

Policy DEDD1 Village Settlement Boundaries

The Neighbourhood Plan proposes to define settlement boundaries as shown on the Policies Maps

Agree: 58.69 (206); Disagree: 14.25 (50); Neutral: 27.64 (97)

Comments

- Disagree only in Hempton. The settlement boundary should extend to the bottom of the gardens in St Johns Way and around other gardens to meet at Barford Road
- Any form of ribbon development must be resisted
- Unable to clearly see
- Subject to exemption and restriction mooted in DNP4
- No development north of Deddington Grange
- Don't understand
- I strongly agree with these boundaries. I strongly disagree with The Poplars shown inside this one. The pros and cons of these boundaries need explanation But it puts The Poplars in jeopardy. Also the Burringtons development is already outside it, so what's the bloody point? The settlement boundaries of Hempton and Clifton are up to them
- As shown development not included. New site developments mainly outside these boundaries
- Too small to fully examine (paper copy)
- Believe we should keep the village compact to avoid sprawl and erosion of the countryside around it
- 1. Omit DNP4 and add half the site DNP7, say 60 new homes. 2. For Hempton, extend the boundary to include plot DNP23 for 25 homes 3. For Clifton, extend to include land behind The Duke DNP17 for 12 new homes, That would provide 100 new homes in total
- Too small to see
- Too small for many people to read!
- Would immediately be changed However would most Development 5
- I am unsure of what this question is asking, it is not clear.
- How can you propose the settlement boundary which excludes all the proposed development sites? That implies that, as they mostly fall outside the settlement boundary, they will not be developed as they are not included in the settlement boundary?
- Deddington should not face the brunt of development whilst other villages escape with "minor" developments.
- DNP4 should be NO BUILD as agreed in prior planning.
- Too much top grade arable land is being taken for housing - affecting the wildlife and causing other environmental issues
- That so much of top class arable land will be taken for housing
- Too much top quality land is being taken for housing and spoiling the landscape, views & wildlife
- Please see paragraph 3.2 of the representation.
- Village settlement boundaries will need to be increased if some of the likely developments are included
- Please see paragraph 3.2 of the representation.
- Settlement boundaries should not be increased due to lack of infrastructure
- It is assumed that any allocated sites will be included in the settlement boundary in due course.
- Strongly in favour. Most councils see merit in defining settlement boundaries.
- Agree mainly, though why not the farm to the south of Hempton?
- I don't really understand the significance of the question.
- This question is confusing as seems at odds with the proposed new allocation/s, which will lie outside these boundaries.
- Settlement boundaries are the artificial creation of the current population, and ossify the community. They outsource the provision of new homes onto other communities.

- Agree that there should only be further development in Deddington, but the amount of housing should be carefully considered due to pressures on the infrastructure
- Without any context I'm unsure of the impact of this question
- Please see paragraph 3.2 of the representation
- The extension of the settlement boundaries in Hempton & Clifton should not be increased because of lack of infrastructure
- It is assumed that any allocated sites will be included in the settlement boundary in due course.
- Why nobody ever obeys them.
- Currently this appears correct but would change in the future
- Hempton should include the farm on the Duns Tew Road
- It's essential to keep the village in a well defined boundary
- It's unclear what the implications are of these definitions. Does it mean that development shouldn't occur outside the settlement boundaries?
- I don't understand this question - the settlement boundaries outlined in Deddington, for example, don't seem to include some/any of the proposed development, eg DNP10 (and they don't include Deddington Grange, actual housing as far as I can tell) so why would we be agreeing settlement boundaries. Is this question agreeing the settlement boundaries as they currently are? In which case I don't know!
- The settlement boundary should include land to the south of the Poplars, Clifton Road, Deddington. Part of the site already benefits from planning permission and all of the land should be included as it forms part of the character of the settlement and relates well to it.
- Before we agree to the village boundaries, it would be good to understand what the implications are please? It is ironic that it is being called a village as with the amount of development that has happened and is happening Deddington is becoming a town but without the facilities that define a town.
- The boundaries have been broken by the development being built on the Clifton Road opposite Home Farm Works
- The settlement boundary should include land at the Poplars, off of Clifton Road. Part of the site already benefits from planning permission and all of the land should be included as it forms part of the character of the settlement.
- This would mean the entrance to chapmans lane would have to be altered plus footpaths to be installed along chapmans lane and connect to thomas street by the oxford rd junction
- Where does Daedas woods fall? Surely they should be included as part of Deddington parish, since that's who they are managed by.
- Development should be contained within the existing boundaries
- Subject to village land remaining in village curtilage
- Yes but maybe enlarge the Deddington boundary to include the DNP10 site
- Proposed settlement boundary runs too close to the Castle Grounds which is arguably the only thing which is unique about Deddington.
- Farm should also be included
- Could extend Deddington boundary to include DNP10
- The map of Deddington does not appear to show either of the two current and significant developments which are taking place outside the settlement boundaries. It is also uncertain whether these two developments have been taken into account in the calculations of housing needs of "126" or "100-150"!
- Two recent (not shown) and one long existing dwellings are outside the southern boundary. Should the boundary be amended?
- The settlement boundary for Clifton inset does not reflect the residential curtilage for Caldicote House, Main St. The curtilage extends to the next grey line North on the map. This is documented in CDC Planning application 17/01190/OUT officer report which states 'the curtilage of Caldicote extends deeper than the site'.
- SEEMS POINTLESS AS PLANNING WILL BE GRANTED WITHOUT REFERENCE TO SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES.
- Clifton is already too small/congested with no facilities like shops etc, I don't believe there is space to build more
- Stupid idea - instantly out of date and didn't work in Adderbury.

- Extending development a long way along Clifton road seems detrimental. They would be neither in Deddington nor Clifton and a long way to walk to local amenities
- Not clear what these boundaries are explaining given that most of the proposed development sits outside of this.
- We have no idea why this is being asked and what the current boundary is, needed more explanation.

DEDD2 Housing Supply

The NP proposes:

* to allocate sites for residential development as endorsed by the community. The overall target will be 100 to 150 new homes to cover the plan period up to 2040 in Deddington, but Clifton and Hempton may also be suited to minor schemes

* to set out key requirements for each scheme (eg, approx. housing numbers, design/ landscape features, means of access and required mitigation) in accordance with DEDD4–DEDD6.

Agree: 62.03% (232); Disagree: 20.86% (78); Neutral: 17.11% (64)

Comments

- I agree entirely with the second part of the policy, but 150 new houses are too many for such a rural Parish. Deddington currently has two developments in process- are these new houses included in these proposals? Isn't the Govt Housing policy currently being rescinded, with new emphasis on new housing distribution in the North rather than the South? Is CDC on the ball with this, or just sticking with outmoded Govt policy? The current population here is some 2,000 people: this number of houses will add a very substantial percentage increase. The infrastructure of Deddington (as a hub for the other two villages) is at capacity - the Surgery has closed its book to new patients and it takes a month to get an appointment. The school is full to capacity too, and the traffic on the main roads is already horrendous. Trying to pull out onto the A4260 can take an unbelievable length of time. Deddington just doesn't have the infrastructure for this, and "Developers Contributions" will never be enough to provide a solution to increased overload of population.
- Will it really only be 140 homes with 14 sites listed or do these sites open up the potential for hundreds of homes - developers LOVE to push boundaries
- The allocation of houses is subject to a major appeal and any reduction must be shared with Deddington
- National target is too high. No adjustment with lower inflow to UK since Brexit - outflow actually! Figure more than caters for local need
- Clifton and Hempton would simply be adding further commuting and with a mix of affordable housing in plans, doesn't fit
- I would prefer far less development and fewer new homes but if we must have them the more input the community has the better
- With as few as possible within OCC etc constraints
- How many are enough? The goal posts move during the period that a neighbourhood plan is still relevant. Continued development in Banbury towards Bodicote has now meant the loss of Bodicote village – Adderbury Twyford is soon to be absorbed into Longford Park Phase
- Though Oxford needs to take more houses rather than relying on the villages to take the increase. Also more provision is needed for education and health!
- We do not need this many houses
- I agree with small (up to 12) development sites dotted around. I disagree with blocks of 111. What planners are these developers on? We are post-BREXIT. We need agricultural land. Look at Bicester to see what these developers do.
- Housing should meet the community's assessed needs (and expressed) need for smaller starter homes and well-equipped homes for old down-sizers

