

- **HOUSING** post-its from Thursday 21 November

H1 Should the parish of Deddington – Clifton, Deddington, Hempton – grow? If so how?

- Small developments only
- Smaller properties to encourage younger couples. But please with off-road parking
- Organic growth only – the infrastructure won't support it any other way
- Allow growth in same percentage as national or regional growth. Say 1% over 20 years
- Further housing is essential and should be allowed. If the arguments put forward recently applied to applications in the past, we would not have the Daedings, Mill Close, Windmill Street, Mackley Close, Gaveston Gardens. We need more housing.
- Only grow slowly – 5 to 10 houses per year so that we can absorb newcomers and make them welcome
- Sensible growth to maintain feeling of community and allow gentle integration of newcomers
- They should not grow nearer to each other or it will become one enormous town
- In keeping with historical growth as is fitting for a village
- Only infill
- Growth is inevitable and necessary – however, it must be managed and limited to ensure character of village is not damaged. We need to avoid a 'Bicester' style growth. Small scale development over a period of years would be ideal
- Yes, but gradually over time; the current 3-4 houses a year fits in with the village and its facilities
- The village needs to be preserved and developed slowly. But this must be in keeping with style and to promote a similar village life. Not too large.
- No!
- Absolute nightmare. All one has to do is visit Bloxham and Hook Norton. No No No
- If necessary but slowly and sustainably to preserve the unique community. No big development
- Do not mind inter-filling or small developments for all ages but would like our village to stay a village and not become a town or even a city
- Infill only
- No

- Yes, but organically and sympathetically
- Clifton needs more housing to make it a community
- Sensitive linking of Deddington to Clifton could be useful through pockets of small, good quality developments
- Clifton has no facilities and further growth is unsustainable
- Preferably not - but inevitable
- Deddington has done enough for the national building requirement – no more please!
- Doesn't need to but should play its part in 21st century needs, therefore small developments of eco housing only
- Doesn't need to grow. Slow progression
- Deddington is full – no work, too many cars – need we have growth?
- Yes, but gradually
- Question? Does it need to grow?
- Infrastructure first
- Only if any plans take appropriate account of healthcare and education provision. Should be clear requirement of developers for any significant 'estate' type developments
- Growth should not undermine the historical and natural significance of the village. Must be driven by local needs *not* developer needs
- No – think it will ruin the character of all
- Inevitable – only incrementally
- Organic (sympathetic) growth is inevitable but should be undertaken by respecting local voices and local authority views – not by national government dictat and over-riding of planning approvals for growth
- Grow within current boundaries ie infill. Up to 50 houses
- Parish should grow slowly, by 10% over 10-15 years
- Yes, but gradually and sustainably in Deddington
- Yes, but gradually – the rest of the communities cannot otherwise cope, eg school, traffic, parking
- At least 30% of all new housing should be affordable (viz for those who cannot pay market rents)

- By limited incremental growth
- Mill Close, Gaveston Gardens and Wimbourne Close didn't destroy village sustainability - and brought great new inhabitants who contribute to village life. New developments should be assessed fairly on their merits
- Minimally!
- Only slowly over time. No mass development
- It should grow but slowly and organically
- Small developments only, over time, with starter and downsize homes. No 3-storey exec houses – there are plenty already
- Slowly – over 5 – 10 years. No large-scale developments
- Little by little
- Agree
- Only with infill
- Yes - selectively
- Small infill developments of up to 10 houses. Especially bungalows. Also self-builds. A few “well designed” larger homes

H2 If there is to be new housing which type should it be?

- Affordable. Not usually an argument
- Low cost for local kids
- All types, move toward eco sustainable housing. 1. Affordable 2. Mid sized 3. Fewer executive style houses
- New houses should only be built on brownfield sites, or small sites which do not have a detrimental impact on the existing village and its facilities
- We do not need more executive housing. We should have more starter homes. More housing to let
- Mixed needs, including bungalows – sheltered accommodation
- More affordable, elderly accommodation
- Smaller houses which will then encourage people in larger ones who don't need the space to move
- Of a manageable size within the community such that increased population can be absorbed organically

