

Ickford Housing Questionnaire - Results

Question 1 – Do you think that Ickford needs more homes? (137 answered)		
Yes	84	61.31%
No	53	38.69%

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	14.00%
1-25 houses	70	51.00%
25-50 houses	41	30.00%
50-75 houses	0	0.00%
75+ houses	6	4.00%

Question 3 – What sort of housing development is needed? (124 answered)	
Starter Homes	66
Small family homes (2-3 bed)	88
Large family homes (4-5 bed)	25
Retirement/downsizer homes	45
Affordable homes	64

Other:-

14

None (2)

A mixture of above (6)

Manor Houses (1)

Low cost rental (2)

NO buy to let (1)

Consider ones that can be held accountable for future infrastructure failures (1)

Affordable homes only work if price is fixed so first beneficiaries cant sell at market price and can only sell on at affordable price to others who need an affordable home. Otherwise they are utterly pointless. (1)

Question 4 - Where do you believe new housing should be situated and why? (126 answered)

1	Within the village envelope, incl. large garden projects. Fields behind P.O.
2	Turn fields because this is central to the village near the park and the land is currently unused and not maintained
3	We have new homes going up in Turnfields - we shouldn't have any more
4	In the area designated suitable at Turnfields 1-25 houses only though. The land (Pound Ground Field) already has planning permission ONLY for 6 stable blocks as part of a FAMILY (the owner) development. Suggest they stick with what they have asked for and build stables! rather than use this as a ploy!
5	Where this is adequate sewerage, water, traffic services would be increased to cope with extra demand
6	Not off Worminghall Road as insufficient access. Increased traffic flow to family garden at the local pub No public footpath on that side of the road Not Pound Ground Field as this leaves "open land" for future development i.e. extends the village Turnfields is the best location as close to family amenities (playground, shop, school). Infrastructure could easily be enhanced (new access via Turnfields / Sheldon Road) to make 1 way system. Most efficient management of increased traffic. Ground is not currently farmed or utilised.
7	Turnfields as currently proposed limited to 35 houses
8	Turnfields
9	Turnfields site only as there is already an access road
10	In all honesty I don't believe they are needed. It would be an absolute shame to build on such beautiful land and I do worry about the local wildlife.
11	Turnfields site - access already available. Limit new building to maximum of 20-25 homes.
12	I think that the best place is near Turnfields with houses for younger village people and older peoples housing
13	Within the village boundaries. The proposed development off Turnfields is ideal. Pound Ground Field is totally unnecessary at this time and way beyond the boundaries of the village.

Q4

14	I believe the site that makes the most sense is the Turnfields one. This plot has the right access and would cause minimal disruption.
15	Support the development at Turnfields as this would be in keeping with the current layout of the village. I strongly oppose the other 2 sites off Wормinghall Road - building on these sites is not in keeping with the village layout. Taking building up to Ickford Road will lead to further applications to infill the area including Sheldon Road. Local infrastructure would not be able to support this level of development. I disagree with the the re-catagerosation of the village as a medium village given that the shop is owned by the village and the school seven the surrounding area. I agree we should take some houses but not the number allocated by the VALP.
16	I believe the council has already marked an area of the village as acceptable for development and my understanding is that the other areas awaiting planning permission have been described by the council as unsuitable for development
17	Turnfields seems most appropriate as a discreet area of no particular ecological or agricultural merit. Other sites unsuitable as they will overload the infrastructure.
18	Any infill sites and Turnfields only
19	Turnfields
20	I believe the housing should be situated on the Wормinghall Road end of the village to keep the main thoroughfare safe or parking for the school would be worse.
21	Turnfields
22	Not sure - the proposed houses off Turnfields already worry me as that spot is tranquil - my son loves to ply basketball in a safe place. However recent drain smells coming through suggests somewhere away from these problems??
23	Places with good public transport to avoid additional motor traffic Walking distance of local facilities Not on a flood plain
24	Turnfields, which was the first proposal and was always supported.
25	Land off Turnfields. This retains a village aspect with views over back fields and the recreation ground. Proposal by Land & Partners was sympathetic to a village site.
26	It would be least intrusive if the developments were at the end of the village, there is too much traffic travelling through already, especially at peak times. The land off Turnfields or the Pound Ground Field at the end of the village would cause less congestion.
27	In towns not villages

