

## Deddington Neighbourhood Plan

### Comments on potential site allocations

(voting on sites listed separately)

- Traffic significantly over-congested for further development around Wimborn Close. Significant wildlife in these fields including deer, kites and other species dependent on the land. Home farm Clifton site would see the tenant farmer with nowhere to keep machinery etc (he is a vital part of the community)
- Whose idea was it to list the plots from North to South! It comes across as an opinion of bias. Surely DNP1 or DNP23 was the way to list the plots. Corruption is evil and there should not of been any hint of it in this document. DNP10 will give the developers most profit!
- I have ranked this in terms of least impact on the landscape or historic nature of the Parish. The owners of the Duke are keen to have new houses behind the pub, but the idea of putting a development on a working farm is without any rationale whatsoever.
- Believe smaller sites are preferable
- DNP20 = Brownfield site hence no 1 ranking. We need to take a share in Hempton - DN23 is less impact on village centre because of increased traffic - no services full stop means potentially 50+ cars extra per day generated from that development alone (25 houses). The 2 other sites in Hempton simply do not have the capacity to carry extra traffic, no matter how small the development
- Any decision concerning Hempton and Clifton should be made by the inhabitants of those places. No housing within 150 metres of Castle mound
- Strong objection to DNP10. These plans open the way to ribbon development from Deddington to Adderbury
- Why on EARTH are there proposals to build on DNP16 - the yards of a WORKING FARM? You have stated that the site contains 'redundant farm buildings' - which is an outright LIE. This is a working, functioning farm producing food for the community...proposals to build on the farm yard are just ignorant. If planning were granted for this site, a family would be essentially robbed of their livelihood. They produce food for the LOCAL COMMUNITY, via the farm shop. This is a vital community facility which reduces car trips for those living in Clifton. Home farm is a vital part of the COMMUNITY, and promotes good farming practice and the benefits of locally produced food. In regards to sites DPN20... it staggers me that there is a proposal to build on a site which houses several businesses ALREADY SERVING THE COMMUNITY, Sites such as DNP 2 & 4 are frighteningly close to the historical site which is the Castle grounds. If we start building here, how long before historical sites themselves also end up being developed?
- Not prepared to rank sites in Clifton and Hempton as we are Deddington residents
- My preferences are for small sites with access to amenities and transport and minimal environmental impact
- Brown field sites should be utilised in preference to productive agricultural land. ridge and furrow DNP20 - Back land? DNP4 - Broken promises DNP7 - Agricultural land. Views. Getting to village centre?
- A brilliant plan.
- Looking at Map and considerations - large central sites feel the best compromise - going out on the corner site sites is stretching too far out at this stage and losing more countryside
- No radical developments in plan period unless meets global warming policy. Restrict housing development to the integral shape imposed on Deddington being built on a ridge
- Generally speaking I think it's important to preserve the appearance of the village as is (was) and to avoid spread and sprawl. Deddington Grange has adversely impacted on the character of the village and further spread and sprawl, particularly where so obviously visible, is to be avoided if we are to cling to the character of a village not a town.
- It would have been useful to have an overlay map of the Conservation area. DNP7 Grove Field, South of the Paddocks would be built directly adjacent to the Conservation area boundary. This site is not only "backfilling" but would directly impact and alter the setting of listed buildings. The Conservation area should be enlarged to protect such sites - applies to DNP1 Chapmans Lane/St Thomas St.
- Moderate size developments preferred e.g. 10-25 units Improve sustainability of Hempton and Clifton through developer led contributions to additional public transport e.g bus stops
- DNP 1 and DNP2 will spoil the greenery and the view from the allotments and for those living on St Thomas Street and Chapman's lane. It will also make Deddington a very strange shape with houses outside the settlement boundary. The wildlife/ecology around the allotments is wonderful and will really be spoilt by this plan (DNP 1 and 2) for a very few extra houses.

