

Neighbourhood Plan Feedback

PART I: CONSTRUCTIVE & CRITICAL COMMENTS

Table of Contents

3. Housing

6. Housing provision for local people

7. Affordable & social housing

8. Small households

9. Infrastructure

11. Business & commerce

13. Young people

17. Young families

18. Environment

20. Green spaces

22. Dark skies

23. Transport

24. Public transport

25. Cycle paths

26. Road safety

27. Planning enforcement

29. NP document

32. Public engagement

34. Misc comments

39. Non-specific critical comments

42. Ad hominem criticism

Housing

- ▶ A balanced and sensible proportion of new house builds are required.
- ▶ Pressure from government to build new homes in places like Stonesfield is inevitable. Whatever one thinks about immigration it is running at about 300,000 p.a. and these people have to go somewhere. In relation to No 6 it is unfortunate that builders prefer expensive housing to low-cost as the profit per unit is larger.
- ▶ I think it is too restrictive of any development beyond the current perimeter of the village.
- ▶ They say we don't need more housing but they are wrong, the community trust have loads of people who need houses or better houses. Even if you live here already you might want a better place or even somewhere to buy but there's nowhere available and it's too expensive.

Housing (cont)

- ▶ No more housing to be built including no more affordable housing developments as those already built have not been sold and have been on the market for years.
- ▶ I would like to see a statement to endorse the need to limit housing developments. Future housing attracts more cars, more carbon, more pollution, undermining WODCs aim to be carbon neutral by 2030. The two aspirations of development and sustainability appear incompatible.
- ▶ The village should use its status of being in the Cotswolds AONB to restrict development to a minimum, I do not wish to see Stonesfield turned into another Freeland, Long Hanborough or what North Leigh will soon become.
- ▶ Stonesfield has had an enormous amount of housing development in the last years. On the whole the developers of the new houses have sadly neither attempted nor achieved to build dwellings that fit in with the character of the village. We have had enough.
- ▶ No more building in the area is best.

Housing (cont)

- ▶ Any new housing should be appropriate to a village in Cotswolds AONB, eg Sunderland Close is appropriate in design and build, Charity Farm looks like an estate from Bicester or Banbury dumped on the end of our village, little or no thought went into it except I expect how much profit could be made from the site.
- ▶ A Rural Exception Site for a limited quantity of affordable housing could ideally have been included but I recognise this depended on landowners coming forward to provide land for this at a price making it economically viable and they have not done so.
- ▶ While protecting the rural character is important, it can inadvertently limit necessary development. Resistance to building new homes might preserve views but fail to address housing shortages.
- ▶ Any new housing must have solar panels on the roof.
- ▶ The Neighbourhood plan needs to emphasis more strongly that any new development must be focussed on providing suitable dwellings for [...] elderly persons.

Housing provision for local people

- ▶ More housing opportunities for local people.
- ▶ More housing for local people.
- ▶ It's clear that further housing is needed for local families, but this plan does not address that need adequately.
- ▶ It is crucial that we consider the needs of the entire community, particularly local families who are at risk of being displaced.
- ▶ It's essential that we strike a balance between accommodating future housing needs and ensuring that our local families are not priced out of the village. By focusing on solutions that allow residents to remain in their community, we can preserve the character and sense of belonging that makes our village special. A fair and reasonable approach to housing development is key to maintaining this balance and supporting those who have deep ties to the area. This draft clearly does not consider this.
- ▶ I am uneasy about the focus on providing housing for existing residents and their families which appears to be at the exclusion of newcomers. I came to the village in 1995 as a complete outsider and have made it my (very happy) home. I believe that my family members have all contributed significantly to the community and village life, and would be keen that the plan is not seen as a deterrent to newcomers. As we see average occupants per household decrease nationally, we will need more households to maintain the heart of the community and its essential services (eg pub, school shop), as well as to inject some new blood, new ideas and enthusiasm. Thank you.

Affordable & social housing

- ▶ More affordable homes.
- ▶ Any new housing should be focused on genuinely affordable smaller properties
- ▶ Allow for some development [...] at a more affordable price! No more big £1,000,000 + houses.
- ▶ Housing - should be more affordable and no more million pound houses.
- ▶ If it's possible provision of small numbers of social housing units and real low cost housing.
- ▶ Emphasis on providing more affordable houses is important but can't be tackle in a Neighbourhood plan alone
- ▶ Affordable housing if required not just to house the poor or just because they live in Stonesfield with parents, should not be a right of passage
- ▶ Too much of a focus on social housing. A proportionate number of houses of 3 and 4 bedrooms to encourage young families are required for the school and pre-school. There is also a problem in the village with drug smoking outside of the shop, unfortunately this comes from individuals living in social housing.
- ▶ The affordable housing is a disgrace in that that which has already been built for this purpose has indeed not even sold after years on the market.
- ▶ Not all local residents require low cost housing & again this has not been addressed.

