

Ickford Parish Council – Housing Questionnaire. Completion deadline 11th August 2017.

The Parish Council distributed a questionnaire to each household in July and residents were also able to respond to the questionnaire on line through the Ickford Community website. Some households may have copied the questionnaire so that others in the household could also respond, as it was not clear if this was to be an 'individual' response or a household one. However according to the 2011 census, and therefore the latest data we have available, there are 541 residents in the Village over the age of 18, and 270 households. Total number of questionnaires received was 140 which if it were one per household would represent 52% of households' alternatively this would represent 25.9% of residents. Whichever measure is used the response is excellent and therefore can be taken to be statistically representative of the village views.

Specific responses were as follows:

Question 1 – Do you think that Ickford needs more homes? (137 Responded)

Yes	84	61.31%
No	53	38.69%
No answer	3	2.14%

Question 2 - What do you feel is an acceptable increase in housing development in Ickford over the next 15 years? (136 answered)

0 Houses	19	14%
1-25 Houses	70	51%
25-50 Houses	41	30%
50-75 Houses	0	0%
75+ House	6	4%

Comment: Whilst 38% of the respondents to Q1 above stated 'NO', this fell to 14% wanting '0' houses, in effect a recognition that whilst they may not want houses, some development may be inevitable.

An impressive 51% response supported some, but limited development in Ickford (1 – 25houses), with a further 30% supporting 25 – 50 houses.

Question 3 – What sort of housing development is needed? (124 answered)

Starter Homes	66 responses	53%
Small family homes (2-3 bed)	88	71%
Large Family homes (4-5 bed)	25	20%
Retirement/downsizer homes	45	36%
Affordable homes	64	52%

Comment: Respondents were able to answer more than one category, but the above provides a good cross section opinion of the mix and type of housing that villagers feel is needed. AVDC expects developers to provide a minimum of 30% affordable housing in the Vale, which can be a mix of housing association, shared ownership or subsidised rental.

Question 4 – Where do you believe new housing should be situated and why?

In analysing the answers to this question, some latitude has been applied. For example where a respondent said 'next to the allotments' or to the 'north of the playing field' this has been interpreted as 'Turnfields'. Similarly where a response said 'Worminghall Road' this was taken as land behind 42 Worminghall Road as distinct from the Pound Green Field Site.

In terms of the preferred location:

Turnfields	80	63.5%
Infill within the village	11	8.73%
Land behind 42 Worminghall Road	10	7.9%
(of whom 4 responses quoted this site as second choice after Turnfields, but not their preferred site)		
Pound Green Field	5	4%
Within the Village envelope	2	1.6%
Little Ickford side of Village	1	
Land behind the Post Office	1	

Concerns were expressed about sewerage, drainage, traffic, public transport needs, preserving the historic bridges etc.

Typical comments were as follows:

The Land off Turnfields site is the most suitable of the 3 proposals. This is the site that has been proposed for many years ; is most central to the village and has long been expected to eventually be built on after the development of Golders Close and Turnfields in the 1980s. It is closest to the recreation grounds in the centre of the village which provides safe off-road access to the School for young children living in the potential new housing. of the 3 sites it is the one that could be most closely described as infill.

I believe the Turnfields site is the best solution. All villages must take their share of providing further housing but this must not be at the cost of the people already living there and development must not lose sight of the historical position of our ancient village. Our village was once two small hamlets which have been joined together, there are a number of historically important houses in the village, and there have been a number of new housing developments over the years. Over development has occurred in many villages to the detriment of the village, we must preserve to the best of our ability these villages. To allow a development adjacent to historical houses would forever distort the balance in the village. It is also inconceivable that anyone would allow a development outside the boundaries of the village, which would change the nature of the small rural village for ever..... The additional 150 plus houses would put a strain on our already over worked drainage system. The occupants of Church Lane already have to have their storm drains emptied throughout the year to prevent their houses being flooded. Flooding in our village is a real problem, ask anyone to share their photos with you. In addition there would be a huge increase in the amount of traffic and heavy vehicles which would have to use the bridges in Ickford or Shabbington. Lastly the school is already over subscribed. There would not be enough places for the occupants of a large development. We have a limited bus route to Thame and neighbouring places.