- High level of young people's housing (affordable)
- Mix of all types
- Affordable housing, aimed principally at those who need family accommodation in the area for their jobs but cannot afford present prices
- More affordable house – no 3-storey town houses – developments to include parking
- More social housing, More smaller houses
- Infill housing. Small / medium dwellings. 2/3 bed semis and terraces for younger members of community to have access to housing market
- Given current mix of housing, new growth should be 90% affordable. Wimbourne Close is excellent example
- Affordable housing part of mix
- By Parish Plan. More starter homes and for elderly
- Small 2-bedroom houses built in ironstone to fit in. Flats. **Not 4 & 5 bedroom houses** bringing in more traffic and over-burdening the school and medical centre – where will all the extra water come from?
- Eco-friendly 1) using grey water 2) superior insulation 3) solar panels/pv
- No more 4, 5, and even 6 bedroom houses – but more 2 and 3 starter houses and small flats for the elderly and younger people in the village
- Yes I agree
- Affordable housing
- Some affordable + 3 / 4 bed
- Not large – increasing number of 1 / 2 person households – with off-street parking
- At least 30% affordable 2 – 3 bed homes, less executive houses
- A mixture of 'starter' homes and 3 / 4 bedroom privately owned
- Affordable. Of local stone and minimum brick. Designs that blend with existing traditional rural buildings
- Hornton stone in keeping with the village. A mix to meet needs
- Biased towards affordable and small units
- It should be a key point of any plan. Deddington needs a wide range of housing types to keep character of village
- Mixed housing with set affordable homes target

- Yes – mixed affordable, and for those wishing to trade down. Sympathetic to local vernacular architecture – not ‘go anywhere’ design
- Infill, well built buildings for older people
- Small houses but hopefully none
- No “townscape” or large estates
- Affordable houses
- A mix, housing for the elderly eg bungalows, smaller houses for young people and family housing
- Small infill developments
- Small – bungalows for the growing elderly population

H3 What is the maximum number of dwellings there should be in one development?

- 8 – 10, not 111 (85 + 26)
- 12
- 30
- About 30
- 20
- 8
- 6
- Max 6 – nothing in conservation area
- 20- 30 mixed types
- It all depends on the space – Where the proposed Banner building is expected 10 houses plenty
- Maximum # should be taken into account, counting **all** developments over the last 10 years
- 4 / 5 No estates
- Approx 5 to 10
- Difficult to say, depends on so many factors but probably no more than 10 to 15
- Growth should be gradual, proportionate and piecemeal. This would be in keeping with the ethos of the village

- 20
- Three
- 3-5
- Housing *density* is more appropriate question than a finite number
- 3
- 3
- less than ten
- 20- 30 max
- No more than 10 at one time
- Certainly not 85
- No more than 10
- 50 a year would be fine, but split into 2 or 3
- 8-10
- 3

H4 What design of building would you like to see?

- Eco with an eye on the vernacular with decent gardens
- Local stone, no brick
- Local materials and design rather than “identikit” town-style estates
- In keeping with its surroundings
- In keeping with local stone/architecture
- Local stone. Not more than two storeys – decent gardens
- In local stone, not brick
- Built in local stone and not over two storeys high
- Some bungalows for older people and detached 3 / 4 bed
- Deddington is already a mix of town houses fronting streets, small estates, sheltered housing, affordable housing, big modern executive and old historic plus cul de sacs of

6 – 10 new builds. The mix of people this attracts works well. I would like to see variety in new projects to encourage this

- Local stone only
- High energy efficiency / zero carbon housing
- Well designed that suit the village. No Hanwell Field type developments
- Hornton Stone
- Local stone
- Hornton stone. Not too high
- Local stone
- In keeping with Cotswold character
- Traditional, in keeping with surrounding houses
- All but a minority should be quality affordable housing, with aesthetic character
- Innovative, Encouraging community activity
- Aesthetically in keeping
- Complementary to village
- Similar to rest of village – brick and stone
- Give consideration to appropriate housing for people to downsize – taking into a/c the style and space still needed by occasional large family visit
- Some acknowledgement of the 21st century in building methods and materials. Deddington has buildings from six centuries, each of its time. Why not system-build affordable housing now – a sample of 10 or so on the village edge. Add colour
- We need more bungalows – not masses of extra housing, especially not in brick. With off-road parking
- More modern eco. Villages did not appear as they are overnight but over 100s of years. Houses were built from the available local materials
- Traditional Horton stone and slate – that's what CDC insist on presently!

H5 Over what time frame should new developments be built?

- 1 or 2 houses a year, if that. – will bring employment
- Slow development only. A few houses at a time. .. What's this? That only a minimum of 10 houses counts as part of a quota (whatever it is)

- Infilling and new small developments at a rate similar to national and regional trends
- No more than 10 a year
- Overall Housing Plan – Not all built at the same time. Make additional Dr and School facilities **before** too many families in! Slow feed
- Only build when infrastructure can sustain development – means everything, schools, health, road, drainage, sewers, water, power lines etc
- There have not been that many new houses in the 18 years we have been in the parish. If a development of 40 or 50 in one go is permitted I would like the village to be able to absorb it before any more
- No large development in old villages. Takes away from local history
- Over two decades
- Like in Cherwell Plan
- 3 dwellings per year
- Over 5 – 10 years. Not in one go. Let the village breathe
- Incrementally over plan period (next 18 years)
- The time frame should be governed by an annual build total. Say 2% per annum
- 20 years
- Over at least 15 years with regard to infrastructure and traffic demands
- No large developments only 'infill', it puts too much pressure on existing amenities
- Over duration of the CDC Local Plan
- Over 5 – 10 years; 10 houses each year
- Over a decade
- Never
- Over 20 years
- 5 – 10 years

H6 What's your view on affordable housing in the parish?

