

## Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan discussion - Village Hall 4/2/17

- Ideal play area for small children behind the village hall
- Need larger play area for youngsters to 'kick a ball'. At present can only use roads – there will be a serious accident as cars speed through the village and down the avenue
- Need starter homes, affordable, to keep younger families in the village.
- Transport links to Wheatley to be able to access bus to Oxford.
- Keep village as a small village by respecting village footprint.
- Bungalows. Older people may want to stay in the village but have no choice in new developments for spacious living. Already bungalows – what about low rise eg 2 storey flats
- Based on housing already allocated, I feel 2-4 more family houses are all that is needed.
- Play areas in a small village surrounded by countryside, walks, airfield etc, is unnecessary and expensive in terms of insurance, maintenance and policing. Most houses have gardens and Village Hall used for family events/meetings
- 1<sup>st</sup> time buyers soon turn into those needed family accommodation and must be insisted on in plan.
- I hope the village roads can be repaired and enlarged in some of the corner sites. It's too narrow for people to walk.
- People who live in Wernal by and large live here because they enjoy village life so to expand the village would be to take away the benefits of living in a small village, so keep to village limits.
- In order to keep the village heart – no infill.
- Worminghall will turn into a town suburb in character if all green spaces are built up
- No more houses please
- Why can't the area behind the Village Hall be used as a play area – safe and enclosed.
- Play area by the Village Hall would be ideal
- Need more usable space behind Village Hall eg Fete, play area etc
- Another 60 houses+ proposed on top of the 15 already with planning would overwhelm the village still no extra facilities. (village grows by 30%)
- Buy the pub, utilise the garden as a play area. Totally agree
- Really good presentation of facts and figures from questionnaires. Balance development in keeping with the village would be welcomed.
- Sell the Village Hall, buy the pub (? + crowdfunding) for community/social centre with space for playground etc.
- Housing estates belong outside the village
- Extending the village requires extending infrastructure to support village life. We have already lost the shop, playgroup, and now have a reduced bus service. The school is pretty full so how are we going to support all these new people?
- Site 12 and opposite area could have road widened and small affordable houses built along.

- We appear to have already fulfilled the quota of new housing now with the 2 proposed sites – until 2033.
- I would like to see the character of the village maintained with no more changes
- The survey shows that very few people living in the village actually need a house. 15 new houses approved should more than fulfil the requirement of the people living in the village till 2033.
- Crikey – that’s a huge increase. . In my opinion this is going to put huge pressure on the village and surrounding villages. We have no shop, doctors and the schools could not cope with the increase.
- With houses already approved, there should be no further development at all

### **Site Reference 1 (above the Avenue)**

- This site would create too much traffic in The Avenue. The houses are unnecessary just to get a play area. We do not need housing estates!
- No
- Too big and who is paying for the upkeep and policing of play area?
- Access from Ickford Road would be essential. No more traffic on the Avenue please. Surely the 30 MPH sign could be extended to solve this
- Access problems would create dangerous situations, top of Avenue too narrow, heavy traffic makes houses move at the moment.
- No, too big
- No
- Why not access via Ickford Road and reduce speed issues in the village
- No – too much traffic down The Avenue – this is a very narrow road as it is and it’s extremely dangerous coming into the Avenue from the Clifden Road as it is.
- Yes, Good site. With play area and green space
- No please. It will destroy green area. The entrance into The Avenue is already dangerous.
- I don’t feel that the footprint of the village should be increased. Please keep it as it is
- I agree with the green space and play area. Fitting in the 15/20 more houses would be overkill
- This site would create too much traffic on The Avenue. 15 -20 houses unnecessary just to get a play area.
- Bottom of Avenue on to Clifden Road - dangerous.
- Enough new houses in village with 15 extra houses passed
- Yes, could be a nice addition to village if designed and build well
- No, from the plan it looks like one house is being knocked down for access? Why knock down a house? Access from Ickford Road would be dangerous so the situation??
- No, village footprint infringed
- Inappropriate because The Avenue could not cope with the extra traffic, too close to a 60 mph speed limit, too many houses in that location, extension of settlement boundary, field floods. Not favoured in 2014

## Site 2 The Avenue

- No
- No
- No – ridiculous
- Small affordable houses? How many?
- Yes
- No
- No – green space
- Road frontage
- Now more access from The Avenue
- Yes, classic infill ribbon development along The Avenue that we've seen many times before
- No, pond here? Drainage and the impact on flooding down The Avenue (which already happens so this would exacerbate that)
- Yes ,if as infill
- What about the ducks?
- No
- Too small to be sustainable
- Yes - True infill

## Site 3 –Clifden Road

- No
- No
- Possible if numbers kept to 3 affordable houses
- Sites 3 & 4 should be dealt with as 1 area. Access should not be from The Avenue
- Yes ( as above) Access should not be from The Avenue
- No
- Yes – infill
- No – green space
- Yes, classic infill close to the road but needs safe access
- No, green space
- Yes, if as infill
- Yes
- Not easily accessible.
- Favoured in 2014
- Yes , true infill

#### Site 4

- No
- No
- No- corner access too dangerous
- Sites 3&4 should be combined. No access from the Avenue please
- Yes ( as above) Access from Clifden Road
- Yes
- No
- Yes infill
- No – green space
- Yes – infill
- Yes
- OK – classic infill close to the road but needs safe access.
- No, access would be dangerous
- No
- Yes
- Not easily accessible.
- Favoured in 2014
- Yes, true infill