Q4

28	Land off Turnfields because it would be the most suitable site. However i do not feel that the village needs such a large development.
29	The work for VALP suggests Turnfields is the only possibility
30	Land off Turnfields because it is smaller development and proportionate to the existing village size
31	Turnfields - well within the boundaries of the village on what is effectively wasteland
32	There shouldn't be any new homes as the village doesn't have the capacity
33	Turnfields as currently only site proposed that is not agricultural.
34	No more houses needed
35	Turnfields
36	Behind Turnfields
37	Infill in village - no new large developments
38	Turnfields
39	The Turnfields site is a reasonable size and would keep the village compact. The other 2 sites are far too large. The Pound Field site would extend the village.
40	Pound Ground field - better access into it without effecting many residences
41	I feel that if any new housing should be built, that is should be in a way that is not going to make the village any bigger.
42	If any, they should be central to keep the village contained and not allowing the overall village size to become larger - the houses should be close to the amenities.
43	I understand that some villagers would like starter homes for offspring to be able to stay in the village. These would be desirable and probably should be located centrally by the playing field and close to the school.
44	In the middle of the village to stop expansion.
45	At the end of Turnfields - there is already a road with a dead end as though anticipating further development also modern housing would be in keeping with the 60's development already there
46	At the end of Turnfields - there is already a road with a dead end as though anticipating further development also modern housing would be in keeping with the 60's development already there
47	No houses.

Q4

48	Where the land is for sale down worminghall rd that backs on to Golders close
49	on the road between little Ickford and the Shabbington Rd. This would have little impact on the scale of current housing in the village
50	If this were to be undertaken, the Little Ickford side of the village is far less populated.
51	Within the village boardary not outside it
52	Not in Ickford!! Roads/ drainage/ utilities can't cope with more housing and the associated construction hgvs etc.
53	Area at back of turnfields. Smaller plot accommodating a smaller development of housing.
54	This is a difficult question as he infrastructure is not set up for any kind of expansion.
55	The identified sites could be suitable but not the number of properties that have been proposed. There must be consideration for safe access, and drainage (which is already a problem in this area).
56	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.
57	I think any site in the village will have some object I think the site by the playing fields are the most preferable I think
58	A couple of houses near to the relatively newer developments or interspersed amongst the current housing if appropriate. Conservation areas and the paths and fields between them should be preserved and inappropriate developments like the huge house at Neil's Cottage, Little Ickford, should be avoided in future.
59	The proposed Turnfields development as it is within the village envelope, and not at the edges where there could be a danger that the village 'sprawls' out of control.
60	Some kind of infill around the other side of the playing field is the only viable option I believe. I would not be in favour of infilling right up to the Worminghall / Shabbington Road as that is simply too large a footprint. These villages are already very close together and boundaries need to be carefully controlled. Once lost they are gone forever.

Q4

61	We have enough problems with the drainage and flooding it must be realised that we are living on the edge of a flood plain. We are in the position that if it rains our garden is under water even in the summer because of the high water table and has reached the back door when heavy. There are times when we are unable to flush our downstairs toilet as the water fills the bowl. Our electricity goes off as the water raises underneath our floor boards. If there are more buildings in the school, we could have more problems. When the pre-school building was put up the contractors had to ask us if they could keep a pump going all night so they could put in a tank and that was in the summer.
62	Within the village boundaries.
63	Where there is adequate drainage. Obvious reasons.
64	Land off Turnfields.
65	Land off Turnfield & east of 42 Worminghall Road - Rounds off village and visually not intrusive. Pound Ground Field - visually intrusive.
66	Either Turnfields or the land East of 42 Worminghall Road, since they will fill out the centre of the village. Not Pound Ground Field, which is outside the village centre.
67	Land off Turnfields firstly. Pound Ground field secondly.
68	On the land off Turnfields. The scheme by Land & Partners seemed to be a reasonable and modest expansion, still retaining green spaces.
69	Land off of Turnfields - site would have minimal impact on boundary of village and there is a suitable access road. If another site is needed, the land behind 42 Worminghall Road is as suitable as anywhere else.
70	Site beyond Turnfields - least affect on current housing.
71	At the end of Turnfields because it causes less intrusion of other people's property than the others. Although there will be more traffic in Turnfields & on Sheldon Road it is not as bad as extra traffic on Worminghall Road & past the school.
72	In the place that has been deemed suitable - only there.
73	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.