Small households

- ▶ The Neighbourhood plan needs to emphasis more strongly that any new development must be focussed on providing suitable dwellings for [...] smaller households
- ▶ Allow for some development, smaller houses & bungalows.
- ▶ I query whether it is totally clear that although large developments are not welcome, small - not just social housing - but for downsizers and young adults to buy - would be.
- ▶ Too many small homes are being built which is destroying the rural environment and is losing its village atmosphere and quickly growing into a town. Wildlife is suffering and a refusal to more homes should be made.

Infrastructure

- ▶ Utility Infrastructure must have the necessary individual capacity (plus spare capacity) for the proposed development without affecting existing properties (whether residential or commercial) in Stonesfield.
- ▶ What are the plans to improve services such as sewerage and water supplies. The new developments in Buckland Way were supposed to have their own pumping station along the Woodstock Road but instead Pye Homes dug a huge sewage and waste water pipe straight through a scheduled monument site along the Combe (without permission!). The sewage treatment plant down near Lower Westfield Farm is too small to cope with all the extra effluent and rainwater created by new housing developments. To support new housing, these sort of services need to be upgraded first. Or they will still continue to dump untreated water into our river systems.
- ▶ Not an improvement but a question about the wording starting "A Grampian condition..." Why does it say buildings must not be OCCUPIED until the water and sewerage infrastructure is completed? Why are the buildings being BUILT before the infrastructure is completed? Coombe Road 's existing houses still don't have adequate water and sewerage infrastructure.
- ▶ Perhaps more could have been said about the deteriorating infrastructure, such as water and sewage, to reinforce the importance of how new housing developments are considered.
- ▶ A4 O1 "facilitate creation of new [facilities]" (can't see any mention of "new" in SEA1 or 2)

Infrastructure (cont)

- ▶ What about services that make the village a good place to live, like bins and potholes.
- ▶ There seems to be a noticeable one-sided approach in several areas, particularly regarding [...] facilities within the village. There doesn't appear to be a clear plan for [...] improving these amenities.
- ▶ If I just look at the policies there needs to be much more focus on actually improving the village. We have one unpleasant shop, a social club stuck in the '70s, a half decent pub, and that's it [...] Why didn't you look at what Charlbury have done? Why can't we have a nice modern community centre and gym, with a cafe.
- ▶ As we all know we are extremely fortunate to a shop, a garage, a sports and social club, the scouts, a school, a library, a church, and many other social clubs and activities, long may that continue.
- ▶ Would love a skate park

Business & commerce

- ▶ Maybe provision of small business units to encourage local businesses and startups ensuring a diverse and mixed community
- ▶ A small Enterprise Zone for new small Stonesfield based business would be welcome.
- ▶ What about jobs
- ▶ A2 “encourage growth in economic activity” In general I don't know how the plan delivers this aim. But one thought is that the policy on this SEA1 only focuses on retention of current commercial use buildings or home working facilities in new housing. Could something be added to address the possibility of supporting new commercial developments, in or on the edge of the village provided they adhere to AONB, maintain character etc, as you have done for parking in SH9? (Also, NB, one of the aims of this policy is said to be a net increase in sites for future employment but I can't see how it would be achieved). The same is true for O2 “new employment”.
- ▶ SEA2 talks primarily about maintaining current facilities or transferring them to being community run, it doesn't consider that there may be other things people want in order to fulfill the Objective. A3 O2 “more people of working age” See comments on A2 above. In addition, the housing policies limit new housing to a small number of affordable homes or infills etc, so “more people” would be marginal at best and there is nothing that would single out any particular age profile

Business & commerce (cont)

- ▶ Policy SH1 accepting housing on previously developed land sets a dangerous green light to build on land occupied by businesses. The disparity in land values means there is always a financial incentive for the owners of business land to convert it to residential despite the fact that the plan acknowledges there are not enough business premises. The plan needs to be clear and state that it will not support the building of residential premises on business land.
- ▶ Proposals for changes of use of premises currently occupied by Class E, F1 and F2 uses to other uses, including for residential uses, will not be supported unless there is firm evidence that the premises are no longer commercially viable for Class E, F1 and F2 uses, or that alternative facilities are available elsewhere in the neighbourhood area in accessible and convenient locations. This policy will not protect anything. It is extremely easy to "demonstrate" that a business premises is not viable. You get an agent to do a "marketing exercise", often at an unrealistic price, to show there is no demand. It happens all the time and is eroding the local business stock. The plan needs to be robust in its defense of business property. Please just say proposals to change the use of business premises to residential will not be supported. End of. The current wording just means the owners have to go through a small exercise to avoid the policy and get planning permission. The cost to them of doing that is compensated many times over by the uplift in value.

