

## DEDDINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 14 ANALYSIS Part 2: Non-statutory bodies, local organisations and individuals.

### Introduction

1. This note summarises the representations made by non-statutory bodies, local organisations and individual parishioners on the Pre-Submission version of the Deddington Neighbourhood Plan (DNP) during its recent 'Regulation 14' consultation period. In each instance, the note records the NP steering group's response to the representation and whether an amendment to the DNP was considered appropriate.

A number of bodies we consulted replied but had no comment to make. These have not been included below.

### 2. Analysis

Representation	Representation Summary	Comments
Duns Tew Parish Council	Any development needs to take into account facilities and services including Health Centre which serves Duns Tew and Heyford as well as Deddington.	Noted. NP encourages developer contributions to Health Centre. Suggest that if there are any new housing development in Duns Tew, Duns Tew Parish Council likewise ask for contributions towards Deddington Health Centre.
Satin Lane Allotment Society	Concerns about allocation of DNP1 Chapmans Lane.	Acknowledged. DNP1 is no longer allocated in draft Neighbourhood Plan.
Friends of Castle Grounds	1. Castle Grounds is the "jewel of Deddington". Objects to DNP1. 2. Urges parish council to set up protective ring around Castle Grounds preventing building in perpetuity.	1. DNP1 no longer allocated. 2. Not in power of parish council.
The Rev Annie Goldthorp, vicar of Deddington	Requests that we remove all mention of the churches of St Peter & St Paul and St John the Evangelist and Old School Room from list of Community Facilities in policy DEDD11 and from list of non-designated heritage assets in Appendix.	<b>Agreed.</b> Church holdings deleted.
Deddington Charity Estates	The charity owns the Pest House Field adjoining to site DNP10 west of Banbury Road. Concerned that if site were developed it would impede access for the farmer and his livestock to Pest Hose Field.	Noted. DNP10 has not been allocated in NP and Deddington Parish Council has recommended rejection of planning application. If approved, PC would endeavour to ensure Pest House Field protected.
Deddington Housing Association (DHA)	Regrets that NP steering group has not been in direct consultation with DHA. Complains of a "lack of transparency" about what the NP means to them as charity. Requests all references to the Holly Tree Cottages and DHA be deleted.	<b>Agreed</b> to request. References deleted from list of Community Facilities in policy DEDD11 and list of non-designated heritage assets in Appendix.
Sport England	General advice stressing need for playing fields, a strategy for playing pitches and	CDC has policies for playing fields and sports facilities which parish council adheres to. The

	indoor and outdoor sport facilities and maintaining them fit for purpose.	NP encourages S106 contributions from new developments including for sports facilities.
National Highways	Welcomes policies that will: help reduce traffic; provide green infrastructure and zero carbon buildings; encourage home working thus reducing motor vehicle use.	Encouragement appreciated.
Natural England	1. Points to sources of environmental data. 2. Gives tips for improving natural environment including: new footpath through new development to link into existing rights of way; planting native trees characteristic of local area; incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.	1. Noted. 2. <b>Agreed.</b> Three suggestions listed have been incorporated in allocation and policies.
Historic England	1. Suggests we consult conservation officer and 2. provide links to generic advice about NPs and historic environment.	1. Assumed to be part of Regulation 15 process with CDC 2. Noted
Deddington Development Watch	1. Queries - what would status of allocations be if two sites with planning applications [for a total of 195 houses] currently lodged are ultimately approved? 2. Suggests we should not approve 115 houses for sake of nursery. Also nursery requirement should be stronger. 3. Policies DEDD1 and DEDD13 should be adjusted as currently in conflict concerning local businesses beyond settlement boundary. 4. Concerning bullet point 5 in DNP11, suggests eastern boundary should be included as well as northern boundary. 5. Valued landscape map needs additional arrows. 6. "Locally Listed Structures" confusing.	1. We will observe progress of applications and reconsider allocations if deemed necessary. 2. We have not approved 115 houses; we have stressed urgent need for new nursery building. 3. Acknowledged and adjustment to clarify policies made. 4. Bullet point 5 dropped on advice of CDC. 5. <b>Agreed.</b> Map redrawn. 6. <b>Agreed.</b> "Locally Listed Structures" renamed as "non-designated heritage assets".
Holly Tree Club	Disappointment expressed that Holly Tree Club not consulted. Requests all reference to Club be removed from NP.	<b>Agreed</b> to delete references to Club.
Anglian Water	1. Welcomes emphasis on retaining ditches to manage surface water. 2. Recommends including policy requiring rainwater harvesting.	1. Noted. 2. <b>Agreed.</b> Recommend inclusion.
Sarah Skinner (parishioner)	1. Pleased that allotments should be designated as Local Green Space. 2. Objects to allocation of DNP1 because visible from Castle Grounds.	1. Noted. 2. DNP1 will no longer be allocated.
Ron Turner (parishioner)	Notes Deddington's housing requirement in CDC's emerging Local Plan is 96, less	<b>Agreed.</b> NP steering group has taken new figure into account.

