

DEDD 11 Carbon Sinking

The NP will require all new development schemes to invest in woodland planting of native trees which will sink (or “sequester”) carbon as part of the proposed Green Infrastructure Network of the parish, another way of tackling climate change.

Agree: 90.11% (337); Disagree: 3.21% (12); Neutral: 6.68% (25)

Comments

- Excellent
- Strongly agree. Trees must be looked after, not just planted and left, often destroyed at sapling status by bad weather
- Where is this taking place? If we build to traditional brick methods, huge environmental impact
- Consider restricting public access to recognised paths. Evidence the public do not wander on 'open country' where there are good and well maintained paths - unless with bad intent
- As long as developers maintain them for at least 5 years, or until they are established.
- Should be local woodland not outside of the Parish. Also planted woodland should be indigenous local trees not cheap foreign species.
- This is mere lipservice. Even shabby developers stick in a few trees. You are only "requiring" this (rather than considering it) because it's easy to do.
- Wind breaks essential on the west ridge side. That was why the windmill was situated there
- Of course we would welcome tree planting but please consider as much diversity of habitat as possible
- It is so important to address the impact building these homes will have on our environment. We need to reduce flood risks, and ensure that trees are planted to reduce the carbon footprint, as well as improving local bus networks to ease travel.
- While i agree woodland planting is a good thing, this question seems to imply that we have to accept the proposed Green Infrastructure network to achieve it. we don't they are two separate things and this appears to be a carefully worded question to get a partial answer to DDE9, which i oppose.
- Developments should have high amounts of green spaces, and not overly crowded such as recent developments for flooding purposes
- Providing the trees are planted in the parish!
- Strict quotas per house should be a prerequisite for ALL developments. Not just the 'marketing' trees at the front of developments, but also in and around the properties. LONG TERM maintenance and protection of these trees should be enforced - similar to TPOs. Without adequate there should be no building AT ALL
- Housing is the problem. We need to think about other way of tackling climate change, without building extra houses which are a detriment to the environment
- This is just a sweetener. We would avoid extra housing and educate the locals how to help
- Curbing the extra housing will help climate change
- It's wrong to think planting a few trees will offset the environmental damage done by building so many houses.
- Please see paragraph 3.14 of the representation.
- As long as trees are suitably planted and so as not to detract from views. A few open green spaces eg as per Gaveston Green are great to have. We don't need trees on all open spaces!
- Developers should also have houses designed to be green eg. sustainable materials and low carbon building practices

- Again, this can go further. New developments can go a long way to helping us to get out of the environmental mess that this world is in. The whole of the construction industry can work in far greener ways from using electric vehicles on site, using better materials, sealing houses properly, installing solar panels from the beginning and many other things. These need to be made mandatory in the planning conditions. Get things right first time rather than having to fix or retrofit.
- However we already have too much traffic through our villages as a cut through and no amount of trees will reduce the carbon produced already
- Please see paragraph 3.14 of the representation.
- Strongly agree
- In agreeing to this policy it is important that the parish council identify an area under its control for this purpose, where planting can occur without payment of excessive fees, equivalent to a ransom.
- Yes, but also new homes should be built to minimise climate damage, e.g. solar panels, ground source heat pumps, etc...so much more costly and higher footprint to retrofit. Again, short term profits often get put ahead of long term common sense.
- OFF SETTING - IS ESSENTIAL AND COULD BE FUNDED BY LOCALS CHOOSING TO OFFSET THEIR OMISSIONS
- Yes, definitely plant more trees!
- Woodland planting? Where? Sounds very half baked!
- This is another hugely important part of the development that I'm really behind.
- Please see paragraph 3.12 of the representation.
- Strongly agree
- In building houses at this level they will inevitably destroy woodland and hedges
- In agreeing to this policy it is important that the parish council identify an area under its control for this purpose where planting can occur without payment of excessive fees equivalent to a ransom.
- Much needed. What sort of world will our grandchildren grow up in!!
- no point!!!
- As long as the planting occurs within the Parish and not elsewhere.
- And they need to be audited and not just be done under schemes where companies pay farmers off to plant trees. Meaningful offsetting must be done.
- I remain cynical
- Fabulous ideal
- I think we need to think carefully about this.
Developers may opt to plant trees and leave the cost of maintenance, coppicing, management insurance etc and access to these sites to the DPC which could be a burden in the future - agree only if the developers agree to take responsibility forever for these sites.
- I like woodlands and trees very much. "Invest" is too a vague thing, I would prefer a more definite proposal.
- Developers must be forced to incorporate solar panels and battery storage into their designs.
- Good, hopefully they will add to visual environment too so it doesn't look too urban.
- Area is generally short on woodland - need to expand where we can.
- Careful consideration of 'native trees' should take place re poor or no mobile telephone coverage.

Policy DEDD 12 Community Facilities

The NP proposes to identify community facilities in the parish for their protection and future improvement; and we will seek developer

contributions to enhance the facilities to cater for the expanding community.