Young people

- ▶ More opportunities for young people
- ▶ What about young people
- ▶ It seems as though the priorities of the retired population have been given more attention, without considering the needs of the younger generation. It would be great to see more balanced planning that reflects the needs of all age groups in the community.
- ▶ Why can't we do more for kids and young people - basically if you don't play for the Strikers there's nothing.
- ▶ As a parent of teenagers, I was surprised how little there was around youth in the plan, in terms of research in to this age group (or reference to existing evidence), their future needs, and policies to support them. The word "youth" is not used once in the plan. Teenager is mentioned 5 or 6 times - in comments from the village survey (proving that the village has feedback/concerns around this area), but the plan itself does not refer to youth or teenagers - there are no policies or aspirations around youth/teenagers. I think this is a missed opportunity. "Young people" are referred to but, confusingly, in reference to people who are old enough to buy property (e.g. first time buyers). In today's terminology "Young people" are teenagers/youth, not adults old enough to have a mortgage.
- ▶ More on how to meet the needs of young people in terms of recreation and housing

Young people (continued)

- ▶ More emphasis on the lack of facilities for young people was mentioned but felt more in passing. The plan felt a little biased toward the older generation. Yes, we have a higher proportion of older people in the village but we have many young people and need to encourage more in order for the village to continue to thrive.
- ▶ Perhaps some youth provision
- ▶ I don't think younger people got a say in this at all. All the people the people I saw were older (no offense) They aren't thinking about the future, just about what they want today. It's not fair
- ▶ It is evident a lot of work has gone in to the plan to date but I don't think it is (yet) quite right for the future of the village. The future of the village is the younger folk and the plan doesn't seem to cater for them/address their needs. The plan seems to have been written from (and for) a more senior (in age) perspective.
- ▶ I think you probably need more feedback/input from those under 40 as it's a bit biased currently

Young people (continued)

- ▶ It doesn't do enough for young people and the future. I am elderly and have lived in Stonesfield a long time. But you said in the Slate this plan was about the future of the village but there is nothing in it for the younger generation. What will they do, where will they live, how will this plan make Stonesfield better for them? I don't mean to be rude as I am sure it was a lot of work, but I don't think you have thought about them enough.
- ▶ The Neighbourhood plan needs to emphasis more strongly that any new development must be focussed on providing suitable dwellings for young couples
- ▶ In my opinion, this proposal seems to be a clear attempt to restrict the development of new homes for local people, which would make it increasingly difficult for many young individuals to remain in the village.

Young people (continued)

- ▶ More on how to meet the needs of young people in terms of recreation and housing
- ▶ The plan is wholly inadequate about addressing the need for greater youth provision. It really requires a section of its own. The village is becoming increasingly old and needs more young people and families to come to the village (and existing ones to stay). This is critical for things like the future of the school and to ensure the village remains vibrant and thriving. There is far too little focus on this other than an acknowledgement of the ageing population. Specifically the provision of affordable housing only for those already in the village should be extended to include provision of affordable family housing including for people outside the village (I don't mean 4 or 5 bedroom houses). The single RES of 4-5 homes only considers the identified need at a point in time. It is disingenuous to assume that further needs won't arise over time and the plan to not make future allowances for that. This could still be caveated on where a need is clearly identified.

Young families

- ▶ I feel we need to encourage more younger people and families from outside of the village through the following: a greater number of affordable/small family residences than is possible by the plan's limited RES scheme. These areas of development shouldn't be excessive as it's important that we maintain our rural setting but an area like that proposed recently on Combe Road on the Eastwood's land would be ideal. These do not necessarily need to be shared ownership housing, a 3 bedroom house recently sold in village for c£500K had a huge volume of interest. This cannot happen without an upgrade to sewerage system.
- ▶ Does this really meet the needs of young families and bringing in new families to the village???
- ▶ There doesn't appear to be a clear plan for supporting young families or improving these amenities.
- ▶ I was left surprised that there was only a small need for lower cost housing. We need a steady influx of younger, working age families to maintain the village's vitality and stop it becoming a retirement home. The school in particular needs families coming into the village or it will shrink and die.

Environment

- ▶ More emphasis on [...] natural environment, less pollution
- ▶ I'd also like more emphasis on the national scandal that refers to the pollution of our river. During this latest dry spell, with the absence of sewage being discharged into our river, it has become clear again - minnows are evident, and now it is suitable to children and dogs to enjoy paddling in. As soon as it rains, this will all change, and it's a disgrace. We should all be furious about this issue.
- ▶ The impact of sewerage polluting the Evenlode River is well documented but the impact of intensive farming is also a factor which might be worth addressing in future plans?
- ▶ A5 O5 what are blue/green corridors - did this policy arise from the survey?
- ▶ I am outraged that the council would support a wind farm. We weren't even asked about this in the village survey. I thought the plan was supposed to represent what residents want.
- ▶ Where has the community solar/ wind energy idea come from???? First I have heard, it sounds more like an individual on the team has added this for their benefit - not something that the village has asked for ??? Not seen or heard of any mention before???

