

Cranham Housing Needs Survey Report

presentation of the findings to the PC, 8 March 2016

213 surveys were distributed in November 2015. 99 responses were received ie a 46 % response rate (higher than normal). Usually our housing need surveys show a disproportionate response from the older age groups but in Cranham the response rate from each age group seemed to be pretty fair and accurate. (see tables F & G p8).

The survey consisted of 3 parts:

Part A is about current housing stock, the number of households, their ages, how long they have lived her, the size and tenure of their homes etc. Key findings from this section (pages 5-8) include:

- 54/55% of respondents have lived in Cranham for >20 years, whilst 12/12% have lived here for <4 years.
- 75/75% of respondents live in a house, 17/18% live in a bungalow and 1/1% live in a flat. 89% of these homes have >3 bedrooms. 7% have 2 bedrooms and 2% have 1 bedroom.
- 65/66% of households have only 1 or 2 people, 26% are 3 or 4 person households and 8% have >5 people.
- 88/88% of respondents are owner-occupiers (60% of which have no mortgage), 1% live in a home rented from SDC and 2% rent privately, 2% are living with friends/family & a further 3% live in a home tied to their job.
- 11 (11%) respondents said a member of their family had moved away due to difficulty finding an affordable home within the last 5 years. (quite high)
- 53/54% of respondents said they were in favour of a small development of affordable homes, 13% were not in favour and 26% were unsure (5% no reply).

Page 10,11,12 The comments box gave people an opportunity to express their personal views on the issue of affordable housing and 47 people chose to do so. A proportion of the responses were clearly against the provision of any affordable homes eg *'Cranham is AONB/SSI/Tier 5 settlement and no further housing, affordable or otherwise should be undertaken in Cranham, particularly on green field sites.'* Several people were concerned that development now could lead to further housing in the future or they were concerned with an increase in traffic in the village and also the lack of facilities. Some were very positive eg *'I strongly support affordable houses in the village. It helps retain those in the village with the local connection and keeps the village alive with young people.'* Other responses were more conditional and keen eg to ensure that any new houses remained affordable in the future or that they fitted in with the surrounding architecture and landscape and that only a small number of houses should be built. There were a couple of

mentions of the almshouses and retaining control within the village. Several people also pointed out a lack of suitable properties for older people to downsize into.

Part B is about homeworking – these questions are included in order to reveal the numbers of people working from home and to refute the assumption that there is no employment in rural parishes. The survey found that up to 34 (31%) (4 no replies) people are currently working from home here, roughly 3/3 of whom were self-employed and 1/4 for an employer. A further 22 (24%) people would like to work from home if they had adequate facilities. They were engaged in a wide variety of activities: arts, crafts & design, IT/knowledge based work, agriculture/gardening, engineering, law & currency trading/house renting/tuition/health & hairdressing/leisure/pubs.

Part C: 23 households responded to Part C of the survey which was only completed by people who predicted that they will need to move within 5 years. Of these 23, 14 appeared to have sufficient funds to find adequate housing on the open market, whilst 9 might be considered eligible for social housing (although one of these was ignored as they indicated they would be moving out of the area). 7 of the 9 needed to move within the next 5 years.

3 of the 8 seemed to be eligible for social rented accommodation: 1 x 2bed home and 2 x 1bed homes.

5 further households looked as if they might be able to afford a shared ownership home: 4 x 2bed house/flat and 1 x 3bed house. (see p22 for table)

Affordability: The average priced property in Cranham during the last 2 years was £514,200 which is considerably higher than the average for the county £185,696 (March 2015). The least expensive property in the parish was £290,000 but to afford even this a household would require a deposit of £43,500 and their annual gross income for mortgage purposes would have to be at least £70,430.

There was a distinct **lack of private rented properties** available here and prices are high eg a studio flat in Edge @ £450 pcm and a 2-bed terrace in Crickley Hill was £650 (to be 25% income = a salary of £31,200).

Current social housing stock: 4 social rented homes, 2 2bed bungalows owned by SDC and 2 x 1bed houses managed by a Housing Association. This equates to 2% of the housing stock within the parish – which is much lower than the proportion for Stroud District (15.5%) and the UK. None of these 4 properties had been re-let since 2009. In addition there were 2 further 1bed almshouses.

The final finding I would like to draw your attention to is that of the 21 households who want to move but can afford to meet their needs on the open market, 9 were over 60 and wishing to downsize or move into older person's housing ie like many villages, there is a shortage of suitable housing for older people.

Recommendations:

Publish this report to all residents of Cranham – put an Executive Summary in the Newsletter and paper copies on Village Hall notice board & shop(?) & be prepared to email it out on request (parish clerk).

With your permission I would like to send a copy to the SDC Housing Strategy Officers

Continue to encourage residents to register on Glos Homeseeker (leave leaflets with clerk or give them my details)

Consider whether and how to meet the needs of the 8 identified households. Options include:

- Doing nothing and see what happens.
- Attempt to meet the need of local residents by supporting a small development. This is obviously my preference. I know it is not an easy thing to take on – exception sites take years to bring forward and it would require persistence, determination and a thick skin but ultimately it can also be extremely interesting and rewarding and you can leave a long-term legacy for your village. First thing to do would be to nominate one or two of your parish councillors to take the lead and become housing champions for the project.
- Next step would be to carry out a site identification exercise with me to find the most suitable site which would involve a walk around with a map one day identifying every piece of land you thought might be suitable. I could then liaise with the landowners to see which land was available and then with the planners at SDC to see which sites they considered suitable. Usually they provide a shortlist in preferential order. This is the way of finding what might be the best sites and also of having any influence on the sites.
- As you know, 2 landowners have already put forward sites and one of them has a developer ready to start drawing up plans. Whilst housing associations are used to working with parish councils and to carrying out lots of consultation, developers can be less keen to do so. My strong recommendation in such a situation is that you take the initiative and indicate that you need to be included in the process and that you represent the community.
- I should also point out that it is very likely that any development would include some market housing as government subsidy for affordable rented homes has now stopped – even the HAs/RPs are looking at cross-subsidy for exception sites. Again by taking the lead you have the best chance of influencing the type of open market housing to be built (although there is no obligation for this local open market need to be taken into

account). Your need is for 5 shared ownership, 3 affordable rent plus a few OM which included bungalows/starter homes.

- Permit me to invite GRHP partners (housing associations) to see which ones might be interested in development here