Agree: 89.49% (332); Disagree: 1.89% (7); Neutral: 8.63% (32)

Comments

- Very important as resources already stretched
- Why "seek"...can it not be a CONDITION of their developing anything?
- Repairs to roads essential for example
- We are a rich village and should not allow developer contributions to mar our judgement
- Would be happier for school to be relocated away from the main road
- Easy to say difficult to achieve. School money going elsewhere
- But 106 funds are no compensation for loss of views, history and traffic/road issues which are blighting the villages
- An expanded medical centre is essential. It is under enough pressure already
- The nursery needs a new building and the next development should pay for this. Year R and Year 1 in the primary school have lessons in portacabins - developers could easily pay to upgrade.
- The nursery, pre-school and school should all be prioritised for this.
- We have allotments, pubs, a sports centre - and they are good. developer contributions do not always enhance - I note that planters are now known as Heritage Benefit. Wow.
- Schools, nursery care provision, Healthcare- all vital
- To be agreed with the natives: the Primary School is at capacity. The surgery has insufficient parking.....
- Sceptical
- Should REQUIRE not SEEK developer contribution
- Money needs to be spent across the parish and in consultation with what the community want. We don't want faceless play areas children simply don't use as they are not really designed with them in mind but just tick a box
- Vitally important
- The pre-school at the Windmill is still a shack that desperately needs replacing (with a new building!)
- Can we please not spend all future community money on the same projects... the Windmill has had a great deal of investment in the last few years. we need to think about other, smaller projects in the village that should be supported also. The Holly Tree Club for one, deserves investment for older people, especially since the Thursday club had to close.
- Particularly school and GP surgery.
- Do community facilities include the school? It risks not being able to accommodate all kids in the village which would be a shame
- Over development should NOT take place to fund community projects. Developer 'aid' should be handled VERY carefully and used to be illegal - this is bribery and should never lead to sacrificing valuable green spaces.
- Very much so! Expand GP surgery
- GP practice and school already at capacity
- Development must not damage or reduce facilities i.e. if you build in Home Farm, Clifton you will lose the village shop.
- Yes but money from developers building in the village needs to be spent in the village not the Shire.
- Keeping the village character is more important than getting development contributions to fund nice but not essential facilities
- Please see paragraph 3.15 of the representation.
- More facilities needed for older children/ young teenagers.

- As the community expands, more facilities are required - this is a good thing and must be improved. Space should be maintained for community and commercial spaces to allow for this, in the same way that open green spaces are protected. Without this, the village will end up with more homes than the existing facilities can cope with and this will have a negative impact on the community.
- The facilities cannot cope already
- Please see paragraph 3.15 of the representation.
- Focused on Deddington
- Need to base developments on the capacity of relevant public utilities and services with coordinated expansion or improvements. e.g. Schools, Health Care, Social Care, Water Services, Broadband etc...
- Doctors can't cope at the moment so improvement is needed. School also needs more land to expand.
- This is supported subject to the reasonable identification of community schemes of benefit to the community as a whole, and subject to reasonable costs.
- Critical that village infrastructure is increased in line with any development, especially with respect to the capacity of the school and health centre to take on new pupils/patients.
- We hear it's already difficult for people to get their children into the village school. Parking is already difficult in the village.
- Above all the expanding community needs a larger school ... see above. Why has this issue received virtually no attention in the compilation of this otherwise comprehensive consultation?
- A bigger GP surgery and school are needed, as the existing village facilities are unable to accommodate the current number of residents.
- There is a danger here of encouraging a never-ending development spiral. As more houses are built, people will demand more facilities - these could be funded by encouraging yet more development. If the NP isn't careful, a worthy aim for, say, more facilities at the Windmill will be funded by more houses. More people will then mean more demand for facilities, particularly as these new people are probably going to be more "town" in their outlook, and will miss the facilities they left behind. So encouraging development funding, and effectively bribing villagers with the money will permanently damage the character of the Parish.
- In the larger developments consider another mini supermarket to relieve the pressure of traffic into Deddington village centre.
- Development of Community Facilities focused on Deddington
- The meagre amounts the developer will provide will in no way compensate for the impact of building large scale developments!
- Subject to the reasonable identification of community schemes of benefit to the community as a whole and subject to reasonable costs.
- Infrastructure and school for expanding community of great importance.
- Do not be fooled, this will be a tick box bribe and we are giving away the village.
- we have enough for old folk already
- Again, these commitments must be audited; there seems to be a lot of commitments and then bare minimum done.
- More housing requires additional educational facilities and healthcare facilities. Both are overwhelmed at the moment so will only get worse with additional housing.
- Infrastructure contribution is a must. Development of both Windmill Centre, football, tennis and cricket a must.
- As above
- It should be part of any contractual agreement to build houses= contribution to infrastructure including fibre and parking and water and drainage.
- These should be directed to Clifton and Hempton who have very few amenities and would reduce travel etc.
- This is vital to foster (and maintain) a sense of community (not just facilities for use) and support.
- BUT NOT PFSU- it should be a village-wide facility

- Any contributions would need to pass the respective test in the CIL Regulations.
- I would question whether agreeing to one large development really gives you the leverage to get maximum benefits to the village. If it does, it should be staggered so the village can maintain leverage and control over any development.
- so if houses are built in Clifton - Clifton should in part receive the benefit. Same with Hempton.
- School is already over subscribed, more public transport is required too!
- Any contributions would need to pass the respective test in the CIL Regulations
- The local GP cannot cope with the demand for its services with the existing population, let alone additional population.
- How will you monitor the usage of each facility? Will you base decisions on community feedback?
- Medical Facilities (?) need updating
- Essential infrastructure more important-school/nursery; GPs; Dentist; -all struggling with capacity
- Although the GP practice is large enough, getting an appointment is currently very difficult. How will we ensure GP cover of more residents?
- Very important as facilities are already stretched
- Facilities in Hempton would reduce our car journeys into Deddington
- School-Health Centre- Food shop
- Larger local shop
- Any additional housing in Deddington should necessitate a new, modern primary school, as well as a bigger minimarket/shop. Impacts on other public amenities (sports facilities, clubs etc) should be considered too.
- Cannot be done otherwise, so far NO improvements have been made to facilities yet the village has grown substantially.
- Expand facilities in/around Windmill area including expanding tennis club with padel (a fast growing sport nationally and internationally)
- The Deddington Co-op is not fit for purpose and does not offer as good a service as e.g. Kings Sutton Co-op
- The loopholes for gaining this investment from developers needs to be far easier than it is and before a developer advertises the money they have spent, actually should be made to have spent the funds and paid to those local facilities. Hempton Road is a classic example where those funds have not been transferred.
- not allow to use most of what we fund already - DPC do not want dogs in this village nor for you to use any facilities - we fund but they are only ones who can use

Policy DEDD 13 Home Working

The NP proposes to support householder planning applications where needed to extend existing homes or build new structures within residential curtilages to enable more home working – subject to activity at such development not interfering with residential amenity – thus reducing the need for commuting.