- "The Housing Needs Survey concluded that 126 dwellings will be needed in the Parish between now and 2040" We do not have enough information to see what justifies this statement. Whilst we would understand a) affordable housing for genuine locals b) additional houses for new employment in Deddington c) OAP's
- Ideally to achieve the maximum amount of 150 homes, building should be split between sites 1,2,3 e.g 1=70 homes 2=40 homes 3=40 homes
- Don't see how we can rank the sites in Clifton and Hempton
- We are most concerned about DNP1 and DNP2 which will lie outside the Parish boundary, interfere with the green space of the allotments, permanently spoiling the countryside setting of the allotments and the views. Parking is on street for majority of Thomas Street properties and creating an entrance/road to these properties would eradicate much needed spaces, an unnecessary imposition for only 22 houses which would not do much to meet the 150 home designation from the Council
- DNP7 will require a crossing similar to The Grange - equi-distant from the main traffic lights so not a problem. The sites in Hempton are up to Hempton residents and the sites in Clifton up to the Clifton Residents. Brown field sites where poss, i.e. DNP 16. Small developments - divide big sites eg DNP7 - do North half only to start with. East of Deddington - agree a buffer zone round the Castle Grounds before granting further planning permission. The Burrington and Poplars permissions are a disgrace - ribbon development in veiled form. Encroachment. Unjustified. Shocking planning decision
- Please do not build on Grove Fields -The Paddocks - it is used so widely by everyone here to walk, relax and see the countryside. Putting a big estate on it would destroy Deddington.
- Some of the large sites could be as phased/part development over future years. It would help to balance the development in the 3 settlements and allow buyer choice of location.
- Smaller infill sites are preferable to one large site, which puts a lot of strain on current facilities and access to the main road which is already difficult at the end of the village. DNP7 should be a maximum of 60-85 houses. Likewise DNP10 and 11 should not be more than 60-85 houses
- I prefer to avoid another large development in Deddington. I don't feel the newest ones have added anything positive to the culture, community or economy of the village, i.e. the pledge to offer 'Affordable' housing to lesser well-heeled locals was a scam. I also don't want to see anything built up on the edges of the Castle Grounds, to preserve it as a haven for wildlife and the well-being of the community.
- The Grange is a wonderful example of how a significant no. of dwellings can be added to the Parish with limited negative impact on the local environment - if we are to deliver the housing needs forecast- this needs to be replicated!
- We feel that Clifton and Hempton residents should choose their potential sites.
- For any housing to be built in or around Deddington, schooling and traffic has got to be considered. We live on Earls Lane and sadly witness horrendous traffic each day at key times.
- I refuse to endorse any of those sites. Will development help people sleeping rough or young people to buy a property? No it will just channel more money into the pockets of greedy developers. As to the 'biodiversity' interest (?) - any loss of habitat is detrimental to the ordinary species living there.
- Home Farm is a much loved, well run family farm with a shop that's valuable to the community not a building plot.
- Clumping all new development along the Banbury Road north of Deddington will create heavy traffic/delays/ pollution during peak traffic periods. Spreading the load across smaller sites will avoid reinforcing existing "them and us" division between long term village residents and new arrivals
- Thinking about heavy traffic and pollution it would be a mistake to build more houses along the Banbury Road heading into Banbury
- One (or two) larger developments will benefit the community most - if 100-150 houses are needed. I think DNP11 and DNP6 are best locations for such larger scale sites. I am not in favour of piecemeal development of smaller sites. We would end up with the same number of houses/people, but much less money in the way of contributions to infrastructure
- Need for affordable housing, not 2 beds costing £420,000
- Please see attached photos. No access to DNP22 at Manor Barn, Chapel Close, Clifton. Chapel Close floods on a regular basis
- I prefer minimum builds on each of the three main locations
- Rather than have huge "Housing estate" builds I have gone with what I believe to be a fair build for everyone, proposing the minimum builds of the 3 main locations
- DNP10 and DNP11 - provision must be given for thoroughfare through to The Windmill. Currently, since Deddington Grange has been built, all foot traffic has been re-routed via Gaveston Gardens - this includes when the primary school visits the playing fields. This is to avoid the main crossroads. Once a quiet estate is becoming a bustling main road. Putting either development in place without such

provision or an alternative public amenity near to these "child friendly" spaces will increase footfall 5-fold.

