

AUBOURN AND HADDINGTON,  
AND SOUTH HYKEHAM  
NORTH KESTIVEN

# HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY REPORT

MARCH 2010

Mrs Katie May  
Rural Housing Enabler  
Community Lincs  
The Old Mart  
Church Lane  
Sleaford  
Lincs, NG34 7DF

Telephone: 01529 302466  
Email: [rhe@communitylincs.com](mailto:rhe@communitylincs.com)

Working in Partnership



## **CONTENTS**

---

➤ Introduction – The Parish	4
➤ Distribution and response	5
➤ Support and opposition	5
➤ Comments	5
➤ Suggested sites	6
➤ People who have moved away	7
➤ Analysis of need	7
➤ Current accommodation	7
➤ Affordability of open market properties	8
➤ Property recommendations	8
➤ Local connections	8
➤ Respondents on the local housing waiting list	8
➤ Summary and Conclusion	9



## **Housing Needs Survey Report**

### **Aubourn and Haddington, and South Hykeham**

The parish of Aubourn and Haddington is situated on the River Witham, approximately 7 miles to the south west of Lincoln.

Whilst Aubourn and Haddington are situated off any main roads, they are a popular “rat-run” between the A607 and the A46 and can get very congested at peak times.

Unlike most other areas, between 2006 and 2008 property prices continued to rise in the parish, with the average (median) property in 2008 costing £247,000. Lower quartile properties averaged £216,000, a staggering 18.9 times the lower quartile earnings for the district.

South Hykeham is approximately 5 miles to the south west of Lincoln. It is a parish of two distinct parts, with the “old” village lying approximately half a mile south of the newer, more urban part of the parish.

Property prices rose steadily between 2004 and 2007, dropping off slightly in 2008. The average (median) property in 2008 cost £141,000 and a lower quartile property averaged £125,000, which is 10.9 times the lower quartile earnings for the district.

The census in 2001 measured the population for both parishes together, and gave a figure of 885. Information from North Kesteven District Council from April 2008 showed 150 households in the parish of Aubourn and Haddington, and 372 households in the parish of South Hykeham.

In terms of facilities and amenities, the rural areas of both parishes are limited in terms of what is available. There is a popular pub in Aubourn, and a community hall known as the Aubourn Enterprise Centre. “Old” South Hykeham has a primary school whilst the “newer” end of the parish benefits from all the services and facilities available in the town of North Hykeham.

In July 2009, North Kesteven District Council felt that there may be a need for some affordable homes for villagers and asked the Rural Housing Enabler (RHE) from Community Lincs to conduct a Housing Needs Survey to establish whether a scheme was required.

This report is a summary of the information gathered through that survey.

## The Housing Needs Survey

### QUESTIONNAIRE SECTION 1: Affordable Housing

#### Distribution and Response

Survey forms were provided by the RHE and delivered to every household in the parish by volunteers from the Parish Councils. They were returned by Freepost or via the collection boxes in the Bassingham Heritage Room or with the Chair of South Hykeham Parish Council, with a deadline set for return by the 26<sup>th</sup> February. All parishioners were given the opportunity to respond.

It is to be expected that the majority of people living in the area are well housed and would not necessarily respond to any survey seeking information about housing needs.

In the experience of the Rural Housing Enabler, the majority of responses in any survey of this kind come from:

- People who feel themselves to be in need of housing now or in the near future
- Their relatives
- People involved in some way in community affairs who probably have an appreciation of the problems affecting the community as a whole, even if they are not in housing need
- People who feel strongly that there should not be any more development in the village

**Of the 412 questionnaires distributed, 67 (16.2%) completed or partially completed forms were returned.**

#### Support and Opposition

The survey asked parishioners whether or not they would support a small scheme of affordable housing for local people in the parish. Responses were very mixed, with **32 households (47.8%) in favour of a scheme**. 46.3% of responding households were not in favour of a project, and 6% did not respond. On this basis it cannot be said that there is strong support or opposition to a scheme in the parishes. Respondents from Aubourn and Haddington were marginally more supportive of a scheme than respondents from South Hykeham.

#### Respondents' Comments

Some households used the additional space provided to make comments on the issue of affordable housing provision. The majority of comments were against any further development in either parish, although a few did support small scale development. All comments are recorded in Appendix 1.

### Suggested sites

Respondents were given the opportunity to suggest potential sites for the proposed affordable housing development. Popular suggestions included (number of responses in brackets):

- Farm corner of Bridge Road Haddington
- Witham St Hughes
- Empty straw cottage house in Aubourn.
- Moor lane, to replace derelict bungalows
- The old village hall site in Aubourn as it is a mess
- North/East side of village or Boundary Lane (3)
- Newark Road South Hykeham
- Paddock land, South hykeham.
- Next to oaktree barretts site? (open space)
- Wood Lane, South Hykeham (2)
- The farmyard at mana farm, meadow lane.

Five respondents indicated that they owned land which may be suitable.