The projected development at the end of Turnfields would enclose the recreation ground making it more of a central part of the village. The proposed development (Cala) would not impinge on the village but it would create far too much development if that and the Turnfields development went ahead. The projected one on Pound field? Is too far outside the village as it stand at the moment.

Question 5 – What concerns do you have about potential housing developments in the village?

(132 responses)

In analysing this question we looked at the number of specific references there were to issues within the village, which totalled 430.

Infrastructure and Services

This accounted for the highest level of comment with 175 responses (41% of total). By far the largest level of concern overall was with respect to sewerage (50), drainage (43) and flooding (59)- so combined **87%** of the comments in this category. It is not possible to properly separate these out (flooding for example also included the noise of pumping to alleviate the issue) – as one can affect the other, and all causally linked, but they are the villagers’ chief concerns.

Other concerns in this category were street lighting and light pollution (5), general infrastructure issues (5), access to health and medical facilities (5).

Traffic, Road infrastructure and issues

There were 141 comments relative to this section (33%), spread across a broad range of issues. A general concern of traffic and the impact on an overall increase and congestion generally was expressed by 59 (42%), with 25 comments on the lack of parking for the school (18%), poor road conditions (10%), noise and pollution (8%). Other areas that were mentioned include emergency access, child safety, condition of bridges, lack of public transport, vibration from heavy traffic, speeding and no cycle paths.

Change of Character of Ickford

This had 68 comments (16% of the total comments)) of which 51 (75%) were to do with the potential change of the character of the village. Ecology and wildlife received 9 comments, security and crime 3, coalescence 4, and loss of privacy 1.

School capacity

Parking for the school was included in the traffic section above, but there were 36 responses (8%) raising specific concerns that the capacity of the school would not be sufficient to cope with an increase in the population of the village if housing went ahead.

Comment: if the planning permission for the school is granted and proceeds, then the capacity will increase by around 5 pupils a year for the next 7 years i.e. by 35 pupils. Subject to the number of houses permitted this is likely to be a major issue.

Question 6 – What improvements to infrastructure would you like to see should the proposed developments go ahead? (120 responded).

It is perhaps not surprising here that some of the answers reflected those given in Q5 above. Again we separated comments into the broad categories of Infrastructure, Roads and Traffic, School and Other.

Infrastructure and Services.

There were 184 comments (54% of total comments in this section). Drainage, Sewerage and flooding (60,50 & 43 respectively) accounted for an overwhelming **83%** of the feedback here, demonstrating yet again residents concern over the urgent need to have these issues addressed in the village once and for all, and before any further development might exacerbate these issues. It very closely mirrors the results from Question 5. In addition there were 14 comments on the need to bring Gas into the village, 7 for improving electricity supply and removing the erratic nature of the supply, 6 for improving internet/broadband and 4 for having local access to a medical facility.

Traffic, Road infrastructure and issues

Under this broad heading there were 117 comments (34% of comments under Q6).

The largest areas of concern here were as follows:

- | | |
|--|----|
| • Need for better road conditions/improvements | 32 |
| • Improved bus service | 29 |
| • Improved Car parking (school/shop) | 25 |
| • Need for speed humps/traffic calming | 8 |
| • Street lighting | 7* |
| • Improved footpaths/cycle ways | 5 |
| • Protect Bridges | 4 |
| • Improve/provide pavements | 3 |
| • General (unspecified traffic comment) | 3 |
| • Restrict HGV in village | 1 |

*the comment on street lighting reflected mixed opinion with 4 being in favour of more/better lighting and 3 being against.

School capacity

There were 14 comments about the school (4%) all of which were basically expressing concern that the school would not have the capacity to cope with the potential increase in entrants due to the proposed housing, and that as a consequence children living in the village might need to be displaced to schools outside unless priority were given to resident families ahead of those in neighbouring villages.

Village Improvements

There were 25 comments on possible improvement ideas for the village. The largest number (7) were for a new/larger shop; with others being creating a social hub (3), improved facilities for the young and youths (3), improved recreational facilities (2), improved tree planting/nature reserve (3) indoor swimming pool for school/residents (1) and one each for the following – old peoples home, a second pub, bike house, bigger village hall or bigger village meeting venue, affordable homes should be for residents only(1).

A possibility could be to consider a development for the village that combines within it some of the above, as well as providing a GP surgery, even if not on a full time basis.

24th August 2017.