Agree: 71.39% (267); Disagree: 6.42% (24); Neutral: 22.19% (83)

Comments

- Too many conversions result in garages being emptied and the cars that occupied them being parked off the property's cartilage. Some businesses attract visitors and parking problems, noise from activity disturbing neighbours.
- I strongly disagree. This is a green light to development that may be unacceptable to neighbours and the wider community.
- This is not relevant to the additional homes required

- Been going on for some time. Yawn. Pretty thorough planning rules too.
- Depends on garden or green space or amenity space encroachment
- Yes these new developments should not restrict current homeowners from adapting their homes.
- This is a positive move... but in a conservation area think it will be much harder to achieve.
- I don't think this should be a key priority, particularly with so many people going back to work and the government encouraging people to return. Focus should be put on improving highways/commuter routes.
- Please see paragraph 3.16 of the representation.
- Supporting people to be able to create the space that they need at their existing property makes so much sense - reduction in economic impacts of having to move, reduction in environmental impacts both in terms of commuting and people having to move, and a potential growth in the economy for local trades to be able to do more work and expand their businesses. This also highlights the need to maintain commercial spaces in the village as if you have more people working from home, being able to walk out and get lunch or coffee is important. Or being able to do a quick shop without having to drive. And being able to get to the pub in the evening as you don't have to drive home!
- That can only happen if employers agree
- Please see paragraph 3.16 of the representation.
- Following the pandemic and the much greater degree of homeworking, this policy is supported and newbuild should be looking to accommodate such activity, possibly in rooms above the garages?
- Each needs to be considered on its own merits from an environmental point of view - can't keep eroding green spaces without it having a negative impact on wildlife / climate change
- So how am I supposed to work from home when I work on a hospital ward???? Many of the homeowners in Deddington Hempton and Clifton are key workers. This proposal will not help. Those that are able to work from home already do. And how are you going to get Companies to agree to this? You can't decide if someone should work from home so how is this going to help???
- Please see paragraph 3.14 of the representation.
- Strongly agree
- New residential development could assist in this process by providing offices above the garages
- follow normal planning - we have too many businesses being run in this village with high number of extra cars attending them. I know of one that has up to 11 cars visiting a day a residential location. It is like living on a motorway not a village. - So no controls already for this.
- Yes, this is a good idea.
- Do not encourage more homeworking
- Sounds like a good idea
- Agree in principle but expect that this reason could be used to simply extend properties for general reasons....needs. to be well policed!
- Define home working? If you mean IT working from home – yes. If you mean running a business which results in vans/lorries/obstructive on street parking – then no
- "Where needed" is another subjective term. I think this could easily be abused, a home office could easily become a bedroom!
- Hopefully that include network availability too.
- Listed buildings need better availability for planning approvals
- Caution with overlooking
- There will probably less working from home now things are getting back to normal after Covid restrictions
- Strongly agree. Since the pandemic a lot of people are spending more time at home so having extra space is more important than it has ever been.

- 100% otherwise we will lose people to towns that are more able to do this.
- you have no rights to stop this already..... so what are you on about?

Policy DEDD14 Local Businesses

The NP proposes to encourage new and existing commercial activity in Deddington and create more local employment opportunities

Agree: 77.63%; (288); Disagree: 5.12% (19); Neutral: 17.25% (64)

Comments

- Interesting to know how this will be done. Reduction of business rates? But presumably that's a CDC issue rather than a PC one.
- Depending on where new business sites will be located. No large industrial style units
- Excellent
- Nice idea, but where?
- Previous developments have attracted little new business
- Overriding policy restraint: GLOBAL WARMING
- The Market Place and roads to Deddington are too busy with traffic already, we don't need more
- Where would the premises be built? Further development needed
- Difficulties already around traffic, speeding, congestion, emissions, noise pollution
- YES- so you can't build on DNP20- you must encourage it. How about an excellent farm shop?
- Keep Home Farm Clifton with a farm produce shop
- Depends on the individual proposal
- Commercial premises must have onsite parking
- How ?? There is nothing currently that supports the existing businesses, how do you propose to encourage new businesses?
- Subject providing OWN adequate parking for staff
- But you will need to provide parking - as per my previous comment. It is a nettle that has to be grasped by the PC and Cherwell. Every new development should have had some public parking as a requirement to build.
- Don't build on Home Farm Works or Home Farm or you will be damaging businesses and reducing local employment.
- Already significant warehousing. Unless clearly a benefit to the Parish do not support.
- No existing employment site, including farm land, should be used for housing
- Smaller industry/commercial activity is preferred
- Strongly, strongly agree. It is our view that this is the most important factor in helping the community, more so than housing. It is also linked to the question about 'why 100-150 new houses' - where are they going to work? Historically, Deddington Market Place has been a hub of commerce with people coming here from across the land. With people starting to shop more locally, we feel that we could get back to this position but spaces must be maintained and made available to allow this to happen. As an example, I know that the Deddington Environment Group have an aspiration of setting up a shop - we must make sure that spaces for groups like this are available. This is not a nice to have - it is a must. Villages that have lost all their pubs and shops also feel a bit soulless and dead - Deddington should buck this trend and not just maintain but grow.
- We have a bit too much already
- Within character i.e. not a steel foundry! or industrial estate - noise- no.