Environment (cont)

- ▶ There doesn't seem to be anything that talks to policy on sustainable energy generation, except via solar PV in new-build domestic homes. The grey box citing resident concerns (end of Section 3) includes comments about this topic (solar / wind / geothermal). If we are to become more sustainable locally (in line with West Ox targets), surely the means to accomplish this should be discussed since it will have an impact on land use and aesthetics?
- ▶ I am not in favour of a community-owned solar panel development, especially as we are likely to have the so-called Botley West solar park imposed on us, which extends to the area around Wootton. Likewise, I think a wind turbine, given the scale of these things, would constitute an eyesore wherever sited, especially as we are in an AONB.
- ▶ The state of our national rivers is shameful and the plan needs to highlight the Evenlode, hopefully put pressure on those responsible for its poor health.
- ▶ Preservation of all local woods, rural footpaths, bridle ways, rural views, and the Common must take precedent, it's part of what makes Stonesfield such an attractive place to be and live in.
- ▶ Maintaining Stonesfields beautiful countryside is a priority.

Green spaces

- ▶ There seems to be a noticeable one-sided approach in several areas, particularly regarding local green spaces.
- ▶ I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed "Local Green Space" specifically regarding the designation marked as number 2 on the map (Combe Road) [...] The area on Combe Road is barely visible for most of the year, raising the question of how it can be considered a "Local Green Space" when so few people can actually see it or have access to it ?
- ▶ Fig 9.4 identifies the local green spaces. With the exception of the school playing field and the two bits of grass at the end of Pond Hill, all the spaces are on the edge OUTSIDE the village. What the plan doesn't seem to acknowledge is the role of gardens in providing habitats and biodiversity within the village. In fact Policy SH8 goes to to support housing development in gardens!!! I could not oppose this more strongly. Gardens should be protected as important wildlife habitats within the village. Please change SH8 to protect gardens from unscrupulous developers cashing in on the residential value of the land to the detriment of the local environment.
- ▶ I have some concerns re. the allocation of green spaces. I understand that green space allocation means the space cannot be built upon. The plan also mentions rural exception sites. However, there is no allocation of space for rural exception sites within the plan. If we allocate all of the green spaces, what land/space will be available for a rural exception site (or sites) in coming years? I feel doing a call for land for a rural exception site(s) after the green spaces are allocated means the village is limiting its own availability of land to provide affordable housing for those with a link to the village in the future. I think a call for rural exception sites should be done before the allocation of green spaces.

Green spaces (cont)

- ▶ Yes we need to preserve green spaces but I have heard land owners not privy to this until very recently.
- ▶ Why doesn't the proposed green plan go all the way round Stonesfield particularly up Akeman Street route to Knot Oaks Wood.
- ▶ It seems apparent that the overall goal of the proposal is to limit additional housing in the village, which I understand and appreciate. However, the LGS in question, which are located near my property, appear to be barely visible or accessible to the public. Given this, I'm curious to understand why these areas were included as Local Green Spaces in the first place. Could you provide any insights into the reasoning behind their inclusion? I wonder whether recent planning applications or the influence of certain individuals in the village might have had an impact on this decision. If that is the case, it could suggest that the proposal may not be entirely impartial, which could potentially undermine its relevance and fairness.
- ▶ It is absolutely crucial to keep the field below the Manor from development. It is a beautiful space, important to keep the approach to the village from Combe as it is. It would be detrimental in every way to allow the field to be developed.

Dark skies

- ▶ More emphasis on dark skies
- ▶ The dark skies environment of Stonesfield could be further enhanced by including encouraging reducing artificial light pollution from individual houses which have outside lighting on all night.
- ▶ Remove the street lamp as you enter into the village as we aim for a dark skies village!
- ▶ I love the fact we have no street lighting, clear night skies are magical, all artificial lighting in the village should be kept to an absolute minimum.

Transport

- ▶ A7 O4 “reduce congestion” I did at first question the “reduction in need for car travel”, but I assume ST3 is intended to address this objective rather than public transport provision? Given the distances, I think it is a bit of stretch to think cycle paths to neighbouring settlements will make a statistically significant difference in car use and village congestion. Probably more of a health benefit. It also stood out to me that one of the aims of ST2 is “To prevent increase in traffic congestion” rather than achieve an absolute reduction and might be more realistic.
- ▶ O4 I flag this one because I don’t actually understand it...how would walking and cycling support the elderly and disabled to access public services? If they are able to, they can already walk or cycle to services in the village, but it seems unlikely they are going to walk or cycle to services outside the village? Conscious not to stereotype, but it is not the most obvious solution to access issues for these groups
- ▶ The history of Stonesfield goes back thousands of years and long before motorised vehicles and that is how it was built so trying to make it fit our current times is just impossible.
- ▶ Infrastructure is developed around cars in the UK. They are necessary in the UK especially in rural places. We need to adapt the village accordingly to cars whilst keeping people safe. Electric vehicles of the future may be more environmentally friendly.

