

Deddington Neighbourhood Plan

Third 'drop-in' event 20-21 November 2015

Comments on Movement & Transport draft policies, with M&T group responses

Policy DED - MOV1: Road safety

(a) Any new development should seek to provide access to the local road network in a way that mitigates the impact on road safety and traffic flow.

(b) Development proposals that would generate significant movement (typically a development of 10 or more dwellings) or would potentially affect a known and evidenced traffic hazard must be supported by a Transport Statement.

The Transport Statement must clearly set out details of the transport issues relating to the development including the measures to be taken to deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the scheme and opportunities for improving road safety and pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

(c) Wherever possible developer contributions will be sought towards road improvements (including without limitation traffic calming measures).

1. The traffic on Earl's Lane near the school/surgery must be slowed down now.	Specific suggestion. DPC better placed to pursue with OCC.
2. Tackle traffic/parking around school & Earls Lane.	As 1 above.
3. 20 mph speed limit in centre of villages and Earls Lane.	Not supported by OCC or TVP.
4. Street lighting on Hempton Road could be better parts of pavements are very uneven & difficult to see! R. Johnson	As 1 above,
5 Traffic calming needed Hempton Road & Clifton Road. Earls Lane parking area needed for Health Centre.	As 1 above. Specific parking suggestion for consideration.
6. Good [idea]. I can get the bus.	Supportive comment.
7. 'should seek' weasel wording very easy to get round. Propose 'shall' or 'must' in 1st sentence of MOV1.	True, but imperative tense impractical.
8. The centre of the village is at capacity with parking without further development.	General comment.
9. Hopcraft Lane & St Thomas Street need either one way or traffic calming. It is already extremely dangerous.	As 1 above.

Policy DED - MOV2: Parking

(a) Development proposals that may be expected to generate significant vehicle movements (typically a development of 10 or more dwellings) must consider the potential impact on the limited daytime parking capacity in Market Place in Deddington.

All applications must include a Travel Plan explaining amongst other things the measures to be taken to discourage the use of private cars, and to encourage more sustainable modes of travel, such as walking or cycling, for daytime journeys to/from Market Place.

(b) Any new development must provide sufficient off-road car parking spaces at least equal to Oxfordshire County Council's parking standards for new residential developments and sufficient covered secure cycle parking for residents and visitor cycle parking at least equal to Oxfordshire cycle parking standards.

(c) Applicants are expected to adopt a comprehensive approach to the adequacy of garaged and ungaraged car parking provision. All applications must clearly set out the proposed number and locations of allocated and unallocated parking spaces justified by reference to the objectively assessed parking provision needs of residents (after taking any garaging provision into account) and visitors.

1. Parking standards are not good enough especially as most households are 2 car families and some with older children are 3 or more.	General comment.
2. Measures to prevent non parishioners parking in the Market Place w ^d be welcome, tho this could mean parking places in front of people's homes e.g. Goose Green may well be taken (as they are on Market days, for instance).	Not supported by survey. See M&T reasons extracted below.
3. If housing is nearer the centre then parking would not be an issue as people would walk.	Whole village within easy walking distance.
4. Pavements & pedestrian routes as part of travel plans is very sensible.	Supportive comment.
5. Stop garages being converted and reducing "off-street" parking spaces.	Covered by Policy DED - HOU5(d).
6. Market Place is being ruined with cars - need a car park.	Specific suggestion for consideration. See M&T reasons extracted below.
7. Traffic measures should stop people parking in Deddington all day while they commute to Oxford or Banbury.	Little or no evidence for this.
8. Parking areas need to be addressed as a top priority.	General comment for consideration. See M&T reasons extracted below.
9. Perhaps there should be an area in the market place for those who are disabled or	Reported disabled parking space to be provided outside the Co-op.

have ill health and need to use a car to go to the village for shopping, using the church etc., etc.	
10. Parking adjacent to double white lines in New Street - this is an offence NO POLICE!!	Specific comment. DPC better placed to pursue with TVP.
11. Holly Tree should be purchased and turned into a car park for school and visitors.	Impractical suggestion.
12. Parking in the Market Square should be restricted/controlled on the main route through - keeping access clear.	Not supported by survey.