- Expanded commerce likely to exacerbate parking issues if not improved to accommodate.
- Encouraging local businesses to grow and provide more jobs is an obvious way of improving sustainability and reducing journeys to work. It might be useful to consider identifying small employment sites on the edge of the village which could accommodate potential growth of local companies.
- Brown field site development on DNP20 already looks at moving existing businesses.
- CAR PARKING IS ALREADY A MAJOR PROBLEM ANY DEVELOPMENTS WOULD NEED THE CARS CATERED FOR, MOST WORKERS WOULD DRIVE IN AS NOT ALL CAN BE FOUND LOCALLY
- Small local businesses (similar to Eagles, Nellie and Dove, and the flower shop) but nothing too large.
- This would be difficult as it would create a need for more parking and there is none available. Parking in Deddington for locals is already a problem
- And yet the old Deddington Antiques Centre is now residential, so how do you propose commercial activity if planning is constantly given to change use away from commercial to residential
- Deddington to remain a dormitory town for Banbury, Oxford etc. It is not viable to a commercial industrial estate.
- Although the employer has the final say on who they employ and where they commute from!
- Not sure how feasible it is. Are we going to have a science park?
- Shops yes- they will come with more people moving in.
- So you want to make Deddington, Hempton and Clifton towns??? The reason people live here is because we like the peace and beauty of a village location. We do not need more shops and more people coming into the village.
- As long as this is within character not mining, fracking or other industrial development causing pollution of the environment including noise pollution.
- Parking? •
- This helps improve sustainability and all communities should encourage job creation.
- Again infrastructure will need to be looked at if more commercial
- Sufficient car parking necessary
- Why? a business needs to stand on own feet and not be subsidized by the local people.
- We should be doing this - how wonderful it would be to have more local employment. Some of these sites, out of the village boundary, could be good locations.
- This would encourage more cars. A car park should come first.
- As a lot of our local community is rural and off the bus routes, attention needs to be paid to providing adequate parking near the village centre. If DNP7 (Grove Fields) is developed, it could include additional commercial facilities, and a parking area which would be close to the Village centre.
- Would this involve development of business parks?
- more independent businesses, shops, offices etc. Local business estate using converted barn/existing building would be great!
- This should be Deddington, Hempton and Clifton - farming is a business - an example is Clifton road.
- But no mention of extra amenities in the plan. All houses, no shops!
- I am assuming this would not be detrimental regarding pollution, traffic, parking, road wear etc
- Some OAP like photo workshops and repair like on TV
- Any hope of the Unicorn being taken over by a decent catreer/landlord - we need a better choice of food -healthy/local/varied
- It is well serviced and needs to stay that way.
- Providing new businesses are not ones that would bring a lot of traffic into the area.
- NOT IF SIMILAR TO THE DISGUSTING NEW 'GYM' BUILDING ON WAY INTO DEDDINGTON FROM CLIFTON - HIDEOUS AND BRINGS DOWN THE WHOLE 3 VILLAGES

- Within scale of village setting
- As long as any new commercial buildings are not unsuitable modern atrocities
- Commercial sites need to stay for employment in expanding village (example DNP20)
- A key objective for all residential developments should be to provide an agreed percentage of "small works places" and to define that term.
- Agree but not sure how we can do this without building more commercial
- but if you build big developments you need to have shops in them - the village you cannot park in already.
- Agree, but not at the cost of local independent retailers.
- Agree to small business expansion, we are in need of another restaurant and cafe, but not a Tesco or Sainsburys

DEDD15 Broadband and Mobile Telecommunications

The NP proposes to encourage improvements to local superfast broadband infrastructure, essential for new homes and businesses. Improved mobile telephone infrastructure will be supported since many parts of the parish suffer from poor, or no, mobile telephone coverage.

Agree: 92.59% (350); Disagree: 1.32%; Neutral: 6.35% (24)

Comments

- Vital. My phone hardly ever works in the village and delivery men complain they haven't been able to get a signal to ring to get directions to the house. My deliveries get delayed by days (sometimes weeks) owing to this issue.
- Why do we need to go digital with landlines
- Stick mast on church
- This certainly needs to be done
- V necessary
- Involve landscape architectural consultation
- This is the countryside. Expect poor mobile phone reception and slow broadband come as part of it
- As required
- How will the NP encourage? It should be mandated
- It's a scandal that more and more phones are required in today's society and a good phone signal and broadband is essential, hopeless if there is a poor or no mobile signal
- Should not affect speeds for existing users and a competitor to BT should be encouraged to break their monopoly.
- Mobile coverage is still a big issue in the parish. This definitely needs sorting
- Should be supported for the current households
- Should be in place for the current households
- No development should be permitted unless full fibre to the premises is installed at the same time
- This is a must from both a current living situation and safety. Landlines are not being installed in many new properties and so we are reliant upon wifi assist on mobile phones to be able to get any signal. When the power goes down, which happens surprisingly frequently here, we have no phone whatsoever. Should something happen, we would not be able to call the emergency services. In addition, if we are to grow businesses and expect more people to work from home, a good and stable mobile signal is vital, not a nice to have. It would all assist with today's commercial activities - many stall holders complain at the Farmers' Market that Deddington has the worst signal of the area and this slows down sales. If we had a decent

phone signal, I would not be surprised if we saw that the market would become even stronger than it is today.

