

Question 26 'Any Other Comments?'

Affordable Homes

Thirty four comments were received about affordable homes. These are listed in the table below.

There is considerable support for the provision of affordable homes.

A significant concern was the introduction of people who cause trouble and devalue adjoining properties. A second strand questioned why affordable homes have to be provided to enable people to stay in the village particularly the young – they move away to university etc and the challenge was why should they expect homes will be provided when more affordable homes are available in nearby communities to get onto the property ladder. A third strand was that new homes become available over a short space of time (e.g.2 -3 years), they are occupied and when the next generation of local people want an affordable home they are not available.

Yes please do not ruin our beautiful village! We bought our home here 23 years ago because we previously lived in Burghfield (all my life til moved to Mortimer) and the woods and fields were ruined by masses of new houses being built so it lost its village feel so we dont want Mortimer being ruined by building loads of new houses. As for affordable housing, no such thing existed previously so why should it be now? If people can't afford to move here then they should move elsewhere like Burghfield as cheaper housing due to the village becoming overcrowded by houses!

Question 7 - I chose 7(a), site 7 only, to ensure there is enough incentive for the landowner/developer to agree to make land available for the provision of a new St John's school and surgery. If the land necessary for a new school and surgery can be assured, I would opt for 7(b). If St John's school and/or the surgery move what will happen to those sites? Will development applications be rejected? I also wonder if applications for infill development or Kings Street development come forward can they be/will they be rejected. There is the prospect of not 110 but 120, 130 or more. Can these be part of any new demand from WBC for more homes arising out of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment? Question 10 - This I found very difficult to answer because I do not have any information about demographics/demand. It is important that new homes support a good mix of people not just one strata of society. Thus probably all the types of home need to be provided. The question is how many. Re affordable homes which are need and should be provided I think it important that the number is that appropriate for Mortimer determined by the housing survey not a one size fits all figure from WBC . The PC, WBC and providers of affordable housing quickly stamp out any anti-social behaviour. Question 15 - This leaves no room for innovative designs. It is important that development looks forward to the future not just replicate the past. The parish has a range of buildings which reflect the time they were built. New buildings present the opportunity for new ideas. HOWEVER new designs must be in sympathy with the rural character of Mortimer, and the existing building stock. An interesting challenge. I would like to emphasise the importance, in my opinion, of 3(d), the development of a more attractive and more successful village centre. A full redevelopment as a single phase project would be a major undertaking and possibly difficult to finance. Some of the best options depend on the existing St John's School being moved, to wait until the existing St John's school is vacated (2021?) would severely limit/stop development of the centre. I suggest that a full design be commissioned that exploits the valued buildings of the present St John's school. The design can then be implemented in phases enabling benefits to be realised early. This should be a major project that is initiated as a result of the NDP.

If you work for the NHS in North Hampshire are you given less priority because it is not West Berkshire as implied on a previous question. What counts as a local resident - is it a crow's flight measurement from the village centre or once you cross into Mortimer West end or Silchester, this is discounted ??? It could become a victim of its success. There has been no explanation of why 110 new houses are needed - increasingly elderly population etc - then demographics of housing might include more retirement homes. With more houses and without increased and flexible transport to include cycling and walking and maybe a train 3 times an hour - this place might grind to a halt!

English rural should be used for all affordable housing renting and shared equity. They will keep properties with Mortimer people and fair rent. Other housing associations have not kept to the terms of keeping affordable housing to those with strong Mortimer connections. Keep the village as a village and not merge with neighbouring villages

There should be more rented accommodation from council / housing association not private housing / landlords

Please keep the focus on this being a village and, as well as developing affordable housing, keep a focus on avoiding creating negative equity or decreasing value for existing home owners.

We have a lovely village which is set to be destroyed. It is a joke to say this is for the benefit of village residents. The homes destined to be built are NOT what the village needs. Young people need homes not executive homes, but...starter / affordable homes. This is only a plan to make money for property developers and not for genuine reasons. It is an ad hoc plan forced on people with no regard for those who call it home.

