

Padbury Parish Council
Summary Report on Questionnaire-based Survey
Bloor Homes Development Proposal

Thank you for all those who contributed to this survey. 115 completed questionnaires were received. This represents a response rate of about 19% for the survey.

The detailed analysis of the survey, and some more of the narrative comments received, will be hosted on the Padbury Parish Council website (<http://padburyparishcouncil.com/>), and hard copies can be provided on request, if you do not have access to the internet.

A clear majority of those responding (87%) were against the proposal as currently stated. About half of those responding attended the Public Exhibition; over 70% had seen the recent flyer.

Those in favour of development on this site (9%) tended to recognise that the village needed more housing, and regarded this site as being the 'least worst' option. However, even they would rather see any development spread over a long period of time, as opposed to it all occurring at once.

A low percentage of those who responded were in favour of some houses on the site, and this became even lower as the potential number of houses increased.

Reasons for not supporting the development included the visual and environmental impact for Springfields and the added burden on existing infrastructure. The Lodge Close development featured repeatedly in responses, since there was a firm perception that the plan as originally presented for that development had changed from the original proposal. A high percentage of those responding had concerns about all of the options offered at Question 5 (If you do NOT support the proposed development, which of the following describes your objections?). There were specific and vehement views expressed about affordable (especially social) housing, to the effect that it might be allocated to 'problem tenants' from outside of the area, rather than meeting local need. They tended to cite drug-related issues from such tenants at Candleford Court as an example, and the potential impacts on the population of Padbury.

With regards to longer-term development, most of those responding were not in favour by a large margin, and even that margin increased in proportion to the potential number of houses that could be built in the village.

In general, there was no significant correlation between the postcode of those who responded, and the content of their response, although the most vehement opposition was from those with a Springfields code. Responses were submitted from all parts of the village.

25th January 2015

Selected Edited Quotations from Narrative arts of the Survey

Homes are needed for people locally
Least disruptive site to the village as a whole
No apartments. 3-4 bed houses are not considered to be appropriate
Limited development on this site would be least obtrusive
We feel that Padbury should accept change, which includes the development of new housing.
However, we feel that the development should be in keeping with the heritage/character of the village and take into account the lack of facilities in the village.

No more houses. Wishes to retain existing view from house.
Out of all the proposed sites, this would be the only one suitable, but on smaller scale
I emphatically DO NOT support any of the proposals
Support is conditional on a smaller development, and infrastructure being able to take it. Padbury will have to expand and this is probably the best option site
Limited small developments are good for villages, but larger developments may destroy the village character
This is the only area which is basically viable for mixed housing. Ideally no development here but elsewhere in the country (eg regeneration in northern counties)

I support extra housing. However, the scheme neither proportionally scaled or responding to needs or infrastructure

Affordable only for local first-time buyers
Affordable housing may be filled with 'problem' tenants from out of area.
Needs to be for local people and not a sink for Aylesbury
People re-housed in a village who don't want to be there
No concerns re: affordable but major concerns re: social housing
More affordable homes required. Terraced housing in Steeple Claydon as an example
Often people living in social housing do not want to live in a village and do not realise the constraints in doing so.

Insufficient wi-fi in village now
No more houses
Close-knit village community will suffer
Historic ridge and furrow field. Barn owl hunting area
Expansion of Buckingham sufficient for area housing development
All Souls College have little respect for the village, and would develop everything
Would encourage potential drug problem as at Candleford Court
Precedent as an example of speculative development exploiting lack of local plan
Concerns re: flooding further down the village
Social cohesion issues might happen if site is too big