Q4

74	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
75	<p>The area behind Turnfields, which backs onto the playing field is an obvious area for development, with minimal impact on the broader environment.</p>
76	<p>I believe that the Land off Turnfields would provide the right number of homes in the right location as it would balance out the housing around the roads in the village.</p> <p>My second choice would be the Pound Ground Field but I think that the size of this development is too large.</p>
77	<p>The land off Turnfields. This was already designated for development and has an access road. The proposed development is about the right size for the village and looks reasonable form the plans presented to the village. It is situated between the playing field and open fields, so will not crowd the existing housing.</p> <p>This development is about the right size for Ickford. We need more smaller houses, as we already have plenty of large houses in the village, with the addition of Farm Close about 15-20 years ago.</p>
78	<p>Land off Turnfields as it will be a smaller development and won't have such an impact on the village. To build on the other two sites as well will double the size of the village nearly!</p>
79	<p>If any access should be new & not from existing roads or close.</p>
80	<p>Doesn't matter</p>
81	<p>Not necessary to build any more. The village is not struggling. The open fields and country scenery is why most of us moved here. The roads are busy enough without creating more traffic and congestion and danger.</p>

Q4

82	No where, however should it happen; it should be in line with the existing pattern of the village which is mainly linear. It should not break out into open countryside.
83	No houses, but if so, just a few & a development of up to 30 houses. Regard should be had to the bends & humped back bridges at the village hall end of Ickford. That road really cannot accommodate more traffic without an increased incidence of accidents. Worminghall Road is the sensible location.
84	Land off Turnfields to complete building within centre of village. Two other proposals encroaching on green areas around village.
85	North of Turnfields allotments - least effect on residents
86	End of Turnfields.
87	Turn fields is acceptable. The other two sites are opportunistic and nothing more than greed on the part of the land owners. They do not care if the village is overwhelmed.
88	At the end of Turnfields. Pound Ground Field.
89	Land off Turnfields, other suggested sites are rich in wildlife.
90	Turnfields proposal.
91	North of the village, as indicated on the map. The South floods easily.
92	Incorporated into existing housing estates without breaking into the countryside and with easy access to the shop and school so that vehicles are not used to get there.
93	Turn fields - it is spare land which does not overlook anyone.
94	The proposal for Turnfields/Golders Close makes sense. It surrounds the playing area for children to be safe and has less impact on the village compared to new developments.
95	The application for planning on the site off of Turnfields looks to be the best option in terms of location (away from main road, close to play area for children etc) & size.
96	Land East of 42 Worminghall Road
97	Turn fields. Best place for traffic.
98	Land off Turnfields. Land East of 42 Worminghall Road.

Q4

99	Within the present limits of the existing housing, infilling where possible. The useful aerial view of the village provided by Cala Homes shows that the most obvious site and the one least likely to impact on present residents is that at the end of Turnfields development. This would provide an acceptable number of 30 or so new homes which the existing village services could accommodate within the 15 year time frame.
100	Land off Turnfields. This would have the least impact on the character of the village.
101	Spread out, not an estate
102	In the centre so as not to extend the village boundaries too much and in a site that can cope with the extra demands on utilities - presumably in the vicinity of Turnfields.
103	Land off Turnfields as road and site allow the development to blend in with existing housing
104	End of turn fields no flooding
105	I find it difficult to state with certainty, but i do see that the areas already highlighted like north end of Turnfields are prime targets for developers. If that becomes the case then my comment below need considering and probably sensible to carry out .
106	There is only one suitable site - the land off Turnfields.
107	The proposed site for the development using the land east of 42 Worminghall Rd is a sensible option. It is adjacent to the main body of the village and does not cause the village to 'creep' along Worminghall Rd.
108	Land off Turnfields at a last resort, but ideally none in this village.
109	The site in Turnfields is a possibility - if the number of dwellings is reduced. Ickford is designated a medium village and this site will provide some dwellings that sit within the inner curtilage of the village.
110	There are 30 houses planned off Turnfields. 66 planned for east of Worminghall Road. 49 planned for Pound Green Field. I have no complaints about the Ickford School development but the other planned developments (above) will change the village dramatically in a very short time. 145 houses equals probably 600 people at the least and the village infrasturcture is not able to cope with this.
111	The end of Turnfields make more sense than other places, with two other large developments in the pipeline, the empty field left will eventually have houses to make us a small town rather than a village. More suitable housing for younger families and youth. must be affordable, not big 5 bedroom homes, Locals are now pushed out of the village due to high prices.