These questions are really just a matter of course seems to me we don't have a choice. If new houses must be built make them suitable/affordable for the existing village young people.

Work here full time and am currently living with my parents and would love to have my own house/flat in the village. Am extremely happy that the residents have been asked their opinions.

Please do not turn this village into a clone of Burghfield Common or Tadley, which is what may happen if we continue this development of our village. There is a belief that people should be able to stay in one place all of their lives - this is not always possible and people do move away from the village, get on the property ladder and then return to the village when they can afford to. We risk losing the charm of the village with this over development and another clone of the disaster that is Strawberry Fields, with all of the promised developments of the village facilities that never materialised. This village is a wonderful place, which is why I chose to return here to raise a family having moved away to get on the property ladder. Please do not ruin it for future generations.

I believe that young spreading their wings and moving away from where they have grown up is a life changing opportunity. Young people leave for many reasons such as going away to University, job seeking elsewhere, job relocation and just to see the world outside of where they have grown up. Providing housing for young people to stay locally makes for very insular and territorial (in-bred) communities. There are other communities locally that provide for young people to start on the first rung of the housing ladder.

more low cost rental properties should be available for the younger generation . People should be made aware of the importance of the local fire station . It is currently running at a very low number and could self close if more firefighters are not found .

I would like to put forward what in the 2013 SHLAA was known MOR 002 adjoining College .This is an indented triangle on the northern settlement boundary which has a current felling licence to effectively clear fell the majority of the tree cover. The area is 0.34 Hectares and it would be suitable for social or starter housing possibly in conjunction with Sovereign Housing adjoining providing affordable housing for local people. It is a logical rounding off of this boundary . I would be happy to come and discuss this site if thought helpful.

The development proposals that the Parish must unfortunately comply with are totally the wrong solution to the problems facing this country, the 'solution' in this case being to

continue the process of concreting the South, and bulldozing the North. Over the last few decades in this country, especially the South, we have seen houses get thrown up with ever more smaller gardens, or quite often, with none at all, in the shape of flats. The 'starter homes' or flats, God forbid, proposed in this development plan are a joke - what do you think these will be priced at in 20 years' time? Half a million pounds? I wouldn't doubt it. What legal powers do you actually have to ensure somebody from the village must live in a particular house by priority? A great idea in principle, but if nobody can afford it, then it won't happen anyway, and the whole exercise is basically just to make a lot of money for developers. I see the plan talks about making the developers provide green spaces and all the rest of it; well the council should dig in and make sure that not only do they maximize green space, but ALSO: - insist EVERY house has 2 car park spaces - insist EVERY house has a decent sized garden, and by that I mean a minimum of two times the area of the ground floor of the house.

If the development plans do not need to be completed before 2026, some of the building should be delayed until the next decade - not all 110 now! Allow our village to grow in an organic way, so that houses become available to buy/rent gradually, as the needs of current residents evolve. Otherwise only those residents immediately ready to resettle will be satisfied, and the remainder will be snapped up by a sudden influx from other areas. Then our young / elderly folk will yet again be stuck with nowhere to move locally! What our village really doesn't want is 'another Strawberry Fields', which met the required 'housing quota' and lined the pockets of the developers, but the sudden availability of large numbers of houses primarily drew in outsiders whilst the needs of existing villagers were in the main *not met*. It is good that we are being asked our opinions, so that issues like street-lighting (an important one for residents who appreciate the rural life of a village) cannot be over-ruled by outsiders moving in - as seen in Strawberry Fields which is the most flood-lit part of the village!