### People Who Have Moved Away

5 households who responded reported that family members had left the village due to a lack of affordable housing (totalling 8 people). Of those, 3 said that those family members (5 people) **would return** if affordable housing was provided, an additional 1 respondent said that those family members **may return** (2 people).

### Analysis of Need

17 households filled out the second part of the form, indicating a need for affordable housing at some point in the next five years.

The survey form also asked for details of why respondents consider themselves to be in housing need, it should be noted that at this stage, these statements are self assessed and have not been verified in any other way.

As part of the analysis process a number of respondents who indicate a housing need are ruled out of consideration. This may be for a number of reasons, the main ones being:

- The respondent does not wish to remain living in the local area.
- The respondent is already adequately housed e.g. they have a large property and would like to downsize.
- The respondent does not provide enough information with which to accurately assess their needs.

Of the 17 households who filled out the second part of the form, 14 were ruled out of consideration.

Of the remaining 3 responses, a current need (0-12 months) was indicated by all households.

### Current Accommodation

The table below shows the current accommodation type and tenure of the three households judged to be in housing need:

Property	Number of Bedrooms	Parents	Tied	Private landlord
House	2		1	
	3	1		1

### Affordability of Open Market Properties

In March 2010 there were a total of 30 properties for sale in Aubourn and South Hykeham<sup>1</sup>:

- 6 bedroom detached house - £595,000
- 5 bedroom detached house - £450,000
- 6 bedroom detached house - £425,000
- 4 bedroom detached house - £395,000
- 5 bedroom detached house - £375,000
- 5 bedroom detached house - £350,000
- 4 bedroom detached house - £325,000
- 4 bedroom detached house - £325,000
- 3 bedroom detached house - £315,000
- 4 bedroom detached house - £275,000
- 4 bedroom detached house - £259,950
- 3 bedroom detached house - £249,950
- 3 bedroom detached house - £245,000
- 4 bedroom detached house - £229,950
- 4 bedroom detached house - £194,995
- 3 bedroom detached house - £179,995
- 3 bedroom detached house - £165,995
- 3 bedroom detached house - £159,950
- 3 bedroom semi-detached house - £157,995
- 3 bedroom semi-detached house - £143,995
- 3 bedroom semi-detached house - £139,950
- 3 bedroom semi-detached house - £135,000 (Shared-Ownership)
- 3 bedroom semi-detached house - £125,000
- 2 bedroom semi-detached house - £119,950

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: [www.rightmove.co.uk](http://www.rightmove.co.uk)



- 2 bedroom semi-detached house - £119,950
- 2 bedroom semi-detached house - £119,950
- 2 bedroom semi-detached house - £115,000 (Shared Ownership)
- 2 bedroom park home - £60,000
- 2 bedroom park home - £45,000

From the financial information provided the above two of the properties would be affordable for one of the households in need. However as they are park homes on an over 55's development, they would be unsuitable for the needs of that household. The remaining two households are unable to afford any of the open market properties for sale.

There were 2 properties available to rent in South Hykeham:

- 6 bedroom detached house - £1500 pcm
- 2 bedroom semi-detached house - £495

The 2 bedroom property is potentially affordable for one of the households in need, but only just, and as they have already indicated that they are unable to afford the rent in their existing property, it can safely be assumed that this too would be unaffordable for them.

### Property Recommendations

The table below shows the recommended property types to meet the needs of those respondents judged to be in housing need. Recommendations have been based on the eligibility criteria set out in North Kesteven District Council's Allocations policy.

Caution has been exerted when suggesting possible housing tenures and attention has been paid to the idea of a householder **not** having to pay more than 25% of their net income on rent or mortgage.

Respondent	Household	Reason for need	Property	Bedrooms	Tenure
A8	Single Parent and Child	Living with parents	House/Flat	2	Rent
A18	Single Parent and Child	Relationship break-up	House/Flat	2	Rent
SH16	Couple and Child	Unable to afford private rent	House/Flat	2	SO

### Local Connection

Of the 3 respondents judged to be in housing need, all have a direct local connection, having lived in the village for between 9 and 30 years.

### **Respondents on the Housing Register and Housing Stock**

There are currently **118** households on North Kesteven District Council's housing register who have expressed a preference to live in Aubourn and Haddington or South Hykeham. Of those **3 have a direct local connection**.

3 of the respondents to this survey indicated that they are registered with North Kesteven District Council, therefore it cannot be assumed that there is any additional need from the housing register

There are currently 14 affordable properties in Aubourn, Haddington and South Hykeham which consist of:

#### **Aubourn**

- 4 x 2 bed bungalows
- 2 x 2 bed houses
- 4 x 3 bed houses

#### **Haddington**

- 2 x 2 bed houses

#### **South Hykeham**

- 2 x 3 bed houses

In 2009 there were no properties re-let.

### **Summary and Conclusion**

On the basis of the survey and housing register data there is evidence to warrant a small scheme of affordable housing in Aubourn or South Hykeham.

The need profile illustrates a demand for 2 bedroom properties, suitable for young families.

Whilst the need is split 2:1 across the two parishes, development of single properties is not a viable proposition, and therefore a single site development is recommended to meet the need in both parishes. In terms of location, due to the particularly high property prices, and concentration of need, Aubourn would be the most appropriate location.