Q4

112	Only where there isn't existing open field spece like in filling between housing otherwise it will end up not being the countryside any more
113	The land at the end of Turnfields or the field opposite the turning into Turnfields.
114	Behind the allotments.
115	North of playing field. Keep it within the existing footprint of the village and not extending the village towards the Shabbington road. Don't want the village to sprawl towards Shabbington and Worminghall building on greenfields
116	Anywhere where it doesn't affect the landscape
117	In-fill around the edge of the village, minimising the visual impact to the village perimeter.
118	Any site chosen needs to have drainage & flood prevention measures in place before construction commences. Proposed sites on Worminghall Road have already been rejected in the draft VALP and both sites propose higher levels of housing than is in keeping with the character of the village. Proposed CALA development would result in significant and disruptive construction traffic with further deterioration in road condition. Only the 'Turnfields' site offers a suitable size and location for development.
119	Anywhere suitable
120	Turn fields road already in place young people. Needed. Older residents have since left Ickford. Different. Reasons One been. Wanted. Better transport. Bus service. Not needing to travel so far not. Using cars so much traffic
121	Not really worried about location
122	In shabingdon
123	Land off Turnfields - planned for future development, with access road already in place. Recreation area becomes centre of village and village not just a ribbon settlement.
124	Worminghall Road

Q4

<p>125</p>	<p>The HELAA (v4) has identified the site at Turnfields as being the only acceptable site in the village at the present time. It has limited impact on the historic layout of the village, nor the conservation area. The proposed site at Turnfields aligns more with existing development patterns rather than extending into the open countryside.</p> <p>Over the plan period, other windfall sites may come forward - infill sites between buildings etc. The HELAA does state that some villages do not have the capacity to meet housing requirements due to constraints. I would argue that Ickford is one such village due to historic settlement pattern, flood risk, and infrastructure.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan states at para 4.77: Additional development in the medium villages will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated that sites allocated (either in the Local Plan or neighbourhood plan) are not coming forward at the rate anticipated. Whilst there is a need for housing identified in the HELAA, the village does not have the capacity for an additional 115 houses.</p>
<p>126</p>	<p>Ickford Village should be kept as a village. New developments should be in areas that are looking to grow and have the infrastructure such as Aylesbury, Bicester or maybe Thame.</p> <p>More houses will change the look and feel of what is currently a lovely village.</p>

Q 5

Question 5 – What concerns do you have about potential housing developments in the village? (132 answered)

1	Lack of infrastructure Flooding increase due to increased run off Congestion
2	Increase in traffic Increase in numbers of people and houses changes overall nature of village over time
3	It will spoil the village- it is a nice, quiet village with more houses being built it most certainly will be spoilt.
4	Flooding - already we have had several major floods (and are on a floodplain!) No access for emergency vehicles (my son is under the heart transplant team and I am aware of others at risk) Traffic - major problems already noted regarding parking and access to village particularly around the shop and school Backed up sewerage post flooding. Safety to children and pedestrians Impact on ecology of area (wildlife, meadow flowers and bats) Impact on linear structure of village (building beyond the village boundaries blurs one village into another educing community identity)
5	New hoes do nothing to cure existing problems of water, sewerage, services etc. Roadways and bridges already in disrepair because of heavy vehicles. Access by emergency services an issue on estate roads.
6	Lack of school places Lack of drainage Street lighting
7	Overwhelming community integration Land drainage - flooding Car parking capacity and access for emergency services School capacity Transportation - public / road conditions / highway maintenance Health and medical capacity
8	Flooding and sewerage problems

Q 5

9	Flooding and bad sewerage
10	Increase in road traffic (speed is an issue too) Pressure on services; transport, drains, school, bridges, traffic Losing the sense that this is a village Decrease in safety
11	Lack of infrastructure to support more than 20-25 additional homes.
12	The village drains already can't cope with all the water where it floods. Parking is terrible and dangerous on the main road near the shop.
13	We are on a flood plain. Drainage of water Problems with sewerage
14	Drainage, flooding and increased traffic levels
15	Identity of the village with large scale development would be lost. Not in keeping with recommendations School is at capacity with current intake of pupils which has risen over the years as it is. Village served by narrow country roads - increased development would put a strain on the road network - traffic, risk accidents, noise and congestion. If all 3 sites approved it would take the village over growth target. Current drains do not cope with usage necessitating the use of tanker during periods of the year. Flooding in the village is already a problem which will increase with any additional housing.
16	Infrastructure The village has no gas supply, so 100 houses will mean 100,000 liters of heating oil will be stored on 'our island' The roads that service the village are single track with poor visibility, the roads are in very poor repair with slippage at the edges, numerous pot holes, a lack of footpaths and the bridges are not suitable for construction traffic or the proposed increase in cars (average is 2 per household so 200 cars or 400 extra crossings per day) The primary school is full and even plans to expand are for the existing pupils. I live 200m from the school but have to drive to Oakley to school my two children.
17	Road system already stretched. School traffic Extra load on already weak drainage / sewerage system