- The target should be less than 100-150, we have reduced requirements across the UK. Brexit and immigration has now reduced the need for such large numbers. This is a developers charter and we should protest!
- I disagree with the targets of 100-150 houses, this was based on historic data before Brexit. The current projections are far less than initially thought and appeals are being made to reduce this number in line with current needs. Many EU nationals returned to their country of origin and immigration has reduced. Any decision on numbers should be made after the appeal.
- 150 homes is significant as the current population of Deddington is 2,164
- Deddington already has a school at capacity therefore should (limit) further developments
- Means of access is critical and must be factored in. Localised flooding issues from drainage and surface water must be a REAL priority
- This is a statement not a question
- Appropriate infrastructure and traffic calming should be considered before any development can take place
- The major problem with the size of developments proposed is traffic. This includes traffic more directed into Banbury. In the morning, because of a lack of substantial roads, it is queued around the roads to the motorway and more houses added without ready access will exacerbate this problem. The traffic lights again is already a high accident site and more traffic at the cross roads will exacerbate this.
- Obviously housing requirement should be mainly absorbed by larger towns & hubs, and only if required across local villages
- Hempton doesn't have the infrastructure to accommodate extra housing. Village character will be lost and valuable farm land will be lost. Too many houses now
- Agreed that new homes are needed, and that the opportunity to live in this area should be shared. However, it is vital that much-needed traffic calming measures are implemented in conjunction with new homes as there is already a significant and dangerous speeding problem for those commuting through the villages to the M40.
- Hempton doesn't have the infrastructure to accommodate extra housing. The village has valuable farmland which should be kept as farmland
- Too many houses built on prime agricultural land
- Would suggest this is revisited 8-10 years' time if plan to build is not until 2040
- I agree if this is to confirm this is to build e.g. 100-150 houses up to 2040.
- The proposed number is far too high. Permitted developments must be excluded and small developments (under 5) which have made a significant contribution in the past
- Please see paragraph 3.3. of the representation
- The local amenities, mainly the primary school cannot accommodate this many new houses.
- Number of houses proposed only feasible if services (e.g. school, GP) increased, more buses and VERY environmentally friendly developments
- Need more information - what is the basis for the number? Developing communities for the future is not just about housing - it is also about commerce and jobs. Where are all the new people to the village going to work? I am not against expansion of the village as it means a stronger community
- Housing planning unlikely to be satisfied until the whole area is built up
- Please see paragraph 3.3 of the representation.
- Hempton and Clifton not suitable due to lack of infrastructure
- Majority should be Deddington, but Clifton and Hempton should also have limited developments. Try to minimise agricultural land.
- Given that this total Housing number for the Parish Council area should be provided by Cherwell District Council after the roll forward of the local plan, this figure may need to be adjusted. However it currently seems to be a reasonable basis for preparing the neighbourhood plan.
- Too many houses
- 1, Is not the figure of 126 in the Housing Needs Survey subject to the deduction of current planning permissions once built out? 2, Have the consequences for the housing market of Brexit and the pandemic been fully taken into account? 3, How much of the new housing will go to people with a Deddington connection? 4, Does the target take into account the Government's agenda of encouraging more development outside the South East?

- Infrastructure already stretched, with few community services especially in Hempton. The main attraction is the countryside and views, and green spaces are being lost / traffic increased which has a negative mental health impact on so many. Building on food production land is not sustainable, but brownfield sites are not as profitable - not sure how much these housing programmes benefits locals – big companies profit, but there is a long term loss to wildlife and quality of life
- Neutral in that 150 poorly built new houses in Deddington would be a shame, but 100 well built houses at a range of affordability (ha!) would be good for locals and newcomers.
- I think both Hempton and Clifton would benefit more from larger developments including the facilities that can come with them more than Deddington
- Adherence to policies is important
- The plan should insist that the housing is limited to the minimum number and that the developers adhere to the housing type and number permitted
- AS LONG AS IT IS ONLY THIS AMOUNT AND NO MORE OVER THE PERIOD, ALSO ONCE A FIGURE IS AGREED ON THE AMOUNT A PLOT SHOULD CONTAIN IT SHOULD REMAIN SO AND NOT MORE ADDED WHICH ALWAYS SEEMS TO HAPPEN, AS PER THE BUILD OPPOSITE THE FIRE STATION
- The recent houses built in The Swere, Deddington do not seem to mirror the local area. It would be better to have small estates that are more harmonious with the local area.
- However these areas have issues with drainage and water supply already so any planning must get the relevant companies to improve the infrastructure as well as making it fit for purpose for the number of houses being considered plus for future expansion
- It ill behaves those who enjoy their own homes to deny homes to those who have no homes, especially younger families.
- A max of 100 homes. the infrastructure in Deddington would struggle to support even this.
- NP does not seem to cover means of access and uprating of existing services such as water supply and health centre.
- 150 houses requirement by 2040 is unrealistically low.
- Not overly keen on all 100 - 150 being in Deddington but am equally unhappy with the environmental impacts of those in Clifton and Hempton. Again, it's difficult to make an informed decision without knowing what 'mitigating measures' are being taken? Will all houses be fitted with enough solar panels to meet the demand of the house and incorporate a battery to make it the most efficient use of solar?
- Deddington, Clifton and Hempton do not have enough services to allow for further development. The health and well-being of all residents will be affected by this proposal
- Please see paragraph 3.3 of the representation.
- Keep the villages small - do not expand them
- I moved to a village and I don't want it to expand. Expand towns not small villages.
- Hempton & Clifton are not suitable because of lack of infrastructure
- Too many
- I disagree with the target of 150 houses for Deddington, Clifton, Hempton. The houses that have been built over recent years have not been taken into account. We have already taken on over 100 houses in recent years which has already considerable impact on the village, parking, traffic, loss of agricultural land, and general loss of the character of the village. I am aware that the government itself (via Michael Gove) are looking at the impact of Brexit and the need to focus on levelling up, which means, less housing and more focus on the north of England. So we should await any decisions on granting planning permission until we have the full outcome of the actual needs in full across the UK. There is a growing need to ensure we protect agricultural land (increasing need and commitment to produce more food in the UK), wildlife and reduce car pollution. Building this number of houses will have a detrimental effect on all of the above. I feel this consultation is biased towards developers who will take advantage of this and will see this as a way to completely destroy our village. We should protect our green spaces and villages as what they are. Once gone they are gone forever. More houses should be built on brown field sites around where there is employment . We are constantly talking about climate change....building more and more houses in villages will create more problems, more travel, destroying wildlife, destroying agricultural land. We need to get back to be aware of the impending recession and the slow down of the housing market generally, so any planning permission given now may not be valid when reduced numbers are

required. Reversing planning permission is near impossible. I Implore those to take this seriously. Land owners and greedy developers have no concern for the village. they will build what they can get away with, make a profit and disappear. We need a sensible slow growth each site judged one on its merits,