- New homes should not be limited to specific providers (Deddington Grange has a very limited set of providers available through the OFNL infrastructure, with no other choice available).
- Wifi calling using the ultra fast broadband makes me less worried about poor phone signal
- Essential!
- No housing should be built without the installation of fibre optics.
- Better mobile reception should be encouraged
- Also essential to provide enhanced Broadband & Mobile Telecommunications to existing homes and businesses as well as new developments.
- Improvements necessary
- Hey did you not notice? you can get 900meg BB today.....
- Certainly now copper phone lines redundant.
- No brainer!
- For domestic, not business use
- Mobile phone reception must improve
- Good idea
- This needs to be tested and proven - not just 'planned'.
- I would agree.... however there is no mention of thoughtful or careful placement of infrastructure. Masts are ugly and are suggested to be detrimental to health, I certainly would not want one outside my house.
- The area is a well known EE deadzone, so having a better variety of mobile networks cover the area would be good.
- Mobile signal strength needs improving
- Estates have different providers - need to be linked to major providers
- Impossible to ignore in the modern world
- Good
- Mobile reception poor
- What about high speed domestic car charging requirements, which necessitate three-phase mains supply? This should be a must for any new housing, and considerations should be given to existing stock.
- IF YOU HAVE HAD DEALINGS WITH OPENREACH AND BT YOU WILL KNOW HOW HARD THIS WILL BE
- Mobile is a big issue all over the parish.
- Get a 5G mast somewhere in the Parish ASAP
- Have this already

Policy DEDD 16 Village Centre

As shown on the Policies Map, the NP proposes to define the Market Place and some surrounding streets, which include numerous commercial premises, as a “village centre” to recognise their importance at the heart of the community.

It is vital, in the face of increased online and out-of-town shopping, to encourage the retention of retail, hospitality and service outlets rather than conversion to private dwellings. The plan further seeks to ensure shop fronts and signs are in keeping with the character of the area.

Agree: 93.88% (353); Disagree: 1.86% (7); Neutral: 5.05% (19)

Comments

- Quite a few of the shop fronts in Deddington are ugly and not in keeping with the historic buildings in the village. How were they ever allowed?

- History of village shows many shops being changed into houses and offices
- Vital!
- The Co-op frontage is currently an eyesore and could be so much better. The illuminated window of Mark David estate agents shouldn't be allowed
- The bright purple used to paint the Care Offices area shocking example of this not happening
- I can't vote for this while The Poplars site is defined as part of it. Exclude DNP4 and you have my (and others') WHOLE support.
- Resolve parking issues in Market Place?
- The vitality of local businesses is key to Deddington's continuing strength as a community. More would be better.
- Dreadful commercial signage recently installed, business at the Pinch Point!...
- If the Grove site is developed it needs a new safe (zebra) crossing by Hudson Street, like the one from The Grange site.
- Agree in principle but there must be a little flexibility to move forward to attract the younger generation
- Is the outline meant to show the heart of the village, or just commercial properties?
- DO NOT take away freedom of parking from these retailers' customers
- Again, how would you encourage retention of local businesses? What are the ideas to support this? You are asking respondents to agree to a policy that has no substance...however ideal you make it sound. I agree in principle this is a good idea, but stopping conversion of existing business premises isn't a remotely good idea - especially to the business owner. A lot of the commercial units in Deddington are 'destination' and specialist businesses, Cycological, Ashcroft, Nellie and Dove... all small family run businesses, if they fail, or the owners decide to retire, and they can't sell the businesses as going concerns are they going to have to leave the commercial unit to rot to meet a policy in the NHP that says they can't convert to residential??? Unrealistic and unworkable! (at best!) you're taking the decision over what people do with their lives and personal assets.... ridiculous and archaic!
- Deddington car park is turning into a park and ride which will affect the commercial growth and historic character of the village centre. Day Parking should be discouraged
- Surely the COOP should massively improve its shop front as they have in other locations and as have fellow local businesses eg Eagles etc
- But improve car parking to encourage v.short stay. Use some of Brown land. Put limits on time in centre!
- Make sure shop fronts are painted in 'in keeping colours', not purple!
- Excessive development will add to car parking pressures in the centre and could undermine the objective of retaining shops
- The co-op is a much needed and supported shop, however it certainly doesn't fit with the style of the old houses/cottages, with its very ugly shop front and lack of finish to the 2 houses they have purchase next to it
- This could be extended even further to include the medical centre. Completely agree with this and it is vital that commercial properties are not converted to dwellings and that we have an expansion of commercial properties. This is a must, not a nice to have.
- Strongly in favour of steps to ensure the ongoing commercial viability of the village centre.
- This should apply to Clifton and Hempton that any planning permission will not include change of use for the village amenities, eg Clifton the Duke of Cumberland should remain a licenced premises and not be included in any development project changing its use..
- Agree but see comments in DEDD14
- The Holly Trees, School, and the Church should also be included
- See my comments above

- The Plan must ensure properties of historical significance are not compromised in any developments.
- Signs are not good on the village green. Unnecessary.
- This needs to be accurate and robust for our future.
- The plan needs a much stronger "vision" for the future of the village centre in terms of conserving its character whilst maintaining the importance of good design. It should emphasise the need for greater priority to be given to the accessibility of the centre and safety of pedestrians as the centre is very much too vehicle dominated.
- need to spread things about more - you cannot park in Deddington as it is.
- Setting limits on landlord rents and preserving retail premises from becoming residential
- Also residents parking on streets surrounding that area e.g. Victoria Terrace. We need a better parking policy and policing at Farmer's Market for example!
- Propose suitable properties be converted to community office spaces (Link to Dedd 13)
- However in recognition that many issues are affecting business at the moment and businesses are failing - better parking facilities in the Market Place are needed to encourage Parishioners to use local shops - the benches outside the Unicorn are examples of unused space
- Houses have been built here already, no extra shops though, the primary school is bursting at the seams now, so we get a new school do we (Rubbish).
- However, I would rather have a well maintained useful house in the centre than a dilapidating empty shop.
- We love shopping in and visiting the Village Centre!
- Indeed! We have lost too many already – tea rooms, ice cream parlour, restaurants, jewellers – to name a few!
- Shop fronts can be very unsympathetic and we already have too many ugly shops.
- Lower rates to allow businesses to offer competitive prices
- Parking in the village centre needs urgently addressing
- In this climate I would not want to disadvantage a landlord who couldn't rent a retail unit - one for CDC
- we should not fund failing businesses if they work great but stop wasting money on things that are not viable

Community Guidance 1

Affordable housing

As recommended in the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) carried out by AECOM, 50% of affordable housing on any new development should be available for purchase through shared ownership or First Home or similar scheme.