Bring back bus service on Sunday Could through traffic from Burghfield to Silchester be encouraged to use Tadley Road instead of Catherine's Hill in the village Could Brewery Common have chicanes either end to discourage motorists from using it as a short cut to Swallowfield by pass at Stratfield Saye Make cars use the main routes as in Germany so the B roads can be reclaimed by walkers and cycle riders etc. they cars could be sent to Junc 11 Can we have 20mph past schools If people walked all around the village they would know exactly what's going on and where. Q7 - keep steep slope at bottom for Winters fun. It's a good sled run where the snow comes village children adore it then Q10 - this is silly of course everybody wants what they want Q11 - this is not realistic, how can this be enforced?, has it worked anywhere? In fact it's silly - sorry! Q13 - what does this mean? This is a developers crazy suggestion Q15 - + enough spaces for cars x 2 at least per unit (bins hidden) (driN pipes hidden) Q16 - no keep the "village"?

Comment next to q11 - how can you enforce this? People are fickle and will do what they can to fix getting one of these. People should not expect to live here. Comment next to q12 - needs change with time Comment next to q13 - this is developers pandering to planners and public comment next to q20 - no we should deter motorists with speed humps and 20mph speed limit Comment next to q21 - surely this is common sense - need bus service on Sunday - need frequent bus service to Tadley - need dedicated bus shelter / lay by adjacent Budgens / church

Comment next to q7 I have answered (a) as long as the access to the site is only from The Street, rather than Drury Lane and the other back lanes. I would not want these lanes to become busy with cars from 110 homes therefore around 200 cars each day at peak times. If there are to be 110 new homes, I think more needs to be done to manage the inevitable increase in traffic. As mentioned earlier a static speed camera would help control the speed of drivers through the village. Perhaps there are new homes should be under the provisions that new residents can only have maximum of 1 car per household? I would support some kind of new business in the lines of childcare facility with priority given to local residents first. Don't bother including provision for council housing - in my experience the residents do not respect what they are given, this creates friction with the neighbours and the community it

should be viewed as a privilege to live in Mortimer, one that is earned through hard work and not just because you have a baby at 16 years old and then expect tax payers to support them. Put them in a flat in town, nearer the job centre!

We hope Mortimer can stay a village. No more shops, takeaways etc. no business premises, keep street lighting to a minimum. Affordable houses can bring the wrong type of person to the village.

Mortimer is such a lovely place to live I just hope it can be protected from large developments which will change the community small village feeling. I except that a small level of new affordable housing has to be found but hope it is not at the detriment of the current residents of Mortimer. I would like to thank the NDP for their time and dedication in trying to protect the village and keep it as perfect as it is for a future generation.

Yes, the problem with flooding and The Street / Station Road needs sorting out comment next to Q11 - there should be no order of preference, housing should be available to all

I aspired to live in Mortimer because it has a village feel, a few shops for essentials and is a quiet, rural place to live. I would like to see the village maintained and for it to remain an aspirational place to live, not a place where everyone can live because that means that those who live in the village may not value it. Residents currently seem to value their surroundings and take care of their 'bit' of Mortimer. Diluting the population with too many affordable houses has the potential to create different communities within Mortimer.

Currently, I feel part of the wider community of Mortimer as a whole. Whilst I appreciate the government dictates that houses must be built, if the roads are designed to complement humans rather than be car centred, there should be no need for cycle ways and footpaths. Let's work toward maintaining Mortimer as it is and ensuring that any development that has to go into the village has as minimal impact as possible. I don't see enlarging the schools as a priority. There should only be enough school places for children in the village only, not provide places for children of outlying villages.

No woodland or trees should be cut down to allow any new building, The doctors surgery should be providing non urgent appointments within 48hrs before any development is even considered the police house should have at least 1 officer available from 6am until 1am who is always in the village at present up to 2 hrs for an emergency call to police is totally unacceptable also no persons with any convictions for theft, violence or drug abuse will be allowed into any new or existing housing within the village. No housing to be withheld from village residents for use by agencies for asylum seekers as many councils already do this .

You must remember this is a village with one sub standard road running through it. It is not a town where there is space for cycle ways. The Street is already narrow and there is no space for cycle ways let alone the existing precarious footpath to the school and station I don't want Mortimer to become more urban like a town. It is already big village How about closing Drury Lane and using it as a footpath and cycle use You don't actually mention the word social housing under affordable housing in this questionnaire and a huge number of houses will be social houses on a new development and they will be next to ordinary houses - so they need to be local not troublesome families from outside our area. Many areas in the village where you could have put offices have had houses built on them

remain rural, feel rural, no large businesses and no more concrete, housing for aged please

We feel that the amount of social housing should be kept to a minimum, particularly on a development where the other properties will be occupied by owners.

New houses must be in keeping with the existing village. New houses must be for local/or relations of Mortimer residents, and be affordable.

1. Better and faster broadband is critical for businesses. Only part of Mortimer has fast broadband and I understand there are no plans for fast broadband in the remainder. This will really affect the ability of small businesses and those working from home. 2. Please ensure protection of the network of footpaths around Mortimer. These are a wonderful resource. 3. If bike paths are gravelled many cyclists will not use them. 4. Bike parking is needed throughout the village. Secure parking is needed at the station. Many people will not currently leave bikes at the station due to damage etc. 5. " affordable homes" are a type of

Orwellian double speak! We need homes that actually ARE affordable to young people.

The parking at St Mary's school needs to be sorted before an accident happens. The station also needs more parking and maybe no fee to park there. Any affordable housing should be run by English Rural, as is Woodside Close. They are much fairer on rent on a shared ownership basis whereas other associations (like Strawberry Fields) charge a rent very close to the amount payable on the mortgage which then becomes "unaffordable". English rural also ensure the properties stay with people with a strong Mortimer connection even when they are sold unlike other organisations. I know of people in the social housing in Woodside Close who do NOT have Mortimer connections and yet the land was gifted for the purpose of affordable housing for Mortimer people

Just leave Mortimer alone - go and build somewhere else. You are just going to ruin it - stop being busy body nosey parker do-gooders. Leave Mortimer as it is - we do NOT need any more social housing impacting price of current private residences. We work all our lives to get a nice house then some do-gooders plonks an undesirable immigrant or social housing resident next door 0 No Thanks!

This development is geared around the need to provide additional housing for the ever growing population, which may be better served by re-developing inner centers - rather than keep building on "green belt" land. If we are to lose this battle of developing houses in Mortimer, keeping it to housing rather than industry will meet that requirement. Would also like to see the developments more "upmarket" as have seen increased police activity around the local area in latter years due to the "migration" of individuals from "troubled" areas, which appears to have raised the crime levels locally. Cannot ignore this link between the two - so by building more expensive housing, this may help to maintain a more stable environment and keep Mortimer in line with the village ambiance it has had. Would once again stress that the Water/Gas/Electric/Schooling and Medical infrastructure is a MUST before this development takes place and this is a PRIORITY of the council to fulfill - rather than just build the houses and meet the government itinerary and take the money from the local developers.

comment written next to Q11: Do not agree with social housing mixed with private

With regard to the Social Housing allocation on the new developments being planned. On the Strawberry Fields development, a lot of anguish was caused to the Private Householders, as a result of the antisocial behaviour, caused by some of the undesirable tenants, that West Berkshire Council had deemed fit, to be housed in a rural community. Some of these people were already known to the Police .Before the development was even completed, the newly planted trees were pulled up, by some of the offspring of the social housing tenants and friends from other areas of the village. And the Police were being called regularly. A lot of these people have now been housed in other areas, so the crime rate and ASB has reduced . Hopefully west Berkshire Council will vet more carefully the people they allocate the Social Housing to in future, on the new developments in Mortimer.

Existing green spaces and woodland areas are vital to the biodiversity and wellbeing of the village especially where public footpaths are located within woodland areas. Social housing must be allocated to tenants that deserve the housing. In the past social housing has been re allocated to tenants that do not deserve housing paid for by the private sector, and have abused this privilege by causing much upset and anti-social behaviour. It is not correct that housing associations have the power to give tenancies to undesirable or unfit persons who clearly are troublemakers and unsuitable to integrate into civilised society.