Public transport

- ▶ In the area of transport, the lack of a bus service on a Sunday forces people to use other modes of transport affecting environmental factors and green ambitions. I think we should emphasise the need for more frequent public transport provision to Witney.
- ▶ Buses, where they go to and more importantly that they run on time, we get too many cancelled
- ▶ More buses to hospitals and Witney
- ▶ I think there should be a push for a bus service to Hanborough to link up with trains to/from Oxford. This would significantly improve commuting options by public transport. Not only would this provide a quicker access to the centre of Oxford, there are also quite a lot of employment opportunities in Hanborough itself.
- ▶ Public Transport
- ▶ "O5 "enhance public transport" ST1 focuses on new housing development bringing transport enhancements with them. But the housing policies limit new housing and there are no policies aimed at enhancing transport independent of new housing. I note the point about pavements and crossings but am not sure this is the transport service itself? The same seems to be true for O3 "enhance sustainable transport links""
- ▶ Will there be a bus to Witney
- ▶ I strongly support the need for a regular bus service.

Cycle paths

- ▶ It would be a great success if a cycle track from Stonesfield to Woodstock could be established.
- ▶ It would be great if more off-road cycling facilities could be established from the village.
- ▶ ST3: the path from Stonesfield to Charlbury. You suggest a dedicated cycling-friendly surface. This would seriously impede the use of the path by walkers - cyclists never give way to pedestrians, who are expected to leap aside. Horses and cyclists don't mix well. The path would have to be significantly widened, losing much of the charm of the woodland flora (bluebells, windflowers etc as well as trees), especially as Lady Bamford is busy creating a massive road that crosses the path and already reducing the path's appeal. How many people asked for this cycle way in the survey??
- ▶ Better transport and cycle links to support people working in Hanborough and Witney business parks and commuting to Reading and London via train via Oxford Parkway and Hanborough stations.

Road safety

- ▶ Pavement parking has become much worse in the 5 years I have lived in the village with pavements now blocked on High Street not only at school run times but around the clock. The impact of this is children and people with mobility issues walking in the road around corners. This prioritisation of vehicles over people when pavements and space more generally are already limited is a concern. I'd like to see the Neighbourhood Plan go further and faster in challenging this issue which in turn will support many of the other aims of the plan.
- ▶ Why can't we think a bit more progressively about congestion and parking
- ▶ More about the children crossing or using the footpath on Pond Hill
- ▶ Road safety
- ▶ If possible, more definite plans regarding speeding in the narrower parts of the village.
- ▶ Many parts of Stonesfield have no public footpaths where there is road traffic, in particular the Ridings, the Tewer and Pond Hill, any future plans must take into account the extra danger that pedestrians, school children, cyclists and horse riders would be exposed to by any extra road traffic.
- ▶ The plan repeatedly talks about congestion in the village. Whilst I can see that there can be some issues with parking in historic areas of the village eg The Cross I don't recognise congestion as an issue.
- ▶ Crossing for school children and making the roads safer.

Planning enforcement

- ▶ There needs to be a clear legislation/ plan to prevent property developers buying land and putting in a reasonable request for housing, to get planning passed. Then selling on the land (with planning permission) to another developer, only for the new developer to change the plan without informing the locals of their decisions. All the wild corridors etc for Buckland Way were completely ignored when Pye to over
- ▶ I don't feel there is sufficient reference to the building of new properties in the village. The objective is stated as Objective 3: To provide clarity on the conditions for future development to ensure the character of the village is, as a minimum, not harmed, while not being unduly inflexible in permitting changes which will benefit the village and those living in it. However there is a lack of control over the building approvals in some areas, where individuals seem not to follow rules respecting the AONB (such as the ever increasing building work being undertaken by Derek Hobbs in church street.). Why are some restrictions enforced and others apparently ignored? I don't feel these concerns are addressed strongly enough in the plan. this approach is not addressing the imbalance of new builds in our village. I would like this strengthened. As I type this response, further building work is happening on the land behind Church Street and Brook Lane, land that appears protected in the plan but clearly isn't.
- ▶ Given the current Government's position on development and particularly housing development the plan needs to incorporate legal address should the aims of the plan be overridden in consideration of a development planning application.

Planning enforcement (cont)

- ▶ Is there a way of insisting that approved planning applications go back for broader scrutiny than a planning officer for material changes to keep them in line with the Neighbourhood Plan? The problem as I understand it with William Buckland Way was that the original approved plan isn't what was built, does this plan fix that?
- ▶ Keeping vigilant for stealth building of houses, checking planning applications.
- ▶ Current areas, like The Glovers Yard, which maybe redeveloped need to be undertaken in keeping with local architecture and materials.
- ▶ It needs planning condition guardrails that specifically ban incremental expansion into large eyesore overdevelopment. Initial planning permission initially submitted for 1-2 bedroom properties just to get building approval, but designed to be further expanded for higher profits after approval and/or building. Removes the danger of incremental expansion tactics that have already destroyed valuable Stonesfield green spaces.