- The parish needs small developments in order to not be overwhelmed with the larger ones... fill in the small areas first, will delay the necessity of the larger developments. I don't agree it's like ripping a sticking plaster off... accepting one large development to meet demand, won't stop the smaller ones coming... but the small ones may well put off the larger ones !
- Clifton is in urgent need of traffic calming measures at both ends of the hamlet. Any additional development in Clifton will exacerbate the current severe risk to traffic safety. Additional traffic calming measures are urgent regardless new development is proposed in the hamlet or not.
- Deddington is already at full capacity at the traffic lights at the central cross roads. The school and GP surgery are also oversubscribed and it is challenging to get spaces therefore we disagree with the "green" assessment for population/community, health/wellbeing and transportation. If building in Deddington, these will need additional resources and planning. The views on the very popular Deddington loop walk should be protected also, as these are very popular with the local community. I feel strongly any new houses should be built to linked with the area (Cotswolds stone), and the developments should have adequate green space and parking. It is not realistic to plan for each household having less than 2 parking spaces each, as parking is already a major concern for the village. Building should be to high environmental specification such as Passiv Haus.
- Adjacent to DNP4 was granted planning on the basis DNP4 was set aside for grazing. WHY on this list? Misleading to villagers & disrespectful of the Castle Grounds. Favour DNP 20 as brown field but density FAR too high.
- Car parking is a problem; many who live in walking distance prefer to drive! Why not move school to DNP7 - giving it playing fields and room for expansion and use present school site for car park, but many people still want to park near shops!
- DNP10 would extend Deddington too far to NW, unbalancing the town. Also removing an extensive vista over the Valley of the Swere!
- Would prefer to see smaller developments which would be more able to integrate into village life rather than one large development
- Home Farm Clifton (DNP16) is not made up of redundant buildings and would not benefit from being rejuvenated into a housing estate. It is a working farm yard with a thriving farm shop serving the residents of Clifton and saving many car journeys to Deddington to buy essential supplies. It is also a haven for wildlife.
- Would prefer smaller developments spread over a wider area rather than huge developments
- Development should be ideally all on Brown Field sites, avoiding agricultural land wherever possible, small scale in keeping with the three villages and avoiding sensitive sites where environmental, historical and important views would be damaged. Development should avoid major extensions of the village settlement boundary.
- Please see section 2 of our representation.
- I was concerned by the flyer from Deddington Development Watch which was presumably sent to all houses in the area? My questions to you would be who makes up this group (there are no names mentioned on the leaflet) and are any of them connected with the neighbourhood plan steering group? If they are then I consider this whole public consultation survey to be NOT valid. Whilst lobbying is permitted it should not be acceptable if the people/persons lobbying hide behind an anonymous group AND are personally connected to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.
- Number of houses per site seems low compared to how they will finish after the builders
- As Clifton doesn't have a shop, to have some more housing there would hopefully keep the local pub/restaurant open which is always good for a community
- Personally would not want one huge site. Although Hempton an outsider for CDC I would be OK if one of the 3 sites was chosen to share the load across the community.
- I think large estates are a bad idea -puts too much traffic and disturbance into one area. Better to spread new housing across the four roads of Deddington, plus some in Clifton and Hempton
- Radwell would be a preferable choice as it would not be visible when driving through the village however the necessary infrastructures need to be put in place 1 sewerage plant as current systems ie Barford etc would not be able to cope we already experience frequent issues 2 Traffic this requires closing off to heavy goods & associated vehicles. Note obviously this wouldn't apply to our farming community The road is getting severely damaged by these vehicles. numerous accidents due to excessive speed eg loss of animal life (including personal) car accidents and close pedestrian misses (in some cases actual hits) 3 modern amenities ie gas etc this village has no gas unlike its close neighbour Deddington
- No preference for locations in Hempton or Clifton as not a resident there.