## APPENDICES

## Appendix 1 – Respondent's Comments

- 1. I fail to see why any person would like to move to Aubourn or Haddington for work reasons as there is very little or no employment. It appears to me that you would like to spread the people around the local villages to live regardless of where they work. 2. The roads through Aubourn and Haddington are already very busy with heavy lorries cutting to and from the A46 any further building would increase this traffic through the village roads that certainly were not designed for this traffic.
- It is my understanding that there are many people within the local connection to Aubourn, who are housed in Aubourn. It is my opinion that any interference by planners would be "Social Engineering" of the kind to encourage by the present government which would change the identity of the existing village.
- There seems little point adding any properties to villages like Aubourn and Haddington, which are essentially thoroughfares with virtually no amenities, and high volumes of traffic. Leaving the question of income to one side, the quality of life in Haddington is poor for the young and elderly – little public transport, no shop or other hub of activity. Those in need of affordable housing would find themselves isolated here.
- As a single parent at present, living with parents isn't ideal but the only place I have at present. Wouldn't be able to afford "normal" housing as my son is getting bigger we do struggle with space I wouldn't want to move very far away from village. My son has settled very nicely into school and has friends around him, its not ideal living with parents and space is an issue, but at present that's what needs be.
- Affordable smaller houses need to be built in this area for the local youth of today otherwise they will be driven away from their own villages. Too many outsiders come first these days.
- My experience of affordable housing seems to create rough ghetto's where it is unsafe for children to play.
- Aubourn had the chance to build affordable housing years ago, but plans were turned down by planning as it was deemed there wasn't a need. I do not trust planning, housing to do as they say. Aubourn ended up with executive houses no local people were able to afford. Aubourn has lost the opportunity and I wouldn't want Aubourn to get any larger. Nobody listen in the past why would it be different now.
- We are a young couple on a modest income who own our own home in Aubourn. Prices did not affect our move here. Aubourn is an unspoilt village and we do not feel it is in any way an appropriate location for such a development. There are no amenities here to make everyday life easy for people of limited means. There are other, far more suitable developments already established in the local area such as Bassingham, Witham St Hughs and North Hykeham, all with shops, schools and medical practises. If such a development were to go ahead we would strongly oppose it at all levels. We fully understand the need for affordable housing but as there are already sites in the local area it is not necessary for one to be developed in Aubourn.

- Derelict buildings within this locality should be renovated and used for housing. Younger couples should be encouraged to buy in the village to get a good cross section community.
- I feel that such a development would be inappropriate for Aubourn. There are no amenities in the village and I think that low cost housing would be much better placed, for example, in Bassingham where it would have virtually no impact on the village.
- I think there are a wide range of properties in the village already. I'm sure many of these would be classed as "first time buyers" properties. Any building development would be detrimental to the village.
- We have recently moved to this area from Staffordshire so are not aware of the prices of houses here but we are aware that affordable houses are needed here & all areas.
- Because any such housing would be given to those highest on the housing list, not necessarily those 'local'. More to the point housing is expensive everywhere in the villages around Lincoln, so the same applies to anyone trying to move from the area! Why should South Hykeham be an exception? Not only that, South Hykeham is hardly a "rural village" these days and there are plenty of housing opportunities in the surrounding and rapidly encroaching areas, as well as local employment in the same areas.
- I wholeheartedly agree with local affordable housing for local people. Young people are having to move great distances in order to rent/buy property within their budgets. Not everyone wants to commute and would prefer to live in the area in which they grew up and have jobs.
- We do not support affordable housing in "old" South Hykeham because:-
  - a) There are insufficient road networks in place to support even more housing.
  - b) Boundary Lane & Lone Lane could not cope with further traffic.
  - c) the local school is congested at peak times as it is, with parents unable to park to drop off & collect their children.
  - d) Affordable & any other housing should be built within areas that can cope with the extra demands placed on amenities and road infrastructure – Old South Hykeham is not such an area.
- Do not agree with more development - no matter how it's dressed up. Are we destined for a world covered in concrete & brick? The world is finite - in area & resources. We are covering prime farm land with housing, factories & roads. Suicidal! Every day there's another 214,000 added to this planet's population – and this is an ever increasing figure. Time to face facts and take action before we're thinned out "nationally" – ie. war, mass famine & disease.
- In the past 15 years a considerable amount of low cost housing has been built in the South Hykeham area, especially along Newark Rd. There is no where to walk dogs or just walk, we also do not have the facilities ie, bus service or local shops to accommodate families or single persons on lower incomes. If any land should be built on it should be "infill" so utilising the amenities available at present & not putting more pressure on the present resources from householders travelling further to the available facilities.

- The one in the village considered is an Amenity area (a) which belongs to Mr Philips & son (councilor) and the other space is on a corner. Why can't the put them on Brown Field sites.
- We see no point in more affordable housing without improvements in public transport. Cars are more and more expensive to run.
- I suggested Boundary Lane, South Hykeham to encourage more residential development rather than industrial.