Q 5

18	Drainage, flooding, traffic increase affecting existing buildings - Ickford already suffers from flooding and drainage problems. My house shakes when traffic passes causing increasing cracks to plaster and brickwork.
19	Flooding Sewerage Infrastructure inadequate Traffic congestion
20	I live in Turnfields and like the view across the allotments and fields beyond - watching nature at its best - it would concern me about the safety of our children who currently play at leisure n Turnfields.
21	Flooding Traffic over bridges Sewerage
22	I am seriously concerned about lots more homes - we will lose beautiful green space and eventually become one town. I love our village it really shouldn't change this much. It devalues our homes in my opinion and i wouldn't want to live here. I wouldn't have even thought to view a house here if I knew all these changes were to happen. I paid for village life NOT busy city life. Close friends, village traditions and peace is why I chose here. Why change it so dramatically? Pressure on roads - little bridges, parking is a nightmare during school events. Quiet peaceful village becoming a place for children / teenagers hanging around - I bought my house for the peace and village life Pressure on school
23	Social housing - tenants causing issues (we have experienced this before!) Extra traffic on roads, which in parts are single track Parking if driveway space is not included in new builds Construction traffic on roads which are not suitable Lack of facilities such as doctor / dentist Parking at school as we already have a number of people that park down our road in morning / afternoon
24	This changes the character of the village - it is no longer a village - increasing in size by 50% we lose all those aspects i.e. green fields, community which was why we came to the village and have not moved and indeed why people have come into the village more recently.

Q 5

25	Land east of 42 Worminghall Rd - too many houses - closes in current houses. Proposal more like a small town - inappropriate. Roads - poor quality and 2/3 exits from village have a single track road - additional cars going past the school. Drainage already overwhelmed during wet periods (major flooding at least 3 times) Sewerage drainage
26	The development on the land east of Worminghall Rd would cause an already busy road to be overloaded with traffic and with limited pathways it would increase the potential of injury to pedestrians. The village school is already oversubscribed and would need to be developed. Parking outside the school at peak times is very disruptive and makes access through the village almost impossible.
27	My concerns are that it will spoil the village and will become overcrowded not at all in favour - particularly land off Turnfields.
28	The current infrastructure cannot cope with the number of houses that are currently in the village.
29	The loss of the village character will be almost certain with one of the larger developments
30	The current infrastructure cannot cope with the existing number of houses and would therefore be totally unable to cope with any further development
31	Foul drainage capacity Over development versus existing 250 homes School over subscribed already Surface water drainage
32	School already waiting list Drains Flooding Traffic Disruption fo building
33	Increase traffic and pollution and impact on natural habitats for wildlife. Flooding The ability of current drainage system to cope with increase sewerage.
34	We get flooded and have sewage coming up already
35	These developments will open the flood gates to more and more

Q 5

36	Lack of school places Traffic increase General infrastructure should remain as for a small village / local workforce
37	It changes the character of the village. We have a lot of infill. Is there a case for starter homes? Has anyone done a survey? Why have we not been asked these questions before? It seems late in the day.
38	Traffic, noise, flooding Drainage / sewerage Loss of character / history Falling property values Coalescence between villages
39	The Pound Field site would almost inevitably lead to the development of the land east of Wормinghall Road, leading to gross over development of the village.
40	All 3 developments will lead to the whole square of fields being developed. Any one of the developments will leave an access into the next field therefore potential to develop further.
41	It is going to increase traffic through the village which is already so busy, especially as the school is full and are wanting to get a few more students there. The character of the village will change as it is all about the "small village Ickford"
42	Completely alters the character of the village and further increases the traffic which is already busy! The school is full - as it services not only Ickford but the surrounding villages that do not have a school.
43	Change in character of a very enjoyable village. Would the village be able to cope with any more than 25 homes bearing in mind that fact it is on a flood plain and there would be a vehicle movement of approximately 4 vehicles per house per day?
44	Increase in traffic and noise Potential increase in crime