- Hempton and Clifton site could be useful as fill ins, but are likely to increase traffic to and from Deddington
- Taking a working farm from Clifton with 3 generations there is completely unjustified. Also development within any of the villages is about to spoil our countryside and small villages
- In our opinion the obvious choice is DNP10 (1) perfect building land and access to main road to banbury. Least visually intrusive, on bus route, adjoining new development where occupants will expect further houses to be built. Other developments will upset existing long term residents who will object throughout the planning process.
- Good to have details of possible new house sites especially for limited disturbance to the countryside and agriculture as well as traffic
- Hempton and Clifton have no infrastructure to sustain additional housing. The development DPN7 provides sufficient housing to meet the proposed target.
- Infrastructure i.e. Doctors, dentist schools should be created before any development discussed. Hempton tiny village no amenities strongly object to development. Object to large scale development of Deddington, no parking now, will change character of village.
- I prefer one or a few large developments close to village centre with a full quota of affordable units
- I think we should avoid large scale development and concentrate on smaller infill development in keeping with the villages environments. Try to keep loss of productive agricultural land to a minimum and use any brown field where possible.
- I do not think any housing in Hempton is a good idea. The traffic is horrendous and people speed, there are several accidents in the village every year. I have lost two cats on the main road due to speeding vehicles. If i HAD to choose a spot in Hempton, it would be Radwell. The land opposite St Johns Way will ruin the views, that our families bought the properties for. It's an absolute disgrace that these developments are actually being taking into account and not listening to the long serving residents. We moved here 28 years ago as the village was quiet and beautiful views from our house. Developments will destroy this.
- We support the strategy of putting most development at Deddington but apart from identifying our site (DNP 6 Land North of Wimborn Close) as the one with the fewest constraints, had not intended to rank the other sites. Unfortunately the software does not allow us to do this and so we have ranked the sites generally in the order based on a spatial strategy focusing on Deddington with the smaller sites being preferred for reasons which we state later. Site DNP6 is well related to the overall morphology of the village, does not extend Northwards beyond the existing limits of development marked by a shallow ridge; is easily accessible to all facilities in the village; and is a suitable rounding off of the settlement in a location where two small housing sites have recently been consented (land at Stonepits Field). It is noted that aside from site DNP 20, which is classified as brownfield (but not contiguous with the existing settlement boundary), all the other sites at Deddington are likely to be "best and most versatile" agricultural land. Whilst we intend undertaking a study to establish whether Site DNP 6 is grade 3 agricultural land or lower, it seems likely that this constraint will affect all sites at Deddington. Given that the precise classification and subdivision of grade 3 agricultural land depends upon its droughtiness and stoniness it is important that more detailed information is collected to establish which subdivision of Grade 3 the sites fall into.
- Unfortunately, Deddington does not have sufficient infrastructure to accommodate additional homes of up to 150 considering that in the last few years Deddington Grange has been built and now two new developments one on Hempton Road and The Poplars next to Castle Grounds. Deddington has a small shop and a small school, the traffic on the crossroads between Hempton Road and Banbury Road which is next to school got terribly worse with the number of accidents increasing. I believe building more houses would increase the traffic which is already terrible and make it more dangerous for its current residents.
- Rather than have huge 'housing estate' builds, I have gone with what I believe to be a fair build for everyone, proposing the minimum builds on each of the 3 main locations.
- Good to have details of possible new house sites especially for limited disturbance to the countryside and agriculture as well as traffic
- Hempton and Clifton have no infrastructure to sustain additional housing. The development DPN7 provides sufficient housing to meet the proposed target.
- Infrastructure i.e. Doctors, dentist schools should be created before any development discussed. Hempton tiny village no amenities strongly object to development. Object to large scale development of Deddington , no parking now, will change character of village.
- I prefer one or a few large developments close to village centre with a full quota of affordable units
- I think we should avoid large scale development and concentrate on smaller in fill development in keeping with the villages environments. Try to keep loss of productive agricultural land to a minimum and use any brown field where possible.

- 20 is the only site that is suitable from every perspective. Adding housing should not be at the expense and detriment of the communities already in those areas.