Agree: 69.97% (261); 9.12% (34); Neutral: 21.18% (79)

Comments

- What is wrong with social housing. Definitely a need.
- Can it be achieved? Developers always wriggle as there's not enough profit in it.
- Maybe on central developments - would not work on anything built on the edges. Transport
- Designated affordable should be subject to a 'right of pre-emption' by local authority where subsequently appearing on open property market

- With priority given to those who have grown up/ were born in the parish and secondly to long term residents (25 years +) and their offspring
- Deddington residents prioritised
- "Affordable Housing" - a relative term. 2 bed new builds in Hempton Rd at £415!
- How often has this ever been done?
- Shared ownership is not useful. It is more expensive, and does not help first time buyers. Homes need to be actually affordable. Not 2 beds for £420,000.
- Encourage local people to stay local
- It depends how you define affordable!
- Is Deddington really the ideal place for first home buyers - surely there are other more suitable locations, closer to towns, jobs and transport hubs.
- Why not council housing? Need truly affordable
- I agree, but it should be at least 80%
- Affordable should be Affordable - use average single person's salary x 1.5 and x 4 (example 35k x 1.5 x 4 would be an example of a young couple being able to afford house = 210k) Not 400k that is being presented on the current Hempton Road development.
- Nice to have but we question whether developers stick to their "commitments" e.g The Poplars site
- We agree with the principle of delivering affordable housing but suggest that the exact % is determined in line with changes to national planning policy and the emerging Cherwell Local Plan.
- It needs to be affordable though!
- these properties MUST BE affordable for low income families and priority should be given to existing residents that have grown up in the village and have to live with their parents 50% figure totally unacceptable. I have a 37yr professional daughter who has to live with us because rental and house prices are so high that she can't get a mortgage
- Need evidence as to why 50%. This should be aligned with jobs and location of jobs. It might be the right percentage but I cannot make any judgment without seeing the joined up thinking with jobs.
- This rarely happens
- We agree with the principle of delivering affordable housing but suggest that the exact % is determined in line with changes to national planning policy and the emerging Cherwell Local Plan.
- Social housing needs should be realistically affordable not relatively affordable.
- It needs to be offered to people first, that have lived on the area for a long time, like myself. Due to housing costs, I have had to move home at 37 with my parents, which is having a big impact on my mental health, as I need my independence back. But on my wages, I can now not even afford renting as it's just NOT affordable. There needs to be more help for people like myself on low incomes.
- This policy may need to take into account government policy which frequently changes.
- I don't believe there should be this much affordable housing.
- Would it not be better to restrict a percentage of housing sales to those who already live in the parish for example - it's not just first time buyers who need help to access affordable housing in the area, those who currently live here are priced out of buying somewhere they can live with a family.
- This can only apply to areas that currently have the infrastructure and transport in place, any new development where this is not the case needs to have it built into the planning.
- 'Affordable' is a slippery term.
- Consideration should be given so beneficiaries of such schemes are local to the parish and not imported from elsewhere to ensure the existing community pride remains intact.
- Will have to take into account government policy which could change.
- Strongly agree that the future developments should encourage purchase of properties to first time buyers to maintaining age of population spread in the community
- This proposed policy may need to take into account government policy which could change.

- ...but I doubt if you will get it.
- Affordable & realistic pricing in line with national median earnings.
- But you need to also find a way to help people who come from here.
- Please don't forget the elderly and the disabled. They should have access to affordable housing.
- Assisted purchase schemes remove rented housing stock, which is a greater need.
- Always spoken about but rarely happens in volumes promised
- To what extent can we increase our influence on this for smaller developments? Can we aggregate each developer's site size to agree community contributions?
- Subject to purchasers being tied to unrealistic commitments: i.e. rates increases; future values.
- affordable housing is better to be provided in cities and larger towns
- (8) bankruptcy proceedings following the disappearance without trace in 1870 of the fraudster Henry Churchill, prominent Deddington solicitor and Coroner for North Oxfordshire 1863-1870;

Venables was also a prolific writer. Whilst at Deddington, he wrote 'The Deddington Church Tracts', four tracts, three priced at 1d., and the fourth at three-halfpence, printed by J.S. Hiron. A sermon preached by Venables in November 1850 entitled 'Rejoice with Trembling' was also printed by Hiron. The sermon (16pp.), preached shortly after the 'Papal Aggression', amounted to a sustained attack on Papists and Romanism.

The Rev. Dr. Wilson, who was the principal landowner in Over Worton, appears to have discharged his responsibilities as Curate conscientiously. In January 1852 the parishioners presented a heartfelt address in gratitude for his voluntary and able services, and large pecuniary outlay.

Reporting on the leaving presentation to the Rev. George Venables in November 1853, the Banbury Guardian noted that his "indefatigable and zealous labors [sic] for the good of the parish had justly endeared him to his flock, and whose removal is most severely felt".

