with new development	Will not need any more with development	Don't know	Response Count
Shops	16.6% (38)	45.9% (105)	31.4% (72)	6.1% (14)	229
School	2.7% (6)	47.5% (105)	31.7% (70)	18.1% (40)	221
Built leisure facilities	19.4% (42)	32.7% (71)	31.8% (69)	16.1% (35)	217
Parks and play areas	14.1% (31)	46.4% (102)	31.8% (70)	7.7% (17)	220

Village Hall	13.0% (29)	42.6% (95)	34.5% (77)	9.9% (22)	223

The table shows that most respondents were generally satisfied with the current level of provision, and around a third thought no more would be required with further development. However, nearly a half did feel that more facilities would be required if further development did take place.

### Environment

Residents were asked whether existing AVDC policies aimed at protecting or improving the traditional characteristics of Tingewick and the surrounding countryside are still appropriate.

#### Q34. Should strict control continue to be applied to the following?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure/don't know	Response Count
Design of new buildings	57.6% (132)	34.9% (80)	4.4% (10)	0.4% (1)	2.6% (6)	229
Development in the conservation area	67.3% (150)	24.7% (55)	4.5% (10)	2.7% (6)	0.9% (2)	223
Preserving the countryside adjoining the village	69.1% (159)	25.2% (58)	4.3% (10)	0.0% (0)	1.3% (3)	230
Preserving the countryside elsewhere in the parish	62.1% (139)	33.0% (74)	3.1% (7)	0.0% (0)	1.8% (4)	224
Protection of Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Nature Conservation value	71.4% (160)	22.3% (50)	1.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	4.9% (11)	224

The table shows strong support for policies which seek to protect the character of the village and surrounding countryside. There were no major variations between the groups of respondents analysed. Perhaps significantly, there was virtually no disagreement in any of the categories by those respondents resident for less than 5 years.

Residents were also asked:

Q35. Are there any areas in Tingewick Parish which you think could be visually improved, perhaps through new development?

The following sites were mentioned by more than one respondent:

- Old White Hart (18 comments)
- Auction site (12)
- "Pre-fab" site- Buckingham Street (3)
- Sandpit-Water Stratford Road (3)
- Recreation Ground (2)

Other sites/areas mentioned were: Royal Oak car park with village hall and its car park, "bungalow plots- Main Street", Main Street generally, redundant nissen huts and land left

over from war use beside Grovehill Farm and adjacent to golf course, Grove Hill, Aerodrome Farm to the south of the bypass, land behind houses on north side of Main Street, Buckingham Street, preschool building next to primary school, the duck pond, and New Street.

More generally, comments were made about parking, traffic management bollards, street lighting, new development, roads, litter and vandalism.

### Other Infrastructure

Residents were asked whether existing infrastructure was adequate and a constraint on further development.

Q36. Which of the following do you think might apply in Tingewick? Please tick only one box per row

	Need more now without new development	Have enough now, but will need more with new development	Will not need any more with development	Don't know	Response Count
Core utilities (gas, electricity, water)	6.6% (14)	65.9% (139)	9.5% (20)	18.0% (38)	211
Broadband	56.9% (123)	23.1% (50)	5.6% (12)	14.4% (31)	216
Surface water drainage	48.8% (105)	36.7% (79)	2.8% (6)	11.6% (25)	215
Foul drainage (sewage)	19.6% (41)	56.9% (119)	2.4% (5)	21.1% (44)	209
Parking capacity	72.6% (164)	20.8% (47)	3.1% (7)	3.5% (8)	226
Road capacity	35.2% (76)	48.1% (104)	9.3% (20)	7.4% (16)	216
Public transport	58.7% (131)	28.3% (63)	4.0% (9)	9.0% (20)	223
Mobile phone coverage	43.8% (95)	26.7% (58)	13.4% (29)	16.1% (35)	217
Other (please specify below)	36.4% (12)	15.2% (5)	3.0% (1)	45.5% (15)	33

The table shows that the main areas of concern at the present time are parking capacity, public transport and lack of hi-speed broadband, all thought inadequate now by over half of respondents. Surface water drainage, road capacity and mobile phone coverage were also mentioned by over 35% of respondents. Over half felt more investment in core utilities and foul drainage would be required to support new development and nearly half thought the same about road capacity. These concerns were raised across all groups, with some minor variations across areas of residence which perhaps reflected how the respondents' area was particularly affected by specific issues. Lack of hi-speed broadband and poor mobile phone coverage was of greater concern to under- 55s.

Additional infrastructure issues that were raised (Question 37) were:

- communal energy generation facilities/windpower
- a bicycle lane from Tingewick to Finmere
- improvements to walkways and paths

- improvements to road surfaces
- free wifi, Council sponsored
- street lighting
- speed cameras
- cable television

More specifically, it was said by one respondent that Main Street can't take any more traffic; another said there should be a new road relief for Main Street, in conjunction with new build within or around the village. An increase in parking and more double yellow lines were also mentioned with a suggestion "do not allow garages to be turned into house rooms and cars to be parked on the paths, etc."