- Essential
- Essential – but in keeping with surroundings

- Not enough – more essential
- We need more
- More or 100% smaller houses – and NOT more 3/4/5 bedroom ‘executive homes’. Deddington should NOT become another Bloxham – a blighted village
- Necessary
- If we want young families in the village then we need it
- High proportion needed with covenants in place giving favour to local people in first place
- What’s affordable? No real definition
- Need more affordable and social housing
- Good idea
- If there is a need it should be provided
- Not necessary. Banbury and Bicester have this and are not that far away!
- There should be a mix of houses. Great villagers are also lost to us because there is a shortage of family houses – as well as shelter homes
- Essential to sustain parish
- Need for local people who grew up here and have family here
- We need some maybe – small development like on the Hempton Road for local people
- Build on west side – better facilities
- Could have a few more (maximum 10) affordable houses, only for local people
- We need a steady supply of new houses, particularly cheaper ones but not at the cost of damaging a great village. I came here 37 years ago so understand its attractiveness. But I travelled to London and Yorkshire every day/ That is inevitable with executive houses
- There should be more for local families
- More needed asap
- Only need affordable housing if there is a demand – which there needs to be a survey to find out
- Would like more affordable housing but targeted at people who have lived in the village for some time or were brought up in the village

- More needed especially for children of current and recent long-time residents
- They've got to be affordable. The new cottages in Earls Lane are on the market for £300,000
- What is position about a social housing development? – Wimbourn Close is successful
- Good to have - to ensure the even spread of socio-economic groups
- Affordable housing should be kept to a minimum
- Essential to focus on affordable housing
- Small development should be available to ensure a variety of ages and backgrounds keep the village authentic
- Yes, we need a balance to ensure the wonderful mix of Deddington life. We don't want just overpriced housing for the wealthy

H7 Do we need to carry out a new Housing Needs Survey?

- No, 2012 should be reliable
- Yes
- Surely the Housing Needs Survey does not say that all these new houses are required?
- Yes – should probably do a survey every year or every other year
- For certain
- Yes. 2012 was too ambiguous and concentrated rightly on affordable. Need to explode the myth that there is any need of executive housing
- Yes
- No
- Think of *suitable* provision for frail/elderly!
- No point in new survey if previous report last year
- Don't need a survey
- Yes
- Yes again
- No – 2012 is recent enough

H8 Do you have an opinion on Self-Build?

- No objection
- Good to do within a plan so some planning over an area. Maybe overseen and helped by manager
- Good idea
- Yes, if properly managed
- I am actively looking for a plot to build a new home on and think Deddington is a well served and active community although I presently live in Adderbury
- Good idea
- As a component of 'infilling' it is a good idea
- Good idea as long as well-designed and in keeping
- Self-build sites which facilitate self-build – Are there any such sites in the plan?
- Better to encourage small self-build plans, undertaken by locals for locals, than feather the nests of large-scale capitalist developers
- Fantastic initiative, giving people a sense of pride, achievement and real connection to their own homes. Needs wider implementation
- Nice if you can afford it
- There should be more opportunity to self build
- Should be encouraged locally as the self-builder generally will invest more into the community with their scheme
- Opportunities for self-build would be a very positive addition to village for all age groups
- Great idea

H9 Do you think there is a need for sheltered accommodation?

- Good idea
- Good idea
- We need to ask the question
- Yes – shortage of good sheltered in the area
- Yes
- It makes sense to provide additional sheltered accommodation for the elderly if this will release large houses for families – without building new ones!

- Need to ask
- No. Village not large enough to warrant it
- Accommodation for senior citizens needed
- Yes
- Me too
- Yes
- Yes
- Sheltered or single flat accommodation essential for elderly
- Still need sheltered accomm.
- Yes. More properties for the Deddington Housing Association / Alms houses
- Yes
- Yes – or bungalows for elderly
- Yes. Village environment is great for the older generations provided there are facilities ie shop, hairdresser, doctor, pharmacy and bus route, all of which, so far, Deddington has
- Need accommodation for senior citizens
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes. Definitely flats for the elderly people
- Housing (large flats) suitable for elderly
- Yes. Close to all the amenities
- Many old people in need of it
- Yes
- Yes. Deddington has a high number of over 65-year-olds in the village. There is a definite need to provide adequate accommodation for these people

H10 What do you think of solar panels on buildings?