- In general I prefer one larger development in a location which consolidates Deddington village boundaries around the crossroads to developments which encourage creep down the Hempton or Clifton roads, including from those villages. I think it important to keep the three villages distinct, while seeing that the residents of those villages may think they need to increase in size to be sustainable. I'm very against developing the Poplars or down Chapman's Lane and, had the option been available, would have excluded those and behind The Lane, Hempton.
- Smaller developments are better.
- DNP1 & DNP2 are incorrectly described in the relation to the map! Our scoring reflects the map NOT the description!
- Smaller developments would be much better for the parish with fewer than 126 houses in total. The Health Centre isn't taking new patients, dentists are full as is the primary school.
- It is such a shame we are allowing our beautiful areas to be ruined with housing developments. We don't have the infrastructure in place. The school and health centre are already completely over loaded. The market square has turned into a car park with the coop not being able to support the community already. These new houses cannot be supported. More houses is going to ruin our lovely villages. It really saddens me.
- DNP4 (The Poplars) is an open space part of the Conservation Area, It's also part of the setting of the adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument. The elevated line of veteran trees marks the surviving c.20ft high ramparts of the Norman castle. The panoramic view of the ramparts from the Clifton Road is a notable Deddington feature. Negative landscape and historic environment assessment by AECOM. 2) The iconic views of the Church tower from Grove Fields (DNP7) would be largely obliterated if this field was built on. There are also access issues with DNP7. Residents' vehicles would need to join the Hempton Road, many turning right towards the crossroads. Crossing the High Street on foot, from The Grove to Hudson Street, would be problematic. There is insufficient space for a crossing without displacing residents' parking and would be close to the crossroads. Negative historic environment assessment by AECOM. 3) There is a real risk developers may seek to build the whole quota up front. Should not the quota be phased? 4) The Government has prioritised building on brownfield sites rather than on productive agricultural land. The country needs to become more self-sufficient in producing food as well as providing greater protection of the environment, biodiversity and wildlife.
- Would favour builds closer to motorway and rail links to avoid increasing through traffic. Hempton is already struggling with the pinch point volume of traffic. Generally don't support building on food-producing land -we already import over 50% not sustainable for future generations with climate change.
- I'd favour a small number of small developments over DNP10 or DNP7, but they might be the least worst option from an environmental perspective. Hempton and Clifton need public transport links if expansion is to take place there (if people will just be driving to Deddington anyway, the houses might as well be close to Deddington). An environmentally sound Deddington plan needs to include additional transport links (even an upgraded bus route to Banbury/Oxford from within Deddington if the large sites are created there). Similarly, there are no services (eg, shops) in Hempton so expansion needs to include planning for their provision (assuming continued growth).
- We noticed dnp1 and dnp2 are labelled in reverse on the map page 4. Would be more supportive of more homes in Hempton if a bus service was added.
- Number of homes, size of property, market segment and access to sites make it difficult to form opinions on middle ranking sites.
- Clifton and Hempton need to take their share of new houses but clearly the environmental impact needs to be taken into account. A single large site in Deddington would solve many problems but we believe that the brownfield site should be number one on the list for obvious reasons.
- Some development in Clifton and Hempton should be included to help them retain/improve critical mass
- estates like the one recently built on the edge of Deddington. Ideally what we need is a ring road running to the East of the village.
- 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. DNP4 (The Poplars) is in the Conservation Area, and should not be developed. - DNP7 (Grove Fields) would be detrimental to view of the church. So called Ribbon development should not be something we should consider for our village. 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! -Recession. 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 causes often 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.

- Prioritise Brownfield sites, and avoid building on agricultural land. The exception to this is DNP6, which will almost certainly get planning permission.
- The village needs small changes as "the grange" was too much to absorb in one way - these people have still not integrated to the village.
- A spread of demand over 3 villages is essential. Phasing of work to prevent multiple building projects concurrently.
- The west side of Deddington has had more than its share of development over the past years. Housing to the Clifton side of the village would help regarding traffic to the M40 not having to pass through the centre of the village.