Policy DED - MOV3: Non-car movement

(a) Any new development must consider the needs of pedestrians and cyclists ahead of those of vehicles and must provide convenient and safe connectivity on foot and by cycle to local facilities and amenities, including bus services.

(b) Wherever possible developer contributions will be sought towards improving and extending bus services for Clifton, Deddington and Hempton.

(c) All applications must be supported by a Travel Plan, amongst other things clearly setting out how the subject proposal has taken the above requirements into account.

Join Parish to Sustrans cycle route.	See Policy MOV4(c). There is already a dialogue with Sustrans.
Some of us drivers are only trying to commute to work to pay taxes!!	General comment.

Policy DED - MOV4: Public rights of way

(a) Existing public rights of way will be protected. Where re-routing is essential to accommodate sustainable development, a replacement right of way between the same points shall be created which shall minimise any loss of amenity value.

(b) Opportunities will be sought to improve and extend the footpath and bridleway network in the Parish in order to provide better pedestrian access to the countryside through improved maintenance and waymarking, and making use of developer contributions, agricultural schemes and local partnership initiatives.

(c) Likewise opportunities will be sought to encourage cycling by developing, improving and extending the network of cycle routes in the Parish, and connectivity, through the creation of new links with appropriate road safety measures, improved maintenance and making use of developer contributions and local partnership initiatives.

1. Excellent policies.	Supportive comment.
2. Better signage in village to PROW's i.e. decent signs to Daeda's Wood from Hempton Road through Daedings even interpretative panels.	DPC best placed to pursue.

3. Footpaths that are diverted/developed around should AVOID going through residential areas (new development).	This is aim of Policy MOV4(a).
4. A footpath along length of Earls Lane and down to Clifton Road to provide a safe circular walk around that part of the village.	Specific suggestion for consideration.
5. Good on public rights of way.	Supportive comment.
6. Cycle lane to Clifton - secure cycle [parking] MOV4(c).	Specific suggestion for consideration.
7. Improvement in the link between Clifton & Deddington. A safe pedestrian path (no lay-bys!). A cycle lane? [Speed] restriction on [Clifton] road too.	Specific suggestion for consideration.
8. More cycle routes like Hempton Road around wider village.	General comment.

Combined comments on Policies MOV3 and MOV4

1. More cycle routes and footpaths would be good.	Supportive comment.
2. Improve/make safer footpaths & cycle routes.	Supportive comment.
3. Hopcraft Lane one way - Pinch point in Chapel Square wrong way round.	Specific comment. DPC better placed to pursue with OCC.

Post-it notes not referring to any specific policy

1. Agree with principles, but doesn't feel very realistic - most households have 2/3 cars (large!).	General comment.
2. "Wherever possible?" Squeeze the grasping vultures for all they're worth!"	General comment.
3. All policies sound sensible and well thought through.	Supportive comment.
4. xxxxx as Planning concerns council should be looking at the infrastructure at the same time as any planning consent will put pressure on xxxxxxx & facilities.	General comment.
5. Existing transport infrastructure is a network of roads with nodes forming accute bottlenecks E.G. Banbury. If Oxon needs more population it needs to relieve the bottle necks.	General comment.
6. I agree with these policies as they are based on the village survey. F.J.Davies	Supportive comment.
7. Transport - nice country roads to refresh you.	General comment.

8. Traffic out of village is a problem due to 2 pinch points Hopcraft Lane.	Specific comment. DPC better placed to pursue with OCC.
9. I agree with these. They reflect the survey.	Supportive comment.
10. Agree with improving transport. Parking is a major problem. Perhaps a one system would help.	General comment.
11. Traffic in and through the village is a serious problem. A village car park close to the centre is urgently needed. Parking in the market place should be time limited (except for nearby residents with parking licences). The village car park could be sited in Earls Lane with pedestrian access to the village centre. Parking in Earls Lane (for the health centre) could be eased by the provision of time-limited echelon parking along the road (right hand side towards Clifton). There is adequate room for about 30 vehicles parked in this way. The present parking has ruined the verge. Cliff Smith	Specific suggestions for consideration. Parking restrictions in Market Place not supported by survey. See M&T reasons extracted below.
12. A BIG thank you to everyone who has worked so hard on the Plan, survey & this consultation!!	Supportive comment.
13. This village can only take a minor increase in traffic. I support these policies.	Supportive comment.
14. I agree with this as it is in line with the village survey.	Supportive comment.