NP document

- ▶ It's a v long read and I didn't get thru all of it.
- ▶ The plan itself is a hefty document, especially when including the appendices, and I feel this is a barrier to a meaningful consultation as not many people will have the time to read and digest it.
- ▶ Make it shorter, make it easier to understand
- ▶ Make it shorter and easier to understand.
- ▶ The document is very long and hard to read. The very form of the document will disenfranchise a significant proportion of residents who have valid opinions on the future of the village. Where is the clear and concise summary that is accessible to all?
- ▶ The plan's accessibility. It's too long. Due to time constraints (working full time, busy family) I resorted to searching on key words to find reference to areas of personal interest.
- ▶ The plan is too long and I have heard from many people that they have just given up on trying to read it and provide any feedback. As a minimum it needs to include an executive summary of the key conclusions and policies. It is not a very accessible document currently.
- ▶ Make it easier to understand. It is so long and very hard to follow.

NP document (continued)

- ▶ I ticked 'read the plan' but have not read all of it. It is admirable that it is extensive but the amount of information is demanding. I wonder if some residents will have been put off by this, though the information days were helpful in making the information clear.
- ▶ Whilst I appreciate compiling everyone's views into a report of this length necessitates a substantial length report, this report was extremely long. This made it very hard to read and digest on a computer or handheld device. I expect this will mean that the number of people returning survey responses will not be representative of the views of the full community. A short executive summary with appendixes would have been a lot more accessible.
- ▶ Thank you for the work that has been done. The document is very long. This may be necessary but may have deterred people from giving feedback. Could a summary be provided for instance if less than 35% of those eligible provide feedback at this point? There may then be greater feedback and therefore a more informative review of the plan.
- ▶ The post on NextDoor said we should do this. I went to the exhibition but didn't read the plan. It was huge and sorry I just don't have time for that
- ▶ I tried to read it but gave up. Too long and didn't understand it.
- ▶ It was a big read! Yes, there is a lot of information that needs to be shared but it was a lot to wade through!

NP document (continued)

- ▶ Is page 65 intended to be blank?
- ▶ Typo on page 92.
- ▶ It's a shame it is such a lengthy document which I suspect will be daunting for many residents, leading to reduced responses and feedback.
- ▶ Stonesfield Parish Council is referred to in four different ways throughout the Plan: Stonesfield Parish Council Parish Council SPC Stonesfield PC Please can we choose one and apply consistently throughout? Also, SPC sub-groups are either a committee or a working party - we should clarify/correct this throughout the plan?
- ▶ There could be less use of acronyms such as SSI's, CTAS and so on

Public engagement

- ▶ [...]Nor has there been proper engagement with all residents to ensure a fair and inclusive approach. I strongly believe that the Neighbourhood Plan should reflect the needs and aspirations of the entire community, not just a select few. It would be greatly appreciated if more effort could be made to involve a wider range of residents in the decision-making process to ensure the plan is truly representative of the village's needs and future.
- ▶ I feel that the current draft proposal is not fair and seems to cater primarily to the needs of a small group of individuals in the village, rather than taking a broader, more inclusive approach. A proposal that only benefits a few, without addressing the needs of the wider village, does not seem like a balanced or equitable solution for our community
- ▶ More inclusive and transparent consultation processes need to be undertaken, including public workshops and iterative feedback mechanisms.

Public engagement (cont)

- ▶ The Council has presented a very narrow version of a Neighbourhood Plan and as a consequence may not align with the broader legal and regulatory context. Neighbourhood Plans are specifically designed to engage with the community and provide local policies to address their concerns. Therefore, the failure to adequately incorporate the community's feedback or to provide clear implementation policies are in my opinion grounds for a legitimate objection.
- ▶ I worry about the opportunities for resident input into the plan. Neither the village survey nor the public meetings which were just presentations and Q&A sessions, gave residents the opportunities to discuss and shape policies. This was done by a very small group of people. I acknowledge that these people have put in a huge amount of work but I am concerned that they may not be representative of the whole village.
- ▶ The report seems consequently to be over dominated by the restrictions on housing and environmental concerns in excess of what came out of the survey.
- ▶ I would have liked more open days to have been run as I couldn't make the two dates provided.

Misc comments

- ▶ Greater community support for the primary school to ensure that it is at the heart of the village community and encourage a greater intake.
- ▶ Community policing to address the local drug gangs and antisocial behaviour around the shop and playing fields which can be intimate young families
- ▶ More actions limiting AirBNB! It's going to become a big problem. The chapel opposite the shop has just been converted so that's another small and affordable house in Stonesfield gone!!!
- ▶ At the moment, I do despair over the number of road signs in the village. I feel they clutter the environment and take away something of a village feel. I suspect this might be a contentious issue though. With regard to our environment, I think it is something that should/could be taken into account. I don't know if this is what you meant by this question and I recognise that it might be a bit late in the day.
- ▶ More focus on disability access esp to dropped kerbs and access to green spaces
- ▶ What about the elderly

Misc comments (continued)