- Given that this housing requirement figures for the Parish should be provided by Cherwell District Council after their roll forward of the local plan, this figure may need to be adjusted. However it currently seems to be a reasonable basis for preparing the neighbourhood plan.
- In the first instance I do not believe we should be choosing sites. This appears that is all agreed when it is clearly not! This full scale development was against the majority of villagers in the last consultation document. The amount suggested should be strongly challenged by our learned parish counsellors. First and foremost the proposed “126 houses by 2040” is totally inaccurate/inappropriate and should be challenged by all parties. The principal reasons being: Brexit. The landscape of required housing has changed. Many immigrants (reported between 1.2 and 1.6m and counting) have left the UK. With on the reverse side permitted immigration is notably lower. Levelling up. This is a government initiative and is strongly focused on the North building houses and regenerating growth, and NOT building in and around rural villages/communities elsewhere in the UK. Brown field site. The government has pointed out that a priority should be for brown field sites. Deddington has only a few such sites. Existing growth: The figure of 126 does not take into account the smaller individual sites that have been built, this ongoing build should be taken into account and therefore reduce the projected number. Challenges. All developers are fully aware there are many challenges (by many groups and organisations) to the overall house numbers that have been set. These greedy developers who have no concern for the village, its setting and our future, are very eager to gain initial planning permission before the outcome of any such challenge. So it is critical we await the changes /potential withdrawal. Once they have planning permission that is it! Recesssion. We are facing a recession and it would be foolish to allow planning permission now and potentially blight our picturesque village with full scale development. As above once the developer has planning permission there is no turning back! Sustainability . Clearly if we are truly looking at sustainability we should be aware that building houses in a rural setting miles away from public and commercial activities is ludicrous. Jobs will be found in Banbury , Bicester, Oxford all requiring travel. Car travel as we know is a major polluter. Public services: Bus transport is limited in Deddington and unlikely to improve, even with the so called developer “contributions” it would take a far, far greater commitment to have a fully functioning and meaningful public transport solution. The developers would be pulling the wool over our eyes to think otherwise. Agricultural land. As we are currently seeing from events in the world, global activities often cause food prices to rise and the need to again look at how we manage our own resources. We should strongly be against building on any agricultural land. This includes previously used agricultural land, which the current land owners have purposely left fallow to allow the developer to claim it is not in use! Target reached. Cherwell District Council have already exceeded the 2030 allocation. With the current challenge /withdrawal of the need to have a 5 Year Housing Supply it is expected CDC will also prevent further developments in rural areas. Wildlife/environment. The UK is spearheading the protecting of wildlife and our environment, we too should therefore respect this. Many of these sites will be damaging to both. Historic protection. I note that one of these sites is on conservation area on the castle grounds, this should be protected. Future development. We know that once we commit to these 126 houses that this will (not) stop future developers seeking further planning for even more houses. This will be the beginning of the end of what we know as Deddington village but will end up like places such as Bloxham. Michael Gove is already reviewing housing requirements and we too should hold back and consider carefully what we do. Deddington, Clifton and Hempton are villages and not towns and we should cherish and protect them for ourselves and our future generations. Accepting small steady growth.
- Agree, but limit the number to 126 less those with planning permission
- My disagreement is solely challenging the target number. There should be no more than the Aecom needs assessment stated - 126, less any that have already been given planning permission. This number has been derived by following the official procedure. Preferably in smaller sites with development spread over the 20 years. The policy should prioritise brownfield sites.
- Need to keep control of this as new developments are of very poor quality when built - The Grange is a mess, footpaths, bubbling trees hanging over, not maintained very well. - also

most houses have had builders back to repair new homes? Also police have been there a high number of times.

- Means of access is key to prevent further disruption to busy traffic have already through village.
- We feel it is important to spread the housing over the three villages in smaller sites so as not to overly impact any one area (or any of the 3 villages).
- No more homes until the infrastructure is improved
- Planning contributions should be in direct proportion to the number and size of developments. Smaller developments shouldn't escape the requirement to make an appropriate contribution to the wider community.
- Deddington seems to be a massive loser in these proposals. What about the infrastructure – school –medical centre???
- Not in Deddington - more focus on development in Clifton and Hempton with support for local amenities!!!
- Too many houses
- New estate recently built west of A4260. Health Centre cannot cope with existing population and will be much worse if more houses built
- We believe that it is necessary to provide further evidence on the level of new homes that are required in Deddington within the plan period. The text states that: - "It would be realistic to anticipate that 100 to 150 homes will be required to be built in Deddington under the new CDC Local Plan." At the moment, no evidence base is available to indicate how this level of housing provision has been reached. The only evidence base relates to the results of the Housing Needs Survey which concluded that 126 new dwellings would be required. Until all of the evidence is available, it is difficult to comment. However, we believe that the suggested level of housing provision is too low given the continued need for affordable and open market housing in Deddington. The provision of affordable housing is usually only provided by delivery of open market housing. Accordingly, we believe that the suggested level i.e. 150 dwellings will not meet housing need in Deddington in the period up to 2040. Allocation of Sites Paragraph 60 of the NPPF states: - "To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay." Accordingly, the emerging NP should identify a range of sites to meet future residential needs. One such site is that at The Poplars, Clifton Road, Deddington. Part of the site already benefits from a detailed permission for the erection of 7 elderly persons bungalows. The assessment of Strategic Environmental Assessment of Sites is incorrect in its assessment of all of the background details are not available and so it is unclear what the information has failed in the results. There is a colour key of likely effects which no doubt seeks to influence the ranking of sites. With regards to DNP4, a number of assumptions are incorrect as follows. Firstly, it would appear that the assessment has assumed that the entire site would be developed. This is incorrect and accordingly the assumptions and conclusions reached are all incorrect. Secondly, with regards to the assessment of Site DNP4 The Poplars, we note that there are positive effects regarding population and community, health and wellbeing and transportation, these are correct. Turning to other issues, we would comment as follows: - Biodiversity & Geodiversity The site's result on this issue is uncertain (blue). At the very least it should be yellow (no affect). Matures trees and hedgerow along boundary can be retained and enhanced. Areas of deciduous woodland priority habitat on the southern boundary can be retained and achieved. There would be no disturbance to wildlife from noise etc. Accordingly, the conclusions are incorrect. Landscape (Yellow) The recently granted planning permission for 7 elderly persons dwellings utilised open land and there was no information in respect of any adverse landscape impact. There is no reason why a small additional development could not take place on the site without any adverse impact on the landscape character of the area. Habitat Environment (Yellow) Historic England did not raise any objections to the recently granted scheme of 7 elderly persons dwellings. Indeed, they concluded that there would be benefits from the proposals on the historic environment, particularly as it was a well designed scheme. The sensitively designed extension to this development should not adversely impact on the scheduled monument or the Conservation Area. Land, Soil and Water Resources (Neutral) There are no water courses and so a development would have no impact on this issue. The site has never been in productive agricultural use and it is incorrect to suggest that is the case. In any event, the size of the land

makes productive agricultural use uneconomical. In view of the above, the conclusion for the site should be altered accordingly.

- The proposal sounds very reasonable but I would think that Clifton and Hempton should definitely absorb some of the proposed housing as they are small and wouldn't be adversely affected by small scale development. Deddington has already been thoughtfully expanded and can take more but not much more, in my opinion.
- There has already been very significant development in Deddington in recent years. It would be good to understand why there needs to be more in Deddington specifically.
- Local infrastructure will be overwhelmed, school over-subscribed, Doctors impossible now to get appointment. Co-op shop unable to cope with numbers.
- if developers honour the NP.
- Considering the current congestion in Deddington, Clifton and Hempton should not be limited to "minor schemes".
- Given demographic and Govt policy changes, question need for number and 'estate' approach.
- Concentrate new development in one suitable site
- But there is no mention of additional amenities
- Clifton and Hempton must also take some development
- This is several questions! Hence difficult to answer. 1. Agree endorsed by community 2. Target 100-150 is very high - Disagree 3. Clifton and Hempton could be developed, especially Hempton. A flat 10 minute walk to Deddington – disagree
- Why are Clifton and Hempton excluded from the 100-150 new homes . Alternatively why is Deddington required to be the sole target for the 100-150 new homes. The "minor schemes" mentioned should be part of the 100-150.
- 100-150 houses over that timeframe does not seem unreasonable.
- As above I don't believe Clifton or Hempton can comfortably be extended at all
- Issues with traffic and Thames water in Clifton especially.
- This figure should be set by Cherwell or OCC
- I struggle to believe that if 150 homes are built in 1 single development such as the proposed DNP10 site that no other development would be allowed in the next 18 yrs.