- NO to DNP4, DNP1 and DNP2. Do not develop around Castle Grounds.
- The map on page 4 is poor. A clearer map or this aerial photo made lighter would be much more helpful
- I'm supportive of smaller developments in infill areas
- Preferably no more homes without a boost to the infrastructure
- Page 3 recommends up to 150 dwellings. Number of homes for DNP7 is showing up to 175. Perhaps the extra space allocated for the 25 + houses could be bungalows to help the less able bodied!
- Inclined to sites with least impact
- A selection such as this appears to give the maximum provision with minimum impact
- North Deddington has borne the brunt of recent development. Hempton and Clifton should share the burden of development.
- Too much congestion of traffic in the village. Houses north of deddington would take traffic out of village Too many cars in Deddington
- Some of the proposed sites will completely change deddington as a village and not in a positive way.
- DNP6 and DNP20- Already in progress? There is already building new housing Wimborn Close and Clifton Road- how real is this consultation? Are these taken into account?
- I do not want any until the traffic situation is dealt with. Deddington has heavy duty lorries and has become a rat run- noise from traffic speeding through goes on all night. It is so bad no-one sleeping at the front can have their windows open. Adding more houses will worsen the traffic.

- There is too much development in Deddington. Hempton and Clifton should be the target locations, with added infrastructure, shops etc. to support that growth. Sites in Deddington keep growing. I support smaller, infill sites.
- Strongly oppose building proposals near site of Deddington Castle. Far too many houses for a small village to accommodate
- No further developments north of the fire station and Deddington Grange. North of the station is ridge and furrow land and Deddington Grange already taken a chunk of agriculture land.
- I think that it is best to have a number of smaller sites in Deddington, Clifton and Hempton. In-fill sites should be prioritised
- I strongly object to DNP 7 being included in the survey. It would materially affect the Conservation Area through a very sizeable development being built along the boundary of the Conservation Area with many listed buildings and views being enveloped. Moreover, I strongly disagree with AECOM's classification of the Biodiversity and Geodiversity as blue - it should absolutely be red. The very sizeable development envisaged by DNP 7 would be the only one in Deddington that has an immediate border with a BAP Priority Habitat of woodpasture and parkland. In the BAP Priority Habitat immediately adjacent to DNP 7 there are a number of species such as the red-listed cuckoo, various bats, swallows, and many others, as well as dozens of veteran trees and ancient hedgerows that would be affected by such a sizeable development. We are in the middle of a climate crisis and I am shocked it would be considered. The light, noise and pollution would no doubt be impactful on an environmental asset of great importance immediately next to the proposed development of DNP 7. That M&G, the owner of the site, which states on its website that it is focused on 'Planet-centric investing' is highly questionable if this were to go forward.
- smaller developments should be preferred as smaller developments would have smaller impact in every way
- Building in outlying areas will increase traffic commuting and further congestion around schools as walking is more impractical. Building on agricultural sites is environmental suicide as we need to grow as much locally produced food. Relying on overseas for food as has been shown by the Ukraine conflict is untenable.
- Sorry I don't rank any proposed site: Deddington, Clifton, Hempton are not in need of any of any large developments. I agree a few small sites, yes, to INFILL certain areas. Neither of the villages have the facilities to sustain these large sites. Many years ago Deddington had 3 garages all selling fuel, shops i.e. butchers, food shops in plenty. Today no, Hempton did as did Clifton, so do not allow these property developers to build in our village.
- I plump for smaller sites, smaller developments throughout the Parish. I would like to veer traffic away from the Hempton Road especially the traffic lights - agricultural land should be cherished not built upon - have we not learnt yet to value farming given Brexit and the Ukraine war?
- DNP11 The woodland to the south and west was a planning stipulation of The Beeches development intended to screen this development from the surrounding countryside. To build around it would be in contravention of this provision. If DNP11 was to proceed an application to include this woodland can be expected.
- I have ranked Hempton sites lowest not because I live there but because the road pinch point in Hempton is already dangerous. Any increase in traffic will increase the risk and planners will need to take responsibility for this. New sites around the centre of Deddington is preferred due to the consideration of traffic versus walking and safety.