- ▶ The unattractive bollard (?) as you enter the village from the Woodstock Rd is unsightly.
- ▶ I'd be happy to pay cost value for my own printed copy in ring binder for reference
- ▶ Assuming the Plan is accepted, it will be incumbent on the Parish Council to ensure the Plan is regularly reviewed and updated to keep pace with a changing world. Reviews will be required every couple of years with potentially a major review/revision every five years. This is how you make improvements and keep the Plan relevant.
- ▶ I think it could be improved with some examples of what we are doing that fits to the plan and shows we are a forward thinking village that cares. For example: 9.5 Over the last 3 years we have planted a tree for everyone in the village 9.4.2 we are committed to planing ahead. Area B (stocky bottom) we have just completed a five year management plan for 1 acre of calciferous limestone meadow to enhance and protect it. The plan has been developed in conjunction with Wild Oxfordshire. (The plan could be referenced) I think a few examples, arguably outside the technical details of the N Plan do give movement to the plan and shows an active side to the village.

Misc comments (continued)

- ▶ Can you require an anti-corruption declaration of 'conflict of interest' in the review process from any person or entity with a personal profit motive responding negatively to this process and undermining the crucial protections in this plan? These individuals should identify themselves to explain their motivation for the feedback given.
- ▶ I'm disappointed that Parish Councils no longer oversee village plans. Am I right?
- ▶ When I was young Stonesfield was very different, it's changed a lot since then, more houses, more people, more clubs and groups. Change isn't always bad but this plan seems to scared of it.
- ▶ How you propose to protect the ANOB from greedy developers and lack of government support
- ▶ The inclusion of the word 'Development' in the Neighbourhood Development Plan set off alarm bells for me; with the emphasis perhaps on more housing; the cynic in me wonders how much of this process is a softener for future housing developments. I know this is not what the community wants but will the District or County Council have due regard for the community's wellbeing when it comes to fulfilling housing quotas handed down from the Government. The Plan will be vital in this regard.
- ▶ The school and pre-school needs to be the heartbeat of the village. Other community pillars include the churches, pub, village halls, library, social club and sports clubs.

Misc comments (continued)

- ▶ The future of our village should be shaped by a diverse group of people, reflecting the needs and desires of everyone who calls it home. I believe it's time to prioritize engagement with the under 50's to ensure a more balanced and forward-thinking approach to our village's development.
- ▶ I hope that [...] the decision-making process will prioritize the long-term sustainability and inclusiveness of the village community.
- ▶ The opportunity for future development in the village is too restricted.
- ▶ Clearer explanation of how ambitions can be funded and achieved, eg youth facilities, road safety.
- ▶ I would like to see clearer statements in the plan to show how the residents' areas of interest that you list in the document will be addressed with positive improvements eg in the areas of Renewable energy Transport and medical services New pavements and crossings with safety lighting New parking facilities, limits to on street parking and traffic in the village new youth/recreation facilities office/workshop facilities Improvements for accessibility and disabilities.
- ▶ Whilst the top priority of the plan appeared to be to meet the specific needs of the village's ageing demographic, I feel that maintaining our unique community spirit, which makes it stand out from other Cotswold villages, should have been given a higher weighting.

Misc comments (continued)

- ▶ The plan lists aims or objectives without clearly identifying how they will be achieved or delivered, as follows: AIM 1, OBJECTIVE 4 "...facilitate ALL members of the community AS FAR AS THEY WISH..." Too broadly written.
- ▶ [There needs to be] some policies with some ambition. Other places have tried to improve facilities and services for residents, just look at Charlbury. Ours just wants to stop anything from changing, as if what we have today is perfect, but it isn't. I'd like better transport, renewable energy, a doctor, safer roads and a better shop. But there's nothing going to happen on those from this plan.
- ▶ Clear delivery mechanisms for all objectives.
- ▶ Every care should be taken to preserve the size of our rural community, Stonesfield is not a town and nor does it need to be.
- ▶ Very much biased towards no development, which is good in some ways, we don't want big estates taking over, but Stonesfield does need to develop to be sustainable, business development, encouraging younger people and families. We gave a great school, shop and community pub, we could have more

Non-specific critical comments

- ▶ There seems to have been little thought given to the actual needs of the village.
- ▶ There are lots of ideas which are just not possible without major disruption and would require many thousands of pounds.
- ▶ Do a proper job of representing what people actually think
- ▶ Sorry but this was really disappointing and a huge missed opportunity to make a nice village wonderful.
- ▶ In general it focuses way too much on what it wants to prohibit rather than what it wants to promote.
- ▶ I thought it was supposed to be about making the village better for the future. There were lots of questions about this in the survey they did, but it just seems now to be about stopping housing. I don't understand that at all and don't feel it's what people want.
- ▶ I don't like the plan tbh. Basically its answer to everything is just-say-no. You can't do this, you can't have that. Some of us want things to get better not stay as rubbish as they are today.
- ▶ Little though has gone into what the village actually needs. It appears to be very biased in certain area.