DEDD3 Housing Mix

The NP proposes to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes responsive to local needs, especially smaller lower cost homes for first-time buyers, and homes suitable for older persons to downsize

Agree: 82.48% (306); Disagree: 7.55% (28); Neutral: 9.97% (37)

Comments

- More starter homes required urgently. Fewer "Executive" types
- What is "affordable" housing. 2 bed houses in recent developments have cost £415,000! This is always the lip service of developers and it never seems to happen. How will you enforce it?
- It seems currently that developers state this will happen to get planning - then build expensive homes on easy Greenfield sites just to make money
- If houses must be built, they MUST be affordable for low income families and first time buyers!
- Strongly agree with these priorities
- Only sufficient for local needs
- Resist watering down vigorously
- Priority should be given to first-time buyers from the Deddington area.
- Strong emphasis on availability for current residents either buying first homes or downsizing

- The new houses should target what the demand is, rather than force arbitrary targets. We shouldn't try and impose a profile of people we want.
- I think the Neighbourhood plan should not specify what kind of housing should be built
- Your main first question should have been: Do you favour large or small developments? That is a LOCAL need, but you are kow-towing to the wretched developers. IT'S NOT THEIR VILLAGE.
- This hasn't been delivered satisfactorily with new developments
- Strongly agree
- We definitely need to consider our elderly - they want to remain in Deddington but there are no smaller properties for them to buy
- High need for affordable housing for village residents. Young people forced to move out of the village due to high prices
- But there is not a very good track record to date on starter homes. More should be a condition for every 12 houses
- But am sceptical as to this being the case
- See no evidence of the statement made
- Can the neighbourhood plan CDC stand and up to developers who are sadly only interested in how much money they can make rather than providing what a community actually needs.
- Deddington's character has already been challenged by new build developments housing demand will only remove the reason Deddington is so nice a place to live
- We need real affordable housing. As young people trying to get on the property ladder, having always lived in the village, it is almost impossible.
- Neither homes for 1st time buyers and older people are attractive to developers as the profits are so much less than the huge mixed market developments. If the Parish want development suitable for older people, and it's on offer at the Poplars, with a willing developer and landowner happy not to take the 'big bucks' why do the PC let DDW pressure group push them into accepting their NIMBY attitude and negative approach to development there?
- First time buyers only or over 65s homes only
- Current cost of new developments is excessively high though. This needs to be managed.
- Medium income families will likely be priced out of the parish
- Current small properties - including historic stock should be protected, and not allowed to be merged to create larger homes.
- In agreement if research has been undertaken to demonstrate these are the target groups in need.
- Housing for over 55s should be in walking distance to village centre - bungalows or ground floor flats. "Affordable " is rarely so for persons in low pay work
- Should be mandatory
- But this has to be a commitment - we have not seen 'affordable' housing built yet
- Should be a large proportion of quality affordable 2 and 3 bedroom homes for local residents. They must be properly affordable.
- The most recent "low cost homes" in the new development at the end of the Hempton Road could not really be classed as being offered at a price suitable for first time buyers. We need some real low cost housing so that young people growing up in the village can afford to stay in the village. Young people are our future and will help grow and sustain the village in years to come. We should be encouraging them to stay and also other young first time buyers to move into our village. We want a vibrant community and fresh ideas to keep us from growing stale.
- Affordable housing is essential
- Mix is important - match the housing to the people we need to attract and give an opportunity to get onto the property ladder. Must be aligned with job growth - what types of jobs and where
- Affordable homes essential
- Not one of the houses that have been built so far has been affordable
- Smaller low cost housing is urgently needed
- Don't agree with speculative open market housing to the extent proposed. Do support homes to meet "Local Needs".
- More houses suitable for older persons to allow downsizing and freeing up larger family homes. Perhaps a retirement village for independent living.

- Lower costs NEED to be low and available for local residents first. I am almost 38 and still cannot afford to buy, and even rent now on my wages and have had to move back to parents. Affordable living needs to be AFFORDABLE and re assessed. It's an absolute joke
- Precise controls over dwelling mix rarely work as builders have to respond to changing market conditions within various parts of the housing sector. However provided this policy is used in a general sense to guide builders' planning applications and applied with a "light touch", then it is acceptable.
- High quality smaller homes for downsizers needed - not flats but smaller houses with large rooms and small gardens.
- Too much affordable housing.
- lower cost being affordable for local first time buyers?
- Good luck with that!
- We do not need any more executive homes we need 1st time buyers and smaller family homes
- too many large houses being built and demand for affordable, starter homes ignored.
- Important to include lower cost homes for first-time buyers, and homes suitable for older persons to downsize.
- We also need more practical family homes of 4-5 bedrooms that are affordable for young couples who wish to have a family in the village. £900-1m is not affordable for those who wish to live and work in the area and have a family.
- This would rule Clifton and Hempton out as there are no services or public transport for the elderly or young families
- When demand outstrips supply, the cost of houses increases, benefiting the Haves at the expense of the Should-Haves.
- There is a need for more bungalows and however feel that any developer will ignore local needs anyway.
- There is an aging population and a requirement for starter homes.
- But will they be low cost? Shared ownership for local people/work in the village/elderly that have lived in the village
- Lower Cost housing must be part of any development plan
- smaller lower cost homes for first-time buyers, and homes suitable for older persons
- Precise controls over dwelling mix rarely work as builders have to respond to changing market conditions within various parts of the housing sector. However provided this policy is used in a general sense to guide builders' applications and the mix of dwellings on their schemes, then it is acceptable
- It is unfortunate that only a small proportion of new houses and especially affordable houses have gone to those with a Deddington connection. We should try to rebalance this.
- Housing costs to be affordable both low cost & downsizers. Realistic pricing or else (decent housing) continues to be preserve of the better off.
- Just charge second home owners 500% more community charge as the local people are being pushed out of the village.
- I am aware from my elderly mother that the village is quite isolating as an older person, as you need cars to get everywhere. I had the same issue as new young family, but as children reached 10 years plus, it was easier.
- Essential to allow local people, including the elderly, priority access to affordable housing. This has been very poorly administered in the past and must be done better.
- We need more local authority homes for rent
- New development near Windmill Centre way too expensive for first time buyers. No bungalows built. Who needs 5 bedrooms??
- 1st timers and older needed
- There is a need for bungalows to accommodate the elderly and disabled.
- If it happens it will be a first
- more affordable housing made available to local young people an established connection to the parish who want to stay local and contribute to the local community.
- Excellent-small lower cost ideal.
- If there are going to be more houses built, then they should be responsive to local needs - both affordable and for older persons. Given the age balance in the village is towards the

older end, perhaps consideration should be given to schemes such as the Grove for starter homes for young couples or individuals, who will be the life blood of the village in the future.

- better to focus on a smaller number of detached houses.
- but given the average cost of a home in the Parish I am unclear how this is achievable.
- Agree in principle but responding to local needs and first time buyers sounds very worthy but could present challenges if there are, for example, limited employment opportunities as is likely.
- There is an urgent need for a footpath on Earl's Lane for older persons to attend the health centre from the Clifton Road sites.
- I like the idea, but I do not see it as realistic. High Quality and low cost do not normally fit together. These policy ideas need to be matched nationally, otherwise this is sounding very insular.
- Agree. This is very important.
- Not sure what it wants me to say? Am I agreeing that the housing mix is a good thing, or is it asking whether I think the NP has taken the mix into consideration?
- Larger developments tend to be character-less therefore smaller sites are preferred
- The "affordable housing" element needs to be properly enforced. recent developments appear to stretch the definition of "affordable"
- But not in estates - need to look different be of superior build quality and good size gardens, otherwise downsizing will not happen.
- More over 55 flats, with lifts to second floors. 2 bed bungalows for people to downsize to free up larger family homes.
- I am pleased to see you mention homes suitable for older persons to downsize, as this is often ignored and is important so that people can stay in the area.
- Low cost affordable homes for should certainly be included
- Can affordable housing be affordable. Not like the Blenheim development at Woodstock where the "affordable housing" is over £400,000!
- Houses must be AFFORDABLE for first-time buyers - not Deddington prices!
- Need a mix of housing - First time, older, family and prestige
- Needs homes for first time buyers and smaller homes for olders to downsize
- More smaller, affordable homes needed - 2 beds
- Strongly agree
- Will these include some bungalows?
- I think the choice should reflect local and national needs. But not at the expense of quality or sustainability and the environment.
- Deddington connection please - like Wimborn Close
- why build houses for outsiders all the time?
- There's clearly a severe shortage of smaller sized properties for young people to start on the property ladder or for older people who want to downsize.