- An eco essential in 21st century
- Don't want them in Deddington

- Don't know – is there enough sun?
- Fine if done subtly
- OK where they are inconspicuous
- They should be same colour as roof tiles and there should be more
- Done sympathetically it's good
- A nice little earner @ 50p/kwH
- An eyesore! Can't wait until technology allows roof tiles themselves to be used as panels
- Never look good. No matter how efficient
- Solar panels are one way forward
- Good idea, we've got them
- Never look good no matter how efficient
- Good for carbon footprint
- Just great. Looks are improving all the time
- Ground and air source heat pumps are far more effective
- A necessary evil
- Every new building should have them, solar energy should be among our primary future energy sources
- Solar panels ugly
- No! I agree, unless hidden from others' view
- No to solar panels
- Good – but not street-facing on traditional buildings. Should be standard on new developments
- Out of keeping and ugly
- No – I think they're OK and are effective
- Good idea – maybe not facing the street, but can be sited to face the back (garden)
- All new build should have solar panels as standard
- Not ideal for modern houses and not attractive for character houses. Should be put on commercial/warehouse-style buildings (like Windmill)

- With the new materials being developed they should be less obtrusive – Graphene? – but OK anyway
- Not a problem as long as it's not unsightly
- You are allowing plastic windows on old buildings, dustbins to be left outside. So solar panel in view!!!
- Good idea
- Not to solar panels. Offer other things
- Excellent. Should be compulsory for new builds to have solar panels and to face south for solar gain
- If cost effective / installed properly / must be part of future housing design
- Good idea
- Solar *tiles* should be on all new builds and refurbishment. More in keeping with old houses
- Fine

H 11 Should any new development be within the current boundaries of the villages or beyond?

- To prevent sprawling development to wreck this village keep within the present boundaries. Don't allow Deddington to be ruined as Bloxham has been
- This would expand the village and we do not need or want this – No big estates
- Green belt should remain that way
- Within boundary
- Within boundary
- Within the village envelope
- Depends how boundary is defined
- Where possible but not in Conservation Area
- Definitely within current boundaries and only in support of Deddington village needs – not speculative development
- Other than very small developments (? 1-2 dwellings) – new developments should be outside in order to protect the village character
- Within current boundaries
- Very selective infill eg recently completed 'terrace' houses opposite school

- Within current boundaries, not beyond
- Within
- Stay within boundary
- Agree
- There should be no development outside current boundaries. Only infill.
- No large developments. No developments beyond village boundaries
- No *large* development within or without
- Within
- Start within boundary and then consider extension
- Within only
- Within boundary
- If it can be eg infill use of large gardens. If not, consider brownfield sites on edge of villages, redundant farm buildings etc
- **No**
- Selective infilling and very small developments **only**

H 12 What criteria should be used in deciding where in the parish any new development should be?

- Small developments. Not overload facilities ie parking
- Whether a conservation area or not – build outside of conservation area – drainage capabilities – do not build on flood plains
- Lollypop lady needed (community issue)
- Observe current criteria ie conservation area
- Roads paths and infrastructure should be there before planning or building
- Fitting in with village breakdown
- Only sites which don't spoil village views or the conservation area. Must protect areas around the conservation area for future generations, showing timeless views
- Most appropriate to access infrastructure available to site Need to preserve green spaces, farm land, views and should not impact on traffic

- Impact on village centre. Traffic consequences
- There is a need for housing. Some needs to be built in this parish
- Visual effect on neighbors * Size – to fit ‘natural’ area * Traffic control and parking * Democratic input needed
- Community opinion
- Infrastructure first
- Parish can’t take any more large development
- Sight lines from Castle Grounds should be protected
- There is space within parish boundaries and current developments for new housing in Clifton – ease the pressure off Deddington – makes Clifton into more of a village? At the back of St James farm? A roundabout at the junction has already been designed and would slow traffic!
- There are no large developments – graded as @ 40/50 houses
- Suggest if allowed at all should be multiple small developments phased over several years. Retains variety. Avoids big bang growth (risk of character change) and gives time for new to blend
- Parking for two cars per house and bigger gardens. Not to be crammed in. Therefore in an area that can fulfil these requirements; v small developments of – 3-4 houses max
- Criteria should be “in keeping” by design and size. No more than 10% over 10 years
- Impact on facilities including school – attracting a mix of generations and socio-economic groups to preserve/support character of Deddington and variety of residents
- Needs of elderly (bungalows) and social housing
- Respecting local voices and local representations – formal/informal; giving primacy to “localism” (which the Tories were supposed to support) over national planning dictat
- Not on ‘greenfield’ sites – not in conservation area, unless infilling –preferably on ‘brownfield sites – where will not harm character or appearance of landscape
- Needs of residents first and foremost
- Infill only
- According to local plan
- More appropriate housing for elderly in the village, ie one-storey homes
- Take account of what is happening over the whole of the district
- Infill and not in conservation area

Alongside pic of affordable housing

- Are these “affordable”? Look at the cars