#### Site 5 - off Clifden Road

- Devastated that this has already been approved by AVDC. This lovely piece of green pasture, featured in the “Village Plan” as a lovely view through to the Almshouses for walkers to enjoy!
- Crazy to squeeze in a back fill housing estate into this green space in the village used by residents as well as animals..... I agree!
- Ok – no more
- Accept the 12 but no more, they should be first time buyer homes
- No
- No
- Yes – accept to 12
- No – keep green space within the heart of the village
- No
- No – but too late
- Located in core of village, safe access from Clifden Road. Similar to Silvermead in configuration – acceptable site
- Permission granted already. If it falls through there are better sites.
- Not favoured in 2014

## Site 6 Off Clifden Road

- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- No
- Yes – central of village. Good access from Clifden Road
- Yes
- No –keep green space within the village
- No – same as 7. Too remote from road and should be retained as central green park area. Flood risk too
- No – green space needed in the village
- No
- No! Lets not lose any more green patches which make Worminghall a pretty rural village
- No
- Inaccessible. Site 6 encroaches on well used footpath.

## Site 7 - Off Clifden Road

- No
- No
- A barn conversion?? No! House masquerading as a barn more like.
- No
- Yes
- No
- Yes – central to the village. Houses on 3 sides. Good access from Clifden Road
- No – nice central green space like a park area. Too remote from road for houses
- Flood risk too
- No – green space in the body of the village prevents us living in a completely built up area
- No
- No. Leave our green spaces for the future generation to enjoy. Once gone, there is no turning back
- No
- Inaccessible.

### Site 8 - Old Sewage Works

- No
- No
- Not another estate!! No
- Safe access for pedestrians to pub still the key issue for me
- Could be a mix of housing on the only brown field site, would include widening the road from the pub to corner of Clifden Road and footpath improvements.
- No
- Proposed before and opposed by Parish Council/rejected by AVDC. Still significant access issues
- Yes
- Same comment as 9- too far from road and in green corner of village. Not good site
- No – access issues. Beyond village footprint.
- No. Village footprint infringed
- No – Let's enjoy some green space to walk through
- Isolated from rest of village
- 

### Site 9 Past the pub.

- This area beyond the pub should be the direction the village expands the perimeter
- No
- No
- I don't believe it! No
- Perhaps if site 8 goes ahead, but access safety is critical.
- Ideal green space could have the ???? made bigger
- No
- Too far from road in green corner of village – not good
- No, again beyond the village footprint and where is the access to this?
- No – village foot print infringed
- No
- No
- Extension of settlement boundary. Does offer green space or play area. But encroaches on footpath
- Favoured in 2014

## Site 10/11 Chicken Farm

- This area should be the direction for the village to develop. Room for play space too
- OK to 3 but no more
- No to all houses
- Access to site and traffic /safety issues. 17 houses = 30+more cars
- No
- Possible if safe access from Waterperry Road can be designed
- If in future the need was great enough, this would be the only acceptable site of larger numbers of houses
- Too big
- No thank you. We are still asking for a review of the recent decision that we were denied access to. So can we get a judicial review as the process was flawed.
- It is dangerous as no highway access
- Yes please. Ideal for a football field and new houses if required.
- Yes please
- Yes – affects less residents
- Nature progression for village and close to road
- Acceptable site
- No – village footprint infringed
- No - safety issues with access
- Yes – this area could provide a small estate which would not encroach on other residents and could expand behind the chicken farm, where there are already 3 houses approved.
- Yes
- This area would be idea for a larger development preserving the village character. The road could be widened and preserved to improve safety and traffic flow. It is also large enough for a large play area including a football field.
- Best location. Links with rest of village, large enough to offer green space and play area, could revive pub, mix of affordable and family homes. Permission already granted for 3. Access already will need redesign because of permission.
- If site 5 falls through, it would be ideal. But given site 5, I wonder whether village would agree 20 homes on this site in total.
- Favoured in 2014
- 20 houses here together with the 15 recently approved may just provide the support and interest needed to maintain the pub, church and village hall which the vast majority of residents believe are community assets.
- This location would be ok so long as the access issues are resolved.
- As 3 new houses already, it makes sense to fully develop this area in one go – also will provide play area/green area.

### Site 12 – next to Kings Close

- No
- No to all houses
- No! Far too far from the village
- No
- Yes
- No, we have already challenged this. The same arguments hold. Absolutely no. Dangerous and no access
- No – village footprint infringed
- Been proposed before – rejected by both parish council and AVDC. Safety and traffic/access issues. No footpaths/lighting
- Please no! Too dangerous for younger families and children.
- Access could present problems
- OK, natural ribbon development along road.
- Been proposed before and turned down due to dangerous access. Children living in this proposed development would be perpetually at risk of being involved in RTAs. Therefore No
- On wrong side of Clifden Road for further development
- 

### Site 13 - Near Court Farm

- No
- No more houses needed
- No – even further from the village
- No – would destroy an enjoyable footpath walk
- No – nice to have green space around church
- As above
- No
- No
- No - would destroy the footpath
- No infill – especially as it is green space that can be enjoyed by all at the moment
- No really infill – horse paddock and footpath – close to church.
- Isolated – not a good housing site – unacceptable
- No – not infill and remote from core of the village
- No – village footprint infringed
- No – would spoil walks
- No – would ruin walking area
- Yes –
- No – worst of all sites. No access, isolated, would destroy footpath and views. NO details given
- Not favoured in 2014
- No direct link to the roads and too isolated