DEDD4 - DEDD6 Design Quality in Deddington, Hempton & Clifton

The Deddington Parish NP Parish Character study identifies features in the villages of Deddington, Clifton and Hempton that contribute to their special local character. Within each of the villages there is diversity of design, construction, material, style, even in terraces. The NP proposes that any new development must avoid uniformity, and must harmonise with the surrounding vernacular architecture and relate well to the adjacent landscape.

Agree: 94.18% (356); Disagree: 3.70% (14); Neutral: 2.12% (8)

Comments

- How can you enforce this? This never seems to happen either.

- Habitats for wildlife. Native trees and screenings not just bog standard laurel & lavender. Hedgehog corridors, leaving a hole in boundary walls to create a wildlife corridor
- Strongly agree
- Why not eco build?
- In following local character must still ensure vehicle movements and sufficient "off street" parking is provided
- Resist watering down vigorously
- The development at Deddington Grange is a disaster in this respect (and every other)
- 'Harmonise' must not exclude 21st Century architecture and technology in favour of pastiche!
- and I agreed before The Grange went up with its standard non-harmonising design - so why bother putting this in? Of course people love new houses, but they don't embody design quality.
- Deddington must retain its village atmosphere
- Many of the homes in deddington are virtually terraces. Why does every new home have to be so separate? A parking AREA should be planned to be sufficient for all
- Lacks diversity of design that is sympathetic with current materiality of the area
- More interest in providing homes that are to the best energy standards possible. This is what we should be aiming for <https://www.greencoreconstruction.co.uk/> quality eco homes that provide comfortable homes that need very little heating and cooling and are cheap to run. All the homes being built currently need to be retrofitted as soon as they are built. Why?
- Yes a diverse landscape to fit in with its surrounds.
- Really important
- Horton stone only. The roof pitch angles, composition and the modest agricultural character must be respected
- Higher proportion of building in stone. Should be to a high environmental specification and developments have a high proportion of green space (not overly dense for profit maximisation)
- Innovative architecture should be a prerequisite, not just pastiche vernacular - house builders designs clad in local stone to fool
- More housing is going to change the special local character. Valuable farmland will be lost with extra housing
- What about solar panels and underground heat pumps as compulsory for any new housing?
- Add swift boxes to new builds
- No more bog standard development like Deddington Grange please
- Agree with this and this has been done well in the past. Architecture and character is not just about the individual designs of the houses, it is also about the setting and how the settlements work as a whole, including with the village.
- Designs should be low energy. Insulation - solar - heat pumps
- No utilitarian boxes
- Smaller sites involving local builders are less likely to attract large national housebuilders who are more inclined to use standard house types not suited to the locality
- ABSOLUTELY, A SETTLEMENT BUILDS OVER A LONG PERIOD OF TIME, SO NEW BUILDS SHOULD REFLECT IT, IT WOULD BE TERRIBLE IF DEDDINGTON LOST ITS IDENTITY
- Vernacular architecture must in future accommodate solar panels [to power homes and electric vehicles] whether or not they are in or visible in conservation areas, just as they have allowed the proliferation of TV aerials and satellite dishes.
- Keep as horton stone
- Deddington should remain in Horton Stone
- Any future development must harmonise with existing character of properties.
- This should be limited housing not affecting, views, historic settings which some of the proposed sites are!
- This policy should require communal heating based on ground sourced heat pump, on any estates wherever practicable. But if gas boilers are to be fitted, the circulation system must be suitable for later conversion to heat pump. Also require grey water recycling.
- Would you include needs to be of sound materials and eco friendly. Also all need EV points.
- Completely agree

- Why have several stone built houses and then have a couple of brick houses slapped in the middle of the development?
- more stone to be used - not just on the outside houses with red brick used extensively on inner parts
- How is this policy to be implemented and monitored?
- The current building diversity championed in the statement is at odds with the desire to "harmonise" and "relate well" for future building. As far as I can see the current diversity was not achieved through harmony or relating well.
- Footpaths and walks should also be taken into consideration as part of the local character.
- The prevailing colour of properties is sand/yellow stone. Developments should avoid "Red Brick" dwellings to maintain the character of the area.
- Which hasn't happened either on the Hempton Rd development or the Swere
- Strongly agree!!
- VERY important
- Stone properties break up the monotony of red brick estates
- Avoid pastiche
- Recent developments do not meet that standard.
- But don't try to use this as a reason to prevent development.
- DPC have no clue nor skills to do this

DEDD7 Travel Planning

The NP proposes to encourage walking and cycling and to require investment by developers in local bus services to reduce dependency on private cars. It also aims to tackle residential on-road parking on new developments and to raise the importance of air quality at the main village junction in Deddington.

Agree: 88.56% (333); Disagree: 5.59% (21); Neutral: 6.12% (23)

Comments

- This is a very worthy aspiration, and it should be a condition, not a "requirement". The caveat to walking and cycling is the demographic of those living in the smaller villages and older Deddington is that these activities are increasingly difficult due to age. Better cycle paths will be needed. There is not even a safe footpath down Earls Lane or opposite Featherstone House.
- Particularly important to improve public transport and encourage walking and cycling
- This is a MUST, No bus service = cars. No services in Hempton/ Clifton = more traffic on roads into Deddington
- Hard to improve air quality when Deddington is already on a main road/thoroughfare
- Particularly important to improve public transport and encourage walking and cycling
- Try carrying your weekly shopping to and from the bus. Cycling is not practical for this purpose either
- Vigorous agreement
- I see investment in bus services is key locally and nationally. Parking in Deddington has become a free-for-all. Action is required
- Developers should fund improved parking facilities in the village (such as Earls Lane) and time restricted parking in the Market Place, with a point system for residents
- Mandatory provision of EV charging points on all new housing developments to improve sustainability
- We live in a village very far away from major towns. It is unrealistic to expect people to cycle to Oxford especially when Oxford is so difficult to travel around. We should however improve the provision for public car charges for clean electric cars.
- Too many cars will be seen when we build this many houses

- Any new development which includes family-sized homes should be mandated/encouraged to financially support the school facilities and nursery facilities to ensure they can accommodate new children/increased numbers.
- I agree that if you keep Deddington unified round its centre, then the bus service excellent. Hempton/Clifton might gain leverage for bus services if they tactically accept some development.
- All these houses will have at least 2 cars. How can our bus service cope even with the limited funds that the developers will provide?
- The local bus service does not currently meet requirements and is unlikely to with the 'so-called' investment from any developer. Up to 150 homes would potentially create at least an additional 200 cars going in and out of the village
- Please bring in 20 mph along all roads in our villages
- Where is the confirmation of bus service investment?
- any requirement for car share facilities, electric car charging points? Money for cycle/walking routes or new bus services?
- Public transport i.e. bus service should be cheaper, frequent and reliable to make it attractive for people to use and leave their cars at home. Traffic will be increasing at a huge rate as all the dwellings are built.
- More off road cycle paths PLEASE
- Important to assess the Oxford and Banbury road as there is already a lot of congestion.
- If development is realistically to encourage less use of vehicles it needs to be Deddington and close to schools etc and the only bus route
- Clifton is already unsafe and at risk of traffic collision due to blind bends, lack of traffic calming measures and lack of pavement. Traffic calming is urgent even if development is not taking place in Clifton
- Distances to Banbury are too far for cycling to be a realistic expectation. Buses similarly are too infrequent to commute on and routes to Oxford is prohibitive as is not direct and passes through many other rural villages on route. Developers should required to build parking for at least 2 cars per household as a Deddington is a rural location and anything less is extremely naive. Stacked parking should also be discouraged as it leads to residents parking on the road.
- Parking is obviously a problem, a current problem that needs addressing especially if more houses are to be built. Village centre already overcrowded, evident from the ever more frequently occurring accidents. Just adding a bus stop does not solve local transport or parking problems
- This will not encourage local residents to use service. Pathways aren't kept clear due to lack of finances/ funding
- It is vital that much-needed traffic calming measures are implemented in conjunction with new homes as there is already a significant and dangerous speeding problem for those commuting through the villages to the M40.
- This is just a sweetener. In reality people will do what they wish to do in any case
- Walking/ cycling routes are not kept clear now, as lack of funding, so therefore are dangerous, as the public/ cyclists use the main road
- My feeling is that this is the single most important consideration. Individual houses must have sufficient off road parking.
- Extend bus service to smaller villages and hamlets
- This in the relatively rural nature of Deddington and even now infrequent public transport is unlikely to work. Better to make EV charging a greater priority
- I agree with the sentiment, but the complete lack of parking being requested by the councils and provided by new developments (and properly marked existing parking space in the market place and the surrounding roads) precludes this is the first instance. Provide parking and mark out the market place properly first! Because like it or not we are in a rural area. Cars are necessary here.
- But needs investment in footpaths and urgently e.g Earl's lane. Parents and children should be able to safely walk to school, they can't easily today.
- Also the already excessive parking in Deddington's village centre and Health centre
- Local bus services in Deddington would be a start. Anyone wanting to spend an evening in Oxford or Banbury is severely restricted by lack of public transport if you do not own a car.