- All property should be affordable!
- I believe the whole property system is broken and these measures do not go far enough to fix it.
- There must be additional restrictions to ensure that properties are not subsequently sold to the private sector or left as legacies to relatives in wills.
- See earlier comments. Developers need to be held to account to provide "affordable housing" and most not be left to the end of any development.
- I definitely agree to the affordable housing but question that definition. Shared ownership is a dreadful option and should not be included in this category which allows higher prices =unaffordable.
- 50%. WAY TOO HIGH A FIGURE - PERHAPS 5-10%
- Affordable housing should be in the reach of first time buyers on modest salaries such as 20k
- Priority should be given to those first-time buyers who live closest to the new development.
- Torn on this one as everyone needs to start somewhere. However, I think this village is expensive and not sure people who need support can find Deddington an easy place to live.
- And a deddington connection policy
- bring prices down
- This aspect of new developments should be paramount

Community Guidance 2)

Freehold/Leasehold

Open market houses should be for sale freehold and not leasehold

Agree: 89.79% (343); Disagree: 2.09% (8); Neutral: 8.38% (32)

Comments

- Leaseholders at mercy of development companies
- NB, Note recent legislation on 'ground rent escalation' (rising ground rent)
- Strongly agree
- Absolutely no freehold - it is a con
- Are affordable houses also pegged at affordable sell-on prices?
- Local authority should not support disgraced practice by developers of reserving ground rent over market value housing
- Leasehold is archaic. The only way it works, is with small residencies of flats/maisonettes, where the freehold is a combined ownership so they can maintain the shared land and actions needed to improve their overall homes. It would be better to encourage NON rented housing, and offer affordable housing that people can buy, thus looking after their own house, respecting it, and the village. Promoting positive living environments and contributing to the overall landscape.
- However, this should only apply to new development and not planning already granted, or buildings already on leasehold
- Leasehold must not be permitted at all in the village in new housing developments
- We think it should be both freehold and leasehold
- Leasehold is a con - everything should be freehold. In addition, new developments tend to come with a contract with the developer for x number of years. This should also stop.
- We think it should be both freehold and leasehold.
- We agree that there is no justification for constructing family dwellings houses that are not freehold. However account needs to be taken of flatted developments which frequently have to be leasehold to take into account joint areas of ownership.
- I think reasonably priced and buoyant rental market would be a good way to keep the community diverse.
- Not sure what this means??
- They should be freehold and leasehold.
- Mechanisms must be in place to enable houses to be purchased on freehold basis
- can be either depending upon type of development.
- Leasehold new builds are appalling.
- I strongly support 'freehold' availability
- Leasehold provides churn in the housing market and perhaps gives great opportunity for younger people to live in the village.
- What is this to do with the NP? Houses should be sold however the seller wishes if they can find a buyer.
- Leasehold is a concept rooted in maintaining the status quo of power and distribution of resources. It does not align with the values previously stated in this consultation about who Deddington is.
- LEASEHOLD SHOULD BE RESISTED AT ALL COSTS
- Very important

Community Guidance 3)

Estate roads should be made to a standard adoptable by the Highways Authority, and play areas should be publicly adopted by the relevant local authority and not be the responsibility of a residents' management company

Agree: 89.74% (341); Disagree: 2.63% (10); Neutral: 7.63% (29)

Comments

- Although in practice this never happens
- Design on local architectural materials and structures
- Developers often back track on land promised to residents and build on it in the future.
- I don't think The Grange passes this one - not its garage widths.
- Roads. Play areas could be either depending on developer. Prefer MGT.Co option
- Subject to good design, not massively overburdened by out of date, highways regulations.
- As long as it's not a burden on local council funding
- The play area on the Grange is adopted but we, on the Grange have to pay for the maintenance of it. This is not right. Also, our highways are not adopted yet we still have to pay the same Council Tax as people who live on adopted streets. This is not right again. Resident Management Companies are just another con - we have to pay for them, we have no choice, and pay full Council Tax. Local Authorities need to take on the accountabilities.
- We agree that all estate roads should be adopted to ensure adequate future maintenance. However residents management companies for open space within a scheme can work well provided adequately funded. Many parish councils refuse to adopt such open space because they do not possess the necessary equipment or administration to ensure regular maintenance. If Deddington Parish Council wishes to take over such land within schemes then we would have no objection.
- In our view the estate roads should also be adopted by the relevant local authority, this has been left out of the above statement.
- Strongly in favour. Residents should not have to pay twice.
- Agree that all estate roads should be adopted but residents management companies for open space within a scheme can work well provided they are adequately funded.
- Strongly agree
- We agree that all estate rates should be adopted but residents management companies for open space within a scheme can work well provided adequately funded. Many parish councils refused to adopt as they do not have the machinery or organisation to look after open space. If Deddington Parish Council can undertake this work at reasonable cost then this solves a potential problem for developers
- each development should be assessed.
- Yes, in order to prevent neglects of the past, I fear this must happen but builders should be making upfront payments to parish council to assist with this.
- If it is possible to extend that to existing developments that would be incredibly helpful and valuable - to the villages as a whole
- A universal solution for every site is not the correct approach. It also assumes that public authorities are the correct organization to manage play areas and estate roads. There may be extremely good reasons why estate roads remain private to avoid the need to provide street lighting etc and so not effect biodiversity or bats. This has not been taken into account. Furthermore, management companies have been established to manage estate roads and play areas etc as part of development proposals. They are a legitimate approach to the management of such facilities.
- Two questions, please do not lump them together! Authorities should not be forced to adopt anything. Of course roads "should" be made to a standard that is adoptable and be adopted. I am currently happy that small estate play areas that are not easily accessible from off estate are supported by the local residents rather than draining council resources.
- It is strange that it's not
- Residents have a say on grounds maintenance Roads should be a high standard
- That should include all parts of the estate, and not have loopholes that exclude cul de sacs / ancilliary roads that are left to private ownership and often fall into disrepair. A good example can be found on Gaveston Gardens, where the public highway ends short of a number of houses in cul de sacs. These areas have gravel glued to the tarmac which disappears after a couple of years.
- 100% as otherwise they end up in a mess.
- The grange is a MESS cheap road materials - why should we take on that mess?

Community Guidance 4)

Zero Carbon

The international PassivHaus standard is now regarded as the most effective at delivering genuine zero carbon building performance. The NP encourages such future proofing of as many buildings as economically possible in new developments.