Non-specific critical comments (cont)

- ▶ Talk the people who actually live here to see what they want, don't just write what u think.
- ▶ There is nothing that actually makes the village better. It just tries to block development and change.
- ▶ It seems very one sided, nimby designed no room for sustainable sensible growth which is what is needed to protect and grow the village in the right way, rather than see it dying away as only old and rich can live here.
- ▶ I feel the plan is not so much a plan (in terms of strategic and exciting ideas for the village) but more a snapshot of how the village is now - and how it should be kept exactly the same going forward.
- ▶ I feel that the current draft proposal is not fair and seems to cater primarily to the needs of a small group of individuals in the village, rather than taking a broader, more inclusive approach [...] a proposal that only benefits a few, without addressing the needs of the wider village, does not seem like a balanced or equitable solution for our community
- ▶ There is nothing in the plan worth commenting on. all it is is empty promises. The only actions you want to take is stop people building houses. You should start and really listen to what people want.

Non-specific critical comments (cont)

- ▶ The Plan needs to be revised to allow for a more balanced and sustainable approach to village development and/or improvements.
- ▶ This plan lacks any kind of ambition. No matter what the ask, it's answer is no. I don't know who they asked but that isn't what the people I know want.
- ▶ It seems like the people who wrote this have decided what they think and not listened to people in the village what we want.
- ▶ It's just for people who already have big houses and don't want their nice views spoiled, but what about the rest of us.
- ▶ Whoever wrote this so-called plan seems to think Stonesfield is perfect as it is and we shouldn't change a thing, which is just nonsense.
- ▶ If this goes through I fear for the future of the village. No one seems to care about the next generation. They just want to protect what they've got themselves today.
- ▶ The village needs to grow or die. It feels like the plan is rapping the village in aspic.
- ▶ The entirely negative focus of the plan is disheartening.
- ▶ None, poorly put together & clearly produced to benefit 1 side of the village.
- ▶ Start again.

Ad hominem

- ▶ After reviewing the draft, it is clear that it has been developed in a manner that primarily benefits a small group of residents, whose perspectives seem to represent the typical NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) view, rather than considering the broader needs of the entire village. The plan appears to be tailored to serve a minority of individuals with personal agendas, rather than addressing what is truly beneficial for the village as a whole.
- ▶ To me it appears that the usual suspects in the village who have a NIMBY approach & are only interested in preserving what they feel is important to them & not the wider village.
- ▶ This plan had been put together by the local retired nimbies who hate to see any development in the village as long as the retired have somewhere to walk their dogs with no change then all is OK. A poorly put together plan.
- ▶ This just shows how out of touch the council is...all you want to do is protect the value of your big houses and have footpaths to walk your dogs.
- ▶ The proposed areas for development are concentrated on one side of the village, and it seems that the plan has been designed in a way that avoids new developments near certain individuals' properties. This raises concerns about fairness and whether the needs of the entire community are truly being considered.

Ad hominem criticism (cont)

- ▶ I see it's the usual crowd of people trying to stop any further development for young people.
- ▶ It is my belief that this proposal has been drafted in such a way that the individuals involved may be seeking to protect the value of their own properties, rather than considering the broader needs of the community, particularly the younger generation.
- ▶ It appears that [REDACTED] is at it again with his ongoing attempt to manage the village, but this time, it seems he is hiding behind his laptop as usual, rather than engaging directly with the community. This approach only adds to the frustration many of us feel, as it lacks transparency and accountability. It's concerning that decisions about the future of our village seem to be made without proper involvement or consultation with the wider community. It would be much appreciated if more open communication and collaboration could take place, rather than relying on behind-the-scenes actions that leave residents feeling sidelined.
- ▶ The Plan must reflect genuine community input rather than advancing a pre-determined agenda of a minority campaign group.

Ad hominem criticism (cont)

- ▶ Yet again the same old village culprits have steered this in a direction to benefit themselves and not the wider village.
- ▶ This just looks like it was written to stop housing. I guess it's susto again. What gives them the right to dictate to the rest of us.
- ▶ Ghetto other people's views not just susto [...] [REDACTED] wrote the housing assessment and decided we don't need more houses and she's susto.
- ▶ Precluding [further 3-4 bedroom residential housing development for people outside the village] from the plan and effectively requiring the PC to update the plan feels like putting an unnecessary obstacle in place and reflects SUSTO's stated aversion to any development.
- ▶ This is just susto stuff. I don't know why they bothered with a village survey, they could have just written it like this 3 years. I don't know what gives them the right to dictate to the rest of us. Waste of time and money, really hope it gets kicked out.
- ▶ The dominance of SUSTO in the committee creates a perception of predetermined outcomes in the report.

Ad hominem criticism (cont)

- ▶ Also I understand the trustees of Stonesfield Community Trust have shown little willingness, let alone enthusiasm for participating in [finding a rural exception site]. As a resident of Stonesfield for several decades I am disappointed that I cannot recollect a single meeting or other measure taken by the trustees to involve the residents in the development of the objects of the trust for the benefit of the residents. This would have been an opportunity for the trustees to contribute significantly to the community through the NP but I understand they have shown no enthusiasm or even willingness to do so.