	completions and commitments, leaving residue of 43 homes	
Peter Mahon (parishioner)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to allocation of DNP11 north of fire station. Says development would be visible from Earls Lane and would encourage further development north of Earls Lane.</li> <li>2. Argues exit from footpath leading from housing on to Earls Lane would be hazardous.</li> <li>3. Copse to north of The Beeches was intended as buffer zone. Effect would be nullified by development surrounding it.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed housing separated from Earls Lane by hedgerow and part of Pond Field.</li> <li>2. Benefit of footpath lessening transport by car deemed to outweigh low risk to pedestrians emerging on to Earls Lane. Gate at end of path to be considered.</li> <li>3. Latest concept plan for DNP11 shows band of trees extending from north end of copse.</li> </ol>
Geoff Todd (parishioner)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Draft NP would result in overprovision of sites and dwellings.</li> <li>2. Objects to DNP1 Chapman Lane site: would provide hard edge to village and would enclose allotments.</li> <li>3. Additional views should be added to landscape section.</li> <li>4. Number of public houses detailed is inconsistent.</li> <li>5. No mention made of National Cycle Route 5. Any thoughts of linking it?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of sites and dwellings has been adjusted.</li> <li>2. DNP1 no longer allocated.</li> <li>3. Views not mentioned in Pre-Submission NP Reg 14 cannot be added at this stage. However policies map now has arrows illustrating all views listed in text.</li> <li>4. Noted and corrected.</li> <li>5. Not financially feasible to link Cycle Route 5 west of Hempton to parish other than by existing B4031.</li> </ol>
Geoff Hall (parishioner)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Congratulates NP steering group on using so little of parish funds,</li> <li>2. Queries how many Grade II* listed buildings there are in parish.</li> <li>3. Is DNP1 ranked above DNP6?</li> <li>4. Can we set percentages of different house sizes to match need?</li> <li>5. Maps not up to date, eg, omits The Swere.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. We have consistently received grants from Locality, the government sponsored agency.</li> <li>2. Six.</li> <li>3. It was in the Pre-Submission NP, but neither are now allocated.</li> <li>4. We have recently been informed (contrary to previous understanding) that it is possible, but can be tricky.</li> <li>5. Correct. We have not so far had access to more up-to-date maps.</li> </ol>
Frank Davies (parishioner)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Deddington a good community. Chief problems are lack of employment and lack of parking. Danger of becoming a dormitory suburb. Partial solution is older residents and working from home.</li> <li>2. DNP should emphasise that large developments not welcome, however smaller developments inevitable.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. Policy Dedd14 encourages working from, or at, home.</li> <li>2. Acknowledged. NP will endeavour to achieve balance between known, sometimes conflicting, wishes of community.</li> </ol>
James Privett (parishioner)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Society has changed over period of NP creation. Now it is clear that community benefits contributing to education (eg, nursery) and health are crucial for young families. Hence there should be a rethink of NP and greater tolerance of larger site/s</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Noted. Various factors have necessitated partial rethink of NP.</li> <li>2) DNP1 no longer allocated</li> </ol>