Email from Steve Waterman, 26th November 2015

Parking

One last comment relating to parking. I realise that this is a near impossible one to solve, (and a lot of possible solutions have been considered and rejected over the years) but I think it is going to look extremely odd that although parking problems were mentioned so many times during the consultation process (and in particular within the Business and Economy group - of which I was a member) there is almost nothing in the emerging policies (other than that new development should have parking spaces!) that attempts to address this issue.

In my view there **are** possible solutions if there was enough will to implement them, but at the very least the Development Plan should be able to state all of the options that have been considered, why they have been rejected, and why therefore the status quo of essentially doing nothing has ended up as the preferred policy.

M&T response:

This is addressed by the M&T reasons extracted below. M&T intend to re-visit parking issues in light of the post-it comments.

Comments on Environment policies by Lynda Lake-Stewart, Chairman of Allotments Society, 3rd December 2015

These look comprehensive- the only thing I would add is that there is good pedestrian access to any new development to encourage walking rather than car use. An example of poor environment is those two houses near the allotments that could have been set back further for a decent footpath (not to mention the mess that Earls Lane is with no footpath and all the surgery car parking). Having spent considerable time buggy walking and now toddler walking with my grandson I have first hand experience of the difficulties and the temptation to use the car rather than battle poor/lacking pavements!

M&T response:

Specific comments about footways for consideration.

Comments on parking in Business & Economy post-it notes

B&E comments and responses	M&T responses
Where will the visitors park? <i>Wherever it is legal to park.</i>	General comment.
Suggest some out-of-town with a subtle signed Heritage Trail. <i>Excellent suggestion - car parking comments passed to M&T.</i>	Does not refer to parking.
Any plan to increase tourism should also be taking into account parking issues and traffic. <i>Good point</i>	General comment.
More places for parking needed. <i>Noted and comment shared with M&T.</i>	General comment.
More businesses mean more cars etc in Market Place. <i>Yes.</i>	General comment.
This will provide a loophole for extending (?) how do you enforce (?) "business use"? Parking is a real issue in some areas of the village and "business" generate more traffic. <i>????????????????</i>	General comment on parking.
Visitor Parking where? <i>Wherever it is legal to park.</i>	General comment.
If visitors are to be welcomed where do they park? <i>Wherever it is legal to park.</i>	General comment.

<p>Holly Tree should be negotiated for and turned into car park for school and relieve market square. <i>I don't believe it is currently for sale and I think the original gift precludes this.</i></p>	<p>Impractical suggestion.</p>
<p>Visitor parking is a priority. <i>The village copes with Farmers Market days and as the closure of Philip Allen updates has made some parking spaces available in the Market Square. Discuss this with M&T.</i></p>	<p>General comment.</p>

Extracts from relevant paragraphs of draft M&T 'Policy background and reasoning' (to be reviewed):

There is limited off-street parking for residents in the Deddington Conservation Area, and likewise limited daytime parking capacity in the village centre for shoppers and workers.

Community consultation showed widespread (although by no means universal) concern about parking, and mixed views about whether realistically anything could or should be done. There was little consensus as regards potential solutions, which, apart from financial implications, would need to comply with applicable regulations.

Various surveys have concluded that parking controls in Market Place would only reduce the available parking space to the detriment of both local businesses and visitors. The cramped historic built environment means there is no available space to create an outlying car park within acceptable walking distance for shoppers or workers from outside Deddington.

58% of adult questionnaire respondents (476 people) felt that it was not possible to introduce parking controls in the centre of Deddington without detrimental consequences, while 79% (646 people) felt that the limited scope to improve parking facilities in the village centre should be a consideration in deciding whether to allow more house building.

Policy MOV2 (Parking) therefore seeks to encourage the identification of measures to discourage the use of private cars for local daytime journeys to the village centre (e.g. through encouraging walking and cycling) and to ensure that new developments have adequate off-road parking spaces to complement garage provision.