Anyone living in Hempton or Clifton would find it nigh impossible without a car or a friendly neighbour with a car.

- Cycling between the villages is very hard when on main roads.
- Bus services must be improved. Also, road to Banbury currently not safe for cyclists.
- Strongly agree - the opportunity to improve cycling and walking routes between Clifton, Deddington and Hempton alone is significant and would not be difficult to do. Plus, the local bus network needs to be adapted to be much more useful. There are several other villages that could also easily be walked or cycled to if the correct infrastructure was in place. I would love to use the buses more but they are too infrequent, take too long to get to Banbury or Oxford and are too expensive. There should be a shuttle that runs up and down the A4260 between Banbury and Oxford, with no deviations, and shuttle services to get people from the villages east and west of the road onto the A4260 to connect to the shuttles. This would provide a much better service for all. Priority continues to be given to cars in the countryside - this needs to change and can easily be done.
- Wider, looked after cycle paths would be good
- There is no suitable footpath from Clifton to Deddington. We have to chase to get it moved and no path to the school
- Restriction on parking times should be considered to stop people parking all day
- Improvement of canal towpath Clifton to Banbury would be a massive improvement to cycling and walking facilities.
- Some cycle routes and improved bus service
- Hard to see how significant benefits can be achieved.
- main traffic light junction need to be widened to allow filter lanes to reduce queuing and loss of air quality
- Unfortunately building new homes will only have negative effect on the traveling through Deddington and increase the traffic on main junction including number of accidents.
- You need a car if you live in Deddington as public transport isn't good enough.
- public transport network today is totally insufficient...and only serves to make people have need to get in their car. I actively want to take public transport but buses are so costly and infrequent!
- Whilst this view is ideal, we believe it unrealistic. Many people make short journeys (within the village) by car. We believe this will (unfortunately) continue to grow but needs to be catered for.
- Permanent improvements to infrastructure and public transport? Make Hempton pinchpoint safer for all by raising the kerb and narrowing the gap for vehicles to force through traffic to slow down? Bus service to resume in Hempton to connect elderly with local amenities?
- If DNP6 and DNP10 are given the go-ahead, a public road connection between the Hempton road and the Oxford road going north should be mandated to cut traffic going through the main village junction.
- Improved local bus service provision (and long term funding) needed
- This is unrealistic in my view. There will be inevitable impact on the road network.
- SPACE BETWEEN HOUSES, GREEN AREAS AND PARKING IS ESSENTIAL, DEDDINGTON IS CROWDED AS IT IS
- It is vital the village is provided with adequate parking for the new houses as the square is already swamped. New houses should have parking for at least 2-3 cars each, being realistic regarding how families live these days.
- More regular S4 services - the S5 services Bicester and the nearby villages every half and hour.
- This sounds favourable but in the grand scheme of things will never happen. Most residents will travel to Banbury, Oxford or the M40 and no amount of attempting to reduce car dependency will stop this. If you really want to encourage walking and cycling the simple fact remains - Don't build in Deddington!
- Create proper cycle/walk paths to provide access to shops. Most houses will have 2 cars and so off road parking needs to provide for this at least.
- Investment in public transport is important and it is good to reduce on street parking. However it is important to accept that each house should have adequate off street parking as we are a rural parish and some trips are inevitable and some jobs will never be possible to be done from home.

- The reality is that cars will be used a lot in Hempton and Clifton no matter what incentives there are as there are no buses and no local shops.
- In principle I agree but encouraging walking etc could be interpreted as reducing off street parking. Off road parking should be compulsory and dependent on the size of the property. ie carparking = number of bedrooms -1. How about each property has one off street parking space and there is communal parking open to everyone somewhere within the development. No onroad parking. All developments should include cycle ways not shared with pedestrians.
- You can't cycle and walk around Deddington, Clifton and Hempton if you don't work there, if you are old or disabled or a child. This is a ridiculous proposal!! Do you really expect me to cycle 30 miles to work, or should I cycle to the outskirts of Deddington and then take my car that I have had to park on the side of the road just to confirm with your plan!!!
- Management of Parking in Deddington must be considered in any future plans. Restriction of length of parking times in Market Square and Earls Lane must be considered to avoid these areas being used as unofficial Park & Ride areas.
- Bicycle lanes needed
- Building 150 houses will increase cars in and out of the village. It will be a joke inferring the developer can improve the bus service that will compensate for the increase in car travel and its impact on environment, more traffic, less parking in the centre, potentiality more traffic accidents. AIR QUALITY will get worse!
- Need to ensure there is parking for more than one car to each house built, so parking on roads is minimal. No bus service in Hempton???
- This is an odd question, you are suggesting we build 126 houses which means a potential additional 250 cars (based on average as stated by ONS). The proximity to public and commercial activity is in Bicester, Oxford or Banbury, so the number of cars will increase. This will impact air quality and also congest even further the centre of the village and the traffic pinch points. Suggesting encouraging cycling is great for leisure but has no impact on the building of houses! The developers do not have the real money to make an improvement to the bus services. The cost would be prohibitive, we know that a gesture will be made that will have little or no impact, other than ticking a box
- If there is development in Clifton or Hempton, a priority should be for a developer contribution towards a bus service
- Requires serious consideration and major infrastructure considerations. Cyclepaths that are safe & well maintained linking Deddington, Clifton, & Hempton to Banbury. Cycle route to Kings Sutton Station. Improved cycle path along canal from Aynho to Banbury. routing of buses to include Hempton & Clifton,
- This is not London the number of cars is due to the fact people cannot afford to live where they work or close to, due to second homes. Also Banbury has will soon take over Deddington and we will become a suburb of City Banbury.
- However being on a main road utilised by hundreds of cars a day means air quality likely to be beyond significant influence.
- On road parking should be tackled by provision of plenty of on-property parking. Most households have 3 cars.
- Does this mean there will be pavements in all the new developments? They're necessary to encourage walking.
- More measures needed to protect footpaths that are being parked on.
- Bus service is pretty good from Banbury to Oxford.
- There is a real need for safe pedestrian areas such as pavements, alongside roads. Earl's Lane near the GP Surgery and the pinch point on the B4031 at Church Street corner are examples.
- Increased housing and the population that ensues can only have a detrimental effect on air quality and global warming - no joined up thinking
- Bus services are key
- more consideration to central residents parking - perhaps resident only parking in some roads just off centre of Deddington
- Maybe consider a requirement for new homes to include an electric car charging point
- Total lack of usable cycle paths
- and that is why more housing set in the Hempton road is a no no. An unrealistic but brave aim given most folk take cars to go shopping and commute elsewhere to work.