	<p>that would bring improvement in infrastructure.</p> <p>2. Opposes allocation of DNP1 citing traffic problems, surface drainage, proximity to Castle Grounds, disruption to wild life.</p>	
Josephine Davies (parishioner)	Deddington village being turned into small town. School and doctors' surgery cannot accommodate increase in population. No further building along road between Deddington and Adderbury.	Noted. NP steering group has had problems of overstretched Health Centre at the forefront of mind.
David Rogers (parishioner)	<p>1. Critical of some details of Parish Character Study.</p> <p>2. States designation of Satin Lane allotments as Local Green Space was never approved by parish council.</p>	<p>1) Acknowledged. Adjustments/ corrections made.</p> <p>2) De facto the designation of the allotments was endorsed by the parish council at its November 2022 meeting when it approved the Pre-Submission NP. To avoid confusion a specific motion on the designation was put to the December 2022 meeting of the parish council. The motion was carried unanimously and recorded in the minutes.</p>
Christopher Hall (parishioner)	<p>1. Choice of sites must be guided by minimising energy use. "The existential demand for the conservation of the planet overrides the desire to preserve untouched the local conservation area, and the preservation of distant views however cherished."</p> <p>2. If necessary school should expand to obviate need for children to be transported elsewhere.</p> <p>3. Endorses Pre-Submission Plan's allocation of sites but would have preferred DNP7 west of The Grove (largest site) which would provide space for a new school.</p> <p>4. As well as EV charging points, PVs with battery (to store solar heat) should be a requirement in all new housing.</p>	<p>1. Acknowledged imperative to alleviate climate emergency.</p> <p>2 &amp; 3. Accommodation for Deddington parish children may not be a problem at existing primary school.</p> <p>4. Suggestion about PVs with battery being explored.</p>
Deddington Parish Archive	<p>1. Suggests inclusion in Appendix of the c.1850 Faulkner Museum of Curiosities in Hudson Street as a "non-designated heritage asset". Surviving east wing of this Gothic stone-built structure now occupied by Medipill.</p> <p>2. Corrects date of Mount Pleasant in Hempton (17<sup>th</sup> century) and adds historical detail.</p>	1 & 2. Valuable information. <b>Agreed</b> it should be added to Appendix.
Annette Murphy (parishioner)	<p>1. Endorses allocation of sites.</p> <p>2. Endorses strong emphasis on retention</p>	Noted.

	of hedges etc and high quality of design and build.	
Susan Fuller Deddington Parish Clerk	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. States that all aspects of proper neighbourhood plan procedure should be followed and that the parish council should be aware in detail of how the NP steering group reached its responses to the consultation, its conclusions, its allocations, its policies, its justifications, and the evidence they were based on.</li> <li>2. Calls for a record of NP steering group engagement with stakeholders and how this has been taken into account in Submission NP.</li> <li>3. Asks for confirmation that councillors attending a recent meeting with developers were in “listening mode” rather than discussing their planning application.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Agreed.</b> Neighbourhood plan procedure is clearly laid down. The steering group follows it, advised by our planning consultant and the CDC planning officer charged with monitoring neighbourhood plans, with whom we have regular engagement. The NP is an agenda-ed item on every month’s parish council meeting with updates, discussion and votes. Relevant documents are circulated.</li> <li>2. All steering group members and parish councillors were invited to two meetings with the promoters of two sites under consideration for allocation. Minutes were distributed after the meetings.</li> <li>3. Councillors and steering group members were in listening mode in that no undertakings were made on either side. The planning application was discussed. As with any meeting with developers the aim of councillors and steering group is to uncover potential pitfalls in any proposed plan and also to secure the best offer possible for parishioners should the site in question ultimately be developed.</li> </ol>
Susan Carrdus (parishioner)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Urges to stick to plans for inviolable open spaces.</li> <li>2. Honour our only Scheduled Ancient Monument by putting a no-build area around circumference of Castle Grounds</li> <li>3. Halve/split large sites and allow the smaller numbers of houses to integrate before adding more.</li> <li>4. NP should say no to generalised housing expansion and push for small-scale site with a variety of houses.</li> <li>5. Objects to DNP1.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Agreed.</b></li> <li>2. Not within our power.</li> <li>3. Not within our power to require development to be staggered over a period of time.</li> <li>4. Noted.</li> <li>5. DNP1 is no longer allocated.</li> </ol>

### 3. Conclusions & Recommendations

The representations are generally supportive of the Deddington NP with some modifications proposed, which have been noted and taken into account. It is considered that the Plan can proceed to the Regulation 15 submission stage without further consultations.