Although more relevant to social and community facilities, the following were also mentioned under this question: a picnic area at pond, mobile library, healthcare facilities/doctor's surgery, sports and activity facilities especially for teenagers, and play areas.

### **And Finally**

Residents were asked (Question 38) "Is there anything else related to new development that you think we should take into account when thinking about your response?"

Some of the comments duplicate those made elsewhere or are covered by answers to questions and these have not been repeated here. Additional comments are summarised below.

**Principle of development (12 comments)** - new housing will not necessarily mean the use of the shop or the pubs; further development will require significant investment in roads, facilities, schools etc more suitable in smaller villages such as Finmere or Water Stratford; privately funded development will probably not be bought by the existing population of Tingewick, so cannot be said to benefit them; local facilities are reaching capacity and huge investment would be needed in the roads, parking, infrastructure and amenities; to entice more of the demographic you talk about then the village would need to increase to become a small town;

Tingewick is looked at as a high value property location with an aging population that will only exacerbate the already stretched resources of the village; making the village longer is a bad idea as this only serves to foster the division in the village as it exists already. On the other hand it was said insufficient accommodation to meet a forecast population growth from within existing households will damage the community by forcing some residents to leave Tingewick.

**effects on character (21)** - developments should be made to build exactly as they are designed and not move away from this just because its affordable housing; don't overcrowd with infill development; a reasonable attitude towards development and extension of existing properties; use of "green" appliances to be closely monitored with reference to planning regulations; in-filling should be actively discouraged - space between allows privacy, light air and a feeling of space; infill detracts from the look and appeal of the village, will affect house prices (negatively) and cause a lot of noise, disruption and traffic in the village; too many villages tend to be spoilt by development; should be mixed styles of housing to reflect the way normal village housing develops over many years; infill and limited social housing reflects the organic natural growth, but large scale development will change the balance too quickly and irreparably destroy the character of the village. empty space is as important to quality of life as built leisure facilities, and should be recognised as such.

**parking and roads (15)** - all family properties built should accommodate space for 2 vehicles; better parking for school, village hall and Main Street; driving through the village at times is horrendous, particularly entering the village from Buckingham and on side; new development needs to be sited at the east end of the village to try and limit any increase in traffic along Main Street;

should development take part to the south of the village a new road onto the bypass would be essential; the current road structure (esp Stockleys Lane) is insufficient for the traffic increase over the last 15 years (Hickmans, Gorrell Close etc) - any new development requires separate highway access; more effective traffic calming measures in all directions and roads in and out of the village; development to the east and west can be accessed via main routes (bypass) without having to drive through the village.

**Community facilities (11)** - regular bus service; animal/bird environment sanctuary/zoo/education centre; more for pre-teen and teens to do, eg skate parks, shelters; a youth group; doctors surgery; more different kinds of shops; money from developers needs to be spent on the playground, maybe moving it to an area more in the middle - have a Committee who will spend the money on what we need; Mary Magdalen could fulfil a demand for increased communal space if its plans for modernisation can be completed; licensed premises should not be increased as these already create social issues and disturbance.

**Infrastructure (5)** - an issue with flooding on Main Street and some other roads; development to the south needs to take account of flooding risk; flood damage in recent times has been in part caused by the high water table and drainage issues; any new development requires sewage/surface drainage especially to south of village; look at possible renewable energy provision (wind farm, anaerobic digester etc); in Scotland telephone masts look like pine trees so that genuine pine trees are not blighted by an ugly mast; no high speed rail.

**types of housing (8)** - the social housing takes away from the character of the village; the cry for cheaper, affordable housing is not answered by flooding the village with houses - people from outside take up this stock and always have done so; some should be designed to suit Muslim residents; options for social housing may be considered based upon the feedback from these dwellings.

**environmental issues (4)** - use older properties for the good of the village then the village won't look such an eyesore; some of the 70's bungalows and council housing is a disgrace and what development you have has been "rammed in"; people responsible for the planning decisions over the last 30 years should be ashamed as a perfectly nice village has been totally spoilt.

**employment (2)** - consideration should be given to models such as Enterprise Control Systems in Wappenham which is an employer of 80+ skilled people with virtually no impact on the village - such a business spending money locally can help build local prosperity from within and help support organic development as opposed to planned growth; a new innovative small unit park, arts kraft park.

**Other comments (6)** - rates are already very high with very small return; "it doesn't matter what I say, the developers will do as they please if they spend enough;" views of existing occupiers immediately surrounding any new development should be taken more seriously, such as fear of subsidence etc in some places; "developers look at Tingewick and see pound signs, not people;" the option "don't need now without development" on the questionnaire suggests the decision to build has already been taken; the information in the attached booklet has been portrayed in such an unbalanced manner so as to convince people that more houses are needed.