Q 5

45	The proposal at present - too many too soon over several sites. Overload on already straining sewerage & electricity. The water table, lack of mains gas, increased noise & traffic through the village at peak times, parking problems, poor bus service. Do not want an increase in street lighting. All the above would contribute to ruining that is a quintessential village making it a suburb. A strain on an already over subscribed school.
46	The proposal at present - too many too soon over several sites. Overload on already straining sewerage & electricity. The water table, lack of mains gas, increased noise & traffic through the village at peak times, parking problems, poor bus service. Do not want an increase in street lighting. All the above would contribute to ruining that is a quintessential village making it a suburb. A strain on an already over subscribed school.
47	No houses, flooding. Each house would require two cars for modern family living. There is no local employment.
48	Flooding, turnfields has a sewage problem already with regular blockages. With a lot of children up living up that road they wont be playing out the front of the houses as they do now with the extra traffic. Already a lot of vehicles up there parked at the weekend and out of hours. The work van want to be parked outside there homes not 100m down the road with all these van thefts going on they are there lively hoods. Construction traffic up and down Turnfields will be a nightmare for the residents
49	Too many houses crammed into every small space. Also ensure there is plenty of off road parking eg a minimum of 2 cars for a 2 bedroom property (ideally at least 3
50	Somewhere that isn't on a flood plain where the infrastructure can cope, which it doesn't currently. As there have been numerous occasions where raw sewerage has come up through the drains in Church Road.
51	Drainage & access .
52	Traffic increase
53	Traffic Over stretched services (water, sewage, primary school etc) Village will lose its character.
54	See above
55	Sustainability.
56	Over development leading to permanent damage to a historical village.

Q 5

57	Infrastructure lacking, I.e. Drainage, public transport, cycle paths (to Promote sustainable travel)
58	<p>Traffic. Drainage Sewage</p> <p>Small village do not want to be a large village. Ickford School wants to increase its size hoping that housing development will go ahead. School development additional classes will mean more traffic into Ickford, no parking. Ickford school was and should remain a small village school, and not to increase in size to attract families from Oxfordshire or Thame.</p>
59	That there would be too many larger homes and not sufficient smaller affordable homes. The total number of houses projected at the moment would make too much impact on the village and its amenities
60	I am a little concern with regard to my understanding that three sites have been identified which will mean over 100 houses This is far to many for the village taken into consideration of the flooding and sewer problem. Plus more traffic
61	<p>The assumption is that because Ickford has a school and a shop and a pub it is set up to cater for development. It is not. These amenities are village-sized by their nature and the school especially could not support a doubling of the population through the enormous developments proposed. Nor could the roads, the ancient bridge over the Thame, or the eco-system of the area, which has significant value. For example, an ecological survey stored on the AVDC website covering the plans for the Pound Green Field developments (https://publicaccess.aylesburyvalcdc.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=OKNNJPCLLEK00) states that there are no records of Great Crested Newt in the area until Shabbington. This is incorrect: we can provide a survey that records Great Crested Newt in 2012, and which identifies both the private ponds in Little Ickford and the village pond nearby as suitable habitats for GCN in 2014. Giant developments such as those proposed for Ickford would clearly be detrimental to the established ecology of the area. Flooding is part of this and is also of enormous concern. The fields around the village and the orchards in Little Ickford flood regularly. This is a water meadow area and the village has flooded often in the past and anyone who lives here knows that the village is a small island in a flood plain with a high water table. Massive development on the scale proposed would create displacement flooding affecting houses and roads. The road between Shabbington and Thame already floods regularly cutting off access to the village and driving traffic over the C17th bridge to Tiddington or out through Worminghall. This traffic would be doubled whilst at the same time the flooding would undoubtedly become worse, creating huge problems.</p>

62	<p>Increased traffic causing increased congestion in the village particularly the bridges where some sort of traffic management system would need to be constructed. The school area is very congested at the present at school drop off and collection times. It will cause delays out of Tiddington at the junction of the A418. At 8-8:30am it is currently very difficult to get on to the A418. Most developers do not allow for 2-3 cars per household. They quote one, which is wholly unrealistic. I have grave doubts that in the event of any building, that the improvement to the infrastructure - drainage and sewerage network will take place. If Thames Water deem it more financially viable to them to use more pump lorries over the vast cost of new drains & sewers in Ickford, then they will use the extra lorries - at the expense of the people on the junction of Church Road & Worminghall Road.</p>
63	<p>Affordable housing has been built twice before during my lifetime living in the village (35 years). Each time, they have gone to deserved people who need them. However, they have then sold them at market price and they are instantly no longer affordable. We then need to build more for those who need them and the pattern repeats itself. It is utterly pointless building affordable houses that do not have a fixed price and selling on means tested criteria attached. There is no housing crisis for any other type of house. Look on Right Move, there is