- if sites 10 /11/20 were chosen this would lead to far less construction upheaval, would not impact extra traffic going through Deddington plus the financial benefit could this go towards parking upgrade to earls lane ?? also we do not need infilling as there is an alternative with large sites available
- I think we should prioritise brownfield sites, and sites with redundant buildings. To keep a village feel we should avoid large plots of dnp10 and dnp7, accepting that targets need to be met then dnp11 would be the site to target the highest number of houses
- I would prefer a number a smaller scale developments spread around Deddington, Clifton and Hempton rather than one large block of houses. Using the brown field site on Clifton Road makes sense to rejuvenate the area also redevelopment of disused farm buildings in Clifton would be efficient use of the land. Expanding Clifton would also give opportunities to support the pub which has struggled to keep open and help the community.
- Avoid building along the Deddington circular walk route so as not to spoil the views as they are an important factor of what makes people want to live in the area. The sites in Hempton might help to make the village feel more cohesive as the new houses (st. johns way) feel disconnected from the older more classic buildings. The site behind the fire station in deddington would be a good site as its near the school and the health centre and not far from the centre but there aren't any particular views to be spoiled as all you can see from the road are overgrown nettles.

- Small sites are preferred as larger sites lack character. Ridge and furrow land should be avoided for historic reasons.
- I believe small village type developments, that can be designed to be in character are much better than these large nondescript developments
- Why do you NOT think a yearly limit is needed
- From the AECOM analysis, there are evidently some sites that have least impact overall or more positive impact than others (i.e. green shading). The above ranking reflects this. From my calculations, taking sites ranked 1-4 would potentially account for between 170-212 dwellings - more than enough to cover foreseeable requirements (i.e. beyond 2040).
- I object strongly to DNP7 partly due to the very large development but mainly as, I believe, it would mean the destruction of two beloved stone houses for access - once owned by the Stevens family - Josie Steven's father built them for his daughters and used to live in the Holcombe - it would be a travesty to lose such lovely properties.
- Access to DNP22 down Chapel Close is very restricted
- I thought that "The Poplars" had already been approved a development site?
- I am only marking 1 as a deliberate choice. Deddington already feels overbuilt with nowhere near the level of infrastructure to support more housing- GP, Dentist, Vet etc all very over- subscribed. Losing the land in the centre of the village removes the rural feel. The area I have indicated would provide the requisite number of homes.
- Surely given the "rural" nature of the village and conservation area, smaller developments would be more appropriate. Having moved from a conservation village which has faced enormous development with large numbers of houses built 272 on one site, I have seen what damage this does to the local community with increase of traffic and lack of facilities.
- Number of properties far too many, will change Deddington as a 'village'.
- Need to control spread along the Hempton Road as so many of these developments would increase an already fast straight road.
- Further development at Clifton and Hempton will create dormitory suburbs with no/little facilities meaning more car usage.
- I think it is important to consider impact on landscape, wildlife, and existing dwellings.
- Will need a bigger school doctor's surgery and a shop away from the centre of the village wherever the builds take place as it is getting spoiled by the amount of traffic
- The village north border sign is next to fire station so do not want houses built outside that point. The site north of Wimborn close fills in a natural gap and adds a sizable plot. If we had to have a larger site south of paddocks would be a better location.
- One single site in Deddington is much better than multiple smaller sites. The DNP10 site is ideal as it is continuing a new development, is near the school, village centre and bus route. It will not spoil any key views (like DNP7)
- BEST TO MAKE UP TARGET NUMBER OF HOMES:- DNP 6. DNP 11. DNP 2
- The site at DNP10 is right next to the new development. It will accommodate all the housing needs in one site without disrupting the environment for existing dwellings. It is on the bus route and within walking distance of the town centre. Putting a few homes in the smaller sites will not service any purpose except spoiling the quality of life for those living next door.
- We do not need more housing. Banbury is already more than blending into Adderbury and if things continue we will no longer be a village but become a town.