Agree: 83.38% (316); 2.37% (9); Neutral: 14.51% (55%)

Comments

- Why "encourage". Why not mandate?
- Why not go all out for ALL new developments to meet this standard?
- Vital!
- "economically possible" not strong enough!
- I agree in principle but have no idea how this might affect design and appearance of new homes
- Have concerns with PassivHaus specifically but doubt any developer will get close to PH.
- Also where possible (and in keeping with the character of Deddington) solar panels and batteries should be requirements for new builds.
- And solar panels
- I would prefer one big plot of houses (eg DNP6) than lots of small plots. This would cause the least disruption to the village life and maximise community benefit through a significant contribution to village facilities from a developer (the larger the development, the bigger the financial contribution leveraged). Both DNP6 and DNP7 would not be seen from the main roads of the village and would seem to have the least impact in terms of increasing the Parish boundary relative to the number of houses they provide.
- "As economically possible" = Weasel words. Any new builds need this. Retro-fitting it is also important - it's being done in Bath.
- If you opt for our 1st 2 choices (DNP6 DNP20), the 3rd and 4th choices (DNP10 and DNP11) would be much smaller developments, causing less chaos on the Banbury Rd while being built and afterwards. Not mentioned by you but CRUCIAL - Impact of 126 new houses on : 1. THE SCHOOL 2. THE SURGERY - it can't (or won't) cope NOW. What plans for enlarging these 2 vital places?
- What leverage do we have to ensure this - developers seem to have all the cards
- Reducing CO2 is of utmost importance.
- However, this will vastly increase the price of the properties, which of course will keep younger people and those on lower incomes out of the property market still
- Passivhaus should be an agreed construction standard. Provided a PH consult/clerk of works is appointed to all new development. Contractors invite to tender for new development must be passivhaus certified and demonstrate PH competency at tender stage as part of development agreements with the parish and district council
- Very important for high environmental specifications.
- All housing should be zero carbon.
- THANK YOU for a most comprehensive and "easy to understand" Neighbourhood Plan. Pat P.
- 1) Small properties being extended further erodes the stock of smaller properties in the village. Planning applications to demolish/extend to much larger properties should be refused.
2. Improvements in parking and pavements etc should not be restricted to areas around new developments. Increase in properties affects us all but improvements do not seem to extend to existing areas i.e. main road bus shelters and crossings at one end of the village differ hugely to the other end! Important to keep within suggested boundaries. Creeping along the A4260/A361 will result in ribbon development.
- Our Market Place, at times is far too congested. Further large housing estates will worsen this situation. Unless alternative car parking is found either by reducing size of "The Green" or a dedicated (car park?) maybe off Earls Lane

- Seems mad that recent developments did not have solar panels as standard
- I have had a thermal report done on our property and even though it is new, it is not sealed properly and so is part of the environmental problem, not the solution. In addition, the house building standards have been the same in this country for decades even though technologies have improved. It needs to be mandated that best practice technologies from around the world should be used to build much better and more economical housing in the UK that is part of the climate change solution. Solar panels, heat pumps and hydrogen ready boilers should be standard but these are a waste of time if the house is not built correctly and not sealed. These houses would be cheaper to build and it should be mandated that these savings are passed down to the customer - this would instantly make housing more affordable whilst developers still make a profit.
- Enough solar panels should be included in every new house.
- Strongly in favour.
- Passivhaus is a desirable if idealistic concept, changing the appearance of 'vernacular' architecture, e.g. reducing the size of windows. The retro-fitting of insulation to solid walls is likely to need substantial subsidy.
- It is rather weird that the surrounding agricultural land is being displaced by both solar panel farms AND new housing. The NP should encourage merging the two by ensuring all new houses have solar panels on their roofs. This might ensure some land at least is retained to grow our food
- This must include all buildings otherwise it gives the builders a way to opt out. Renewal energy generation must be included.
- Neutral as I feel this will make the house too expensive for local young people to purchase.
- Planning of houses must include Solar, Wind Energy etc.
- If they can't afford PH standards - it shouldn't be built. Already it's a loophole.
- This should be in a policy, not just guidance, for any estate to have communal heating, based on ground source heat pump wherever practicable, but if gas boilers are to be fitted, the circulation system must be suitable for later conversion to heat pump. Also requiring grey water recycling
- This is a MUST as still we see no change to do with EV world that is being forced upon us.
- Solar and heat pump seem the most sensible way forwards, especially for affordable housing. Above requirement insulation should also be mandated.
- With many thanks to the neighbourhood Plan Steering group for their difficult and complex job and the photo from Kevin Mayo of - for me - unusual sight of our village!
- define economically possible!! needs to be balanced against increased margins that developers are seeing on houses as a result of increased flexibility in working styles and less urban living as a result!
- Subject to cost and timescale
- A one fit is for everything and is inflexible. Whilst future proofing is in principle acceptable this is not necessarily the solution for everything. There needs to be flexibility in the policy.
- doubtful that this will be achievable.
- All new houses should be with solar panelling in view of climate change and increased cost of heating.
- Thank you, The NPSG for taking so much time and effort to support the community.
- sounds reasonable from your wording, I am not interested enough to do my own research into whether this may be correct.
- I don't know enough about that standard to comment on it, but heating and energy should ideally be from renewable sources.
- Houses or flats let out at peppercorn rent. Co-op age workers Post office Care staff Nurses Perhaps yearly contract like National Service. I am 87 I need support. It's hard to get. Why no taxi rank by shops. Rain water to gully sewerage to Banbury Canal
- I would add it should be mandatory.
- All should have solar panels; heat pumps and charers (?). Deddington has gas but no oil boilers should be part of any development
- More electric vehicle charging points as a standard of planning. What happens to the school and health centre.
- Plan for the future - all should be of highest building standards - especially insulation, ventilation and heating.
- It's an expensive standard but worth aspiring to.

- and a policy to improve current housing - see new ones to west of deddington are not very green in their construction. - again cheap construction to maximize profit.