- There is no acknowledgement in this document that the change to electric vehicles will, to an extent, lessen the need to restrict vehicle movements from a climate change point of view. Congestion and parking problems are therefore more relevant than carbon emissions in the longer term.
- We should be realistic. It is unlikely that inhabitants are going to be walking or cycling to work/shops. Even with a widescale network and high frequency it is unlikely that many will see bus as a preferred mode of transport.
- Too many issues for one response. Good luck encouraging walking and cycling. Public transport - further study or evidence required to back up any suggestion that more public transport would reduce cars. Nobody I know in the villages would use the bus in place of a local car journey with the exception of school children. I approve of the desire to reduce on road parking in new developments. What good is it to "raise the importance" of air quality at the junction? This is an ineffective action.
- Parking in the centre of Deddington should be a priority as whilst the aim is to reduce car use it will still be required in certain circumstances and as it stands there is not enough parking to meet the demand.
- I need a taxi to go to essentials
- That must assume a minimum of two cars per property which appears to be the norm. Thought needs to be given to enforcement as most new residents in developments seem to abuse parking requirements
- Enforce ample insulation/ground source heat pumps for all new builds - solar panels - more than a 'token' few. All eco considerations should be applied.
- If public transport improves - fine, yet to see it. Cars are still essential for people in the area.
- We need our half hour bus back. 1 hour is inconvenient as there is very little in Banbury to encourage anyone to wait one hour for a bus.
- **ADDITIONAL CAR PARKING REQUIRED FOR DEDDINGTON IF MORE HOUSING IS BUILT**
- Provision of electric charging points needed throughout village
- Great idea in theory but three small children needing to get to school, clubs etc from Clifton i don't see that a bus service would fulfil our needs.
- Probably will not achieve target
- Dedicated cycle lane between Hempton-Deddington-Clifton
- Aim's good but unachievable. Terrain not the best for cycling and most jobs will be distant and require a car.
- Rural location means not feasible for reliance on public transport. Adequate off road parking and visitor parking required.
- No bus service from villages - too dangerous to cycle - I've tried it! Walk? At 86?
- I'd really like to see a safe cycle route to Adderbury, and ideally onward to Banbury.
- Priority should be given to improving bus links (speed and frequency) to/from Oxford.
- **A BIG ISSUE IS THE QUALITY AND ACCESS TO DECENT FOOTWAYS FOR THE LESS-ABLED AND YOUNG MUMS WITH PRAMS AND YOUNG CHILDREN.**
- parking is already an issue in Clifton
- Not sure bus service is the issue here. The village was built before cars and now most households have more than 1 car. Also think new housing areas need to not be crammed so that cars park on the street and make it congested.
- we fund CDC they need to invest some of the money they take to fund this.

DEDD8 Valued Landscapes and Key Values

As shown on Policies Maps (Cherished views; Longer views in separate document), the NP proposes to identify specific landscapes and key views that define the rural character of the parish and the setting of its three villages. Deddington stands on a ridge with extensive views of rolling countryside in all directions. Development schemes must not harm valued landscapes or key views

Agree: 85.71% (318); Disagree: 9.16% (34); Neutral: 5.66% (21)

Comments

- Why is the view from the end of Wimborn Close not marked as a long distance view (can see Avon Dasset from here). This is probably the MOST key view in Deddington.
- Very strongly agree. This is incredibly important! The views from the allotments don't seem to be included in these maps.
- As pressure rises to build new homes, Deddington will eventually have to build more than 140 homes, especially with all sites listed. The crossroads will no longer cope and no doubt a bypass will be constructed to take traffic around the centre of Deddington. This could change the landscape forever
- I feel this is key, and an important point to maintain
- The landscapes around deddington, especially to the South are highly valued by villagers and visitors alike.
- Already screwed with new Hempton Road development
- View both in and out are important as are the green lungs into and within the village and its hamlets
- Very important. Key accessible 'sunset' view (northwest from Deddington Grange) especially 'recycling' lay-by
- The views will still be there but not from existing properties
- BUT! At appeal this can be ignored by Inspectors and has been. (Adderbury last year).
- Views over the fields from the allotments are missing from map
- DNP1 and DNP2(?) will harm key views in the village that are not notified on this map but should be. The allotments in particular are a much-treasured community/rural space that will be ruined if development is allowed around the perimeter.
- I agree with your words. I disagree with CDC action. Add cherished views out of Castle Grounds, northwards and southwards. Someone removed one of the arrows. What about looking OUT from Deddington
- These views must be protected for us and future generations. These views affect everyone, the building of any houses would clearly impact the cherished views both on entry and exit to the village
- I believe the Castle grounds must have a sufficient "buffer zone" to enhance its uniqueness. I believe Earl's Lane ridge and furrow field is a valuable "LUNG" for local walkers, proclaiming its rural past and current grazing agricultural practice. Farmers need every acre in view of Brexit limitations. What is the point of this angle? Only walkers can appreciate the views (?). On the roads one is only aware of other traffic to be safe, such is the increase in the main road use.
- The arrows seem to suggest consultation regardless of options to the north where the large ?? ruled out if this policy is complied with
- This map does not count the north of the village (in the picture) as having valuable views. They do, they are also surrounded by fields and farmland.
- Very important!
- what do xxxxx in blue mean around the castle grounds? Who decides what the 'cherished' views are around the parish?
- Any new development even outside conservation areas or areas of special interest must have a FULL heritage impact statement, evaluating vistas and assets of special interest
- Key views are only the benefit of the residents in those areas. Views on the deddington loop and walks should be more prioritised.
- Key views of Castle Grounds ignored. English Heritage/Parish Council could IMPROVE views by careful tree works around the Motte. Also rural character of the Parish SHOULD INCLUDE green fields as currently exist. Those fields are not only VITAL characteristic of the village but also enhance the important views.
- Any additional housing will change the local character.
- Preservation of these views would be ideal where possible.
- Additional housing will affect the local landscape

- Deddington is a village. Views in and out are important and must be kept. Villages by their nature are not made up by continuous and full development. Open spaces in Deddington e.g. South of Earl's lane must be kept.
- There is much made of a "famous" view towards Deddington Castle but all I can ever see are trees! More important are the views to the north along the Hempton Road towards Hempton which are truly outstanding!
- Why not protecting view of Bloxham and Barford to the North?
- Treelines must be considered as part of this - the OS map does not show the treeline along the northern edge, which existed when the site was a field, that means that the grange cannot be seen from the north.
- Valued landscapes are important and certain developments need to be abandoned if views and characteristics of the villages are to be maintained. Would like village (Deddington) to be retained within existing boundary.
- There is an historically important view to the South West from the top of Radwell Hill in Hempton that has not been featured. (Iron Age hill fort and rolling countryside)
- You say this, yet you are quite happy to build on land opposite residential areas where people's view will be destroyed by new builds
- The arrow showing views outwards from Hempton Road (top left on Map 1), should be moved slightly further Westwards to take into account the consented housing at Stonepits Field.
- Map not showing outward views towards the north from Cosy Lane.
- As stated, Deddington has extensive countryside views in all directions. These maps appear to focus on specific areas from a handful of points in the village.
- Strongly in favour of protecting key views for the benefit of current and future generations. All but one of key views identified in 2018 NP approved by Examiner.
- Stunning views from Hempton are not shown on the map.
- DNP7 sits on top of a public footpath and would harm views from that. Any development at DNP1 would greatly harm the views from St Thomas Street.
- Landscape views on Hempton road ignores existing developments currently being built.
- Development schemes will inevitably affect cherished landscapes and views, as they have done for decades - even centuries.
- You can't keep the landscape and still develop - the two are mutually exclusive.
- Agree. A key view has been destroyed with the latest development - The view of the church as you travel from Hempton to Deddington. A view that welcomed travellers for hundreds of years until 2022
- We very much value the key views over Grove Fields and to the south of Deddington. We would prefer for any proposed development to not negatively impact any of the identified key views.
- Maintain valued landscapes
- Deddington stands on a ridge with extensive views of rolling countryside in all directions. Development schemes must not harm valued landscapes or key views. The Poplars and its later add ons WILL. Developers must keep their words!
- 150 houses will inevitably detrimentally impact the views!
- The arrow showing views outward from Hempton Road (top left on Map 1) should be moved slightly further westward to take account of the consented housing at Stonepits Field.
- Most, if not all, of these "proposed" developments will have a negative affect on the specific landscapes and key views that define the rural character of the parish and the setting of its three villages. I also note that this map is not showing all of the views , and is misleading to all readers, was this deliberate ? There are a number of views which should be inserted to make this accurate.
- These views were recognised by the inspector as important to protect. The policy must be strongly worded.
- The trees by Gaveston gardens are a mess and as all of that area has been stolen from the village, many cut down or things built in there, it has been removed already no idea why you list this area as in need of preservation.
- Why is the view north from Cosy Lane not included? It is a panaramic view looking towards Bloxham, Adderbury. Kings Sutton and deddington? What other views include 4 church spires/towers?
- This is essential to preserve the character of the village
- You have omitted the key view North over Daeda's Wood and the Swere Valley.

- This visual point cannot be achieved due to the planning permission which exists for 7 elderly persons dwellings within Site DNP4.
- It would be good to please have a key for the second figure above. I think the arrows are reflective of the beautiful views from Deddington, but the beautiful views into Deddington are also just as important. For instance the view of the spire of St. Peter and St. Paul from the footpath running from The Grove is stunning and shouldn't be lost by developing DNP 7. DNP 7 would be building over three of the key views shown in the first figure above.
- landscape impact should be taken most seriously
- Keep our country views-don't destroy what we have.
- No view is sacred
- I do not agree with the apparent heavy bias on views to/from the south of the village. Despite the mention of "all directions". The NE long distance view indicated has already been lost from the point shown.
- I feel that views north from the village should also be taken into consideration such as north east to Bloxham church spire, north to adderbury church spire and north east to king Sutton as well as the countryside before east of these views.
- The map highlighting key views has included views to the South of the village but omits key views north from existing settlements, notably Adderbury Church and the surrounding landscape also Bloxham Church Steeple and The Barfords. These views are spectacular from Cosy Lane and The Daedings, any proposed building on the land north of Deddington Grange (DNP 10) would obscure any key views completely towards the North.
- The view down the hill from the Daedings down to Daedas wood should be included in the cherished views
- Would include the open land within the village as part of the aspect/rural feel.
- This should not be an argument against DNP7
- I strongly agree. My property has key and long distance views, which was a key reason for buying the house. It would be personally devastating to lose those views to a housing estate and would also financially devalue my property. Nothing could compensate me for the loss of the views and I cannot imagine I would be financially compensated for the devaluation of the property either.
- I was pointed out by English Heritage (now Historic England) that the tree-lined earth embankments form part of the scheduled Ancient Monument and are NOT a screen protecting it.
- Especially views along Hempton Road northward and westward from the bottle banks
- Views to the North not on map. Views from Cosy Lane, the Daedings, DNP10
- But impossible to achieve. Any building will impact views.
- Keeping landscape-views vital
- Views are only visible once leaving village anyway. Extending village is more important
- What about the key views North from Deddington? At the rear of Wimborn Close, The Daedings, Gaveston Gardens and The Grange? Those views extend for miles on a clear day.
- Large developments in the fields next to the A4260 Deddington would take away the impact of maintaining Deddington as a village. It would look like a sprawling suburb.
- What a load of nonsense!
- we will soon be part of banbury and these views will be built up on
- There are more important views than just to the Southwest. Northwest for example is striking and offers an important reminder particularly at sun rise and sunset what a special location Deddington is.

DEDD10 Local Green Spaces

The NP is considering designating a limited number of spaces in Deddington as Local Green Open Spaces. Identifying which space or spaces might be suitable is still under review. The policy would give these spaces the equivalent status to Green Belt.

Agree: 86.93% (324); Disagree: 5.08% (19); Neutral: 8.56% (32)

Comments

- This must be prioritised to maintain rural living
- The Castle mound and its surroundings have a strong case
- Good luck with that!
- Green spaces (lungs) are essential. Several already exist and MUST be retained.
- Consider disturbance factor to local residents
- Community should be consulted as to which spaces are included
- Space around allotments would be a good start!
- The allotments and surrounding fields should be a designated green space
- There is no Green Belt land in Deddington. I propose DNP4 as a vital local green space - it would somewhat mitigate the damage of the Blue Cedar development.
- Would support this designation over Satin Lane allotments which has real local amenity value. Not convinced there is need for further land to be designated.
- This is a must but how can we if we have a further 150 houses!!
- Green spaces are critical for the village and should be maintained. Building additional houses would diminish these valuable green spaces.
- Since there is no green belt for deddington yet: it should be pursued as a fact. I value the allotment greening of Satin Lane, as a refreshing place to walk in.
- But how safe is the Green Belt (see N.Oxon)
- Significant new mixed habitats blanketing the outskirts of the parish including woodland, ponds, meadow, wildflower margins, hedgerow etc. many different habitats would encourage greater diversity than just woodland for example and be a real asset to the parish.
- This is important to protect the integrity of the village and to promote wildlife and reduce flood risks, and reduce co2.
- DEDD9 & 10. How can anyone answer these two questions with any impartiality after the blatant attempt by DDW to sway public opinion against the Poplars and encourage people to say they want it to be allocated as a Local Green Space. The PC made a decision not to name any potential sites in this respect, but DDW, clearly not happy with this decision have taken it upon themselves to leaflet the whole parish with their propaganda... None of the DDW members should be on the NHP team, they are not impartial - DDW are a pressure group determined only to encourage development where they want it to go in the Parish.... The whole NHP process has been totally compromised by DDW and should be scrapped completely. DPC are elected to represent the people, not just support the machinations of a pressure group. DPC's integrity is being called into question here and how they deal with this issue will have a huge impact on the Parish, and the landowners affected by the pressure DDW are clearly putting to bear. The PC need to sort this out once and for all, it's been dragging on way to long. (Edited)
- DNP4 was EXACTLY meant to be one of these and set aside for grazing... Permission [was granted] on that basis and [this] should not be able to happen in the future - for this site as well as others. (Edited)
- Important to maintain all open green spaces
- Local Green Open Spaces don't really mean anything - I would be more for the idea if the public could use these areas for picnicing, children's games/parks etc. There are plenty of local green open spaces around the edge of the villages anyway - why do we need more inside the village? Unless of course they can be accessed for enjoyment by villagers
- Want as much of this as possible!
- Open Green Spaces and Public Open Spaces are key and are very good at stopping development in places where it should not happen. It will also allow there to be more formal places that people can go to, to enjoy the outdoors.
- Allotments area and the Poplars
- Strongly in favour of greater protection of the quality of the environment for the benefit of current and future generations. Two green spaces greatly valued by local people are Satin Lane Allotments and The Poplars.
- Just in Deddington, or surrounding areas too? E.g. the ridge between Deddington and Hempton is of particular value to so many dog walkers, runners, cyclists...
- Green Belt policies by reducing the supply of land for homes inevitably increase the price of housing.

- Again, nice idea, but if nothing is designated a developer will ignore
- Extremely interested in this
- Grove Fields and the footpaths toward the south-west of Deddington provide access to rural green space very close to the village and we would like to see this protected with a designation of Local Green Open Space.
- As long as these Green Spaces do not restrict existing access. Where are these planned spaces?
- Building 150 houses limits our green spaces!
- All green space should be preserved we should focus on brownfield.
- The allotments should be designated as local green space
- To include the preservation of Satin Lane allotments.
- We would have more if greedy people did not fence this off
- Seems sensible to help preserve the boundaries of the villages
- Castle grounds, windmill, daedas wood, rural walks and farmland should all be protected
- I think that there needs to be a better definition of 'green open spaces'. Are these meant to be available to the public to enjoy or will they be allocated in order to block development...? If so then this is just NIMBYism. (Edited)
- DDW has tried to influence this decision I do not believe that we need further green spaces.
- Land at The Poplars, Clifton Road, Deddington
- all views to castle grounds from clifton rd and chapmans lane covering the views to the valleys they overlook the allotments should be allocated green open spaces
- Nice thought, but too much "considering". Until spaces are Identified I will not choose a response.
- How are these being determined? Do locals have any input?
- Satin Lane allotments should be protected from development
- Allotment acre NB
- Would include all land currently there especially around the castle.
- This will of course be difficult to agree with landowners!
- Good, but nowadays Green Belt is pretty useless, unlike years ago.
- Need to keep green areas within the village
- Replace the word "limited" with a specific number which should be a minimum of 10.
- Please keep the view from the main road as full of crops and woodlands.
- why when everywhere else they just build on green belt?