- Avoid big estates and one developments that impact Deddington historic environment and landscapes.
- DNP7 is too big. Half would be better
- It is a huge shame that there has to be so many new houses to spoil this lovely village and severely overstretch the capacity for the school, Health Centre and the attractive Market Place
- We favour infill development. Development of Hempton and Clifton with cycle and bus links a primary school? To ensure survival of these local villages.
- Need to consider village amenities and their capabilities in all developments and preserving the landscape views.
- DNP10 is the best site as it can accommodate all housing needs on one site and is adjacent to a current new build estate and is on the S4 bus route and easy walking distance of the village centre
- The number of homes is too large. We prefer smaller sites
- Deddington has born the brunt of significant new housing developments in the past few years. Clifton and Hempton should make a contribution to the 100-150 target with one middle-size development each.



DWP 10, 11 and 7 are each too big and extend Deddington significantly into open countryside-unnecessary expansion.

- DNP7 Definitely not: Traffic bad enough now! DNP22 Traffic/ Environment DNP16 Would be ruined by traffic! Very poor idea for a tiny village DNP23 Traffic increase would ruin area DNP19 Traffic and pollution- do not need this DNP18 Traffic, pollution not necessary Having lived in Clifton for the last 15 plus years we have been appalled at the number and frequency of HGVs up to 44 tonnes weight using our village despite a 7.5 ton restriction! NO action from County Council. Road is a virtual racetrack at the best of times. Noise, air pollution - commercial vehicles using Clifton as a short cut.
  - To preserve village character and feel (in Deddington, which is already much larger than Clifton and Hempton) I wouldn't like to see any major new single development of 50+ houses. Smaller sites developed over time, with variation in style/architecture better reflects how the village has expanded to date. Large sites are often devoid of any identity, and set the precedent for other major developments turning Deddington into a small town.
  - I'm in favour of the larger scale developments as they create their own micro community and in keeping with other developments nearby; also it takes development away from the centre of the village into land that is spacious and suitable. My only reservation is concern over amenities in Deddington such as schools/health centre being overloaded.
  - DNP22 access road is narrow and difficult to widen for 28 dwellings also proximity to sewage works. Are recent and current developments taken into account?
  - I agree that it would be good to have a larger site in Deddington and a smaller site in each of Clifton and Hempton
  - Like every other development nothing will be done regarding the infrastructure of the village therefore more congestion, incredibly bad parking in the village and not enough amenities to cover everyone especially health centre and school.
  - ANY DEVELOPMENT IN HEMPTON OR CLIFTON SHOULD BE AVOIDED AS IT WILL CREATE MORE PARKING PROBLEMS IN DEDDINGTON MARKET SQUARE ANYTHING IN CHAPMANS LANE SHOULD BE AVOIDED BECAUSE OF POOR ACCESS.
  - I think it makes sense to build around Deddington as it already offers town facilities like medical and shops, whereas Clifton for example does not even have a village shop and not much road/traffic space as it is already.
  - It would be useful to understand, how the local infrastructure is improved alongside the growth. School is at max capacity. Doctors surgery struggling. Parking a challenge in parts of the village. Thames water issues in Clifton and Deddington. Traffic and speed issue.
  - Most in Deddington and a little in Clifton and Hempton to bring some benefits to the villages. Playgrounds and speed calming for example.
  - The Grange was a lot for village to take on - you need to spread to smaller developments across village or you risk a Village to the North of the Village. - Deddington Gaveston Gardens did not welcome anyone in the Grange development so they still do not feel part of this village.
  - I would rather see smaller developments than one or two large ones that swamp the local nature of the parish.
  - Development should be on a smaller scale to promote sustainable growth and maintain character of Deddington and local area. A single large development will feel like a bolt on and cause significant impact on traffic and infrastructure.
  - Developments larger than 100 homes would have a massive impact on a small village we all love for its nature, spreading them out allows for integration and feel the community wouldn't change too much. Environmental impact on this is a massive concern, homes should have solar panels and be as ecological as possible!
-