**Appendix 3 – Question 3e**

* No for "Affordable homes, i.e. for rent or shared ownership through a Housing Association" there are other villages with infrastructure to accommodate this Clapham/ Bromham
* Architecture to fit with area.
* stop building houses that people will change into mansions and then make them unaffordable
* integral solar panels incorporated in roofs would be good
* The village doesn't need this - the addition of some more is to help others, as long as Oakley is not spoilt in the process. We must not expand the village, other than filling in the large gap between the school and the railway line - but leave the sport area unspoilt.
* Need a broad mix.
* car parking
* no higher than two storey, must have parking
* too many private landlords who take advantage
* Any housing development would ruin Oakley There are too many houses already The infrastructure would not be able to cope
* This could help young people who have grown up in the village to have their own home.
* Local stone and materials more trees
* Don't feel any more homes are necessary
* Need to consider traffic safety, likelihood of further development, setting a precedent for further development.
* Housing remains unaffordable to many
* homes should fit the village environment i.e. not too big a site, design which matches the attractive existing sites.
* homes for sale 40 to 50%, private rented no more than 15%, affordable homes Good idea for estates
* to keep the village up to the standard it is accustom to.
* If any this would be the preference
* To keep village correct
* There is enough general housing in Oakley
* No more housing
* For those who want to live/stay in the village but can't afford a mortgage
* I do not wish to see more rented homes A Help to buy scheme for affordable homes
* There are already problems with the main sewage overflowing in Ruffs Furze. The existing system could not cope with extension.
* need for balanced housing
* Affordable homes only for young Oakley people.
* Design should be in keeping with the look and feel of Oakley Village Character of properties is important and part of the existing charm of Oakley
* Homes of standard family size, i.e. 2-3 bedrooms. Affordable homes in a small development only to bring diversity
* but only if they remain so and not sold off cheaply
* mixing affordable homes with privately owned within new developments has implications which, from experience in Oakley can cause anti-social behaviour which affects privately owned homes
* Design - not more than 3 storey buildings
* Green spaces need to be kept free
* but include covenant to benefit local people
* Affordable homes needed to improve affordability & social mix
* A reasonable mix - and pepper potted as a mixed development
* The large development of private and social housing in Pavenham Road seemed to be geared to the Housing Association Borough wide priority list rather than giving priority to Oakley people to stay in the village. Any Affordable housing would probably again not be allocated with Oakley people as those with highest priority
* Affordable housing constructed on Pavenham Road did not seem to be allocated to Oakley residents but rather to people from the wider borough of Bedford on the housing association list. The concern is that a similar consequence would follow for any new affordable housing.
* \* No large estates \* Small parcels released for 4-6 properties over a period of years \* Small number of plots for self build released over a period of years Hopefully above would stagger impact spread over whole planning period, whilst promoting better standard of design (rather than via large developers. Would require different funding for roads and services etc
* Affordable (cheep) homes for renting or shared ownership will bring down the standard of Oakley as a country village, and are not needed in any case. We have enough room on the open field between the Village school and the railway to produce a good number of new houses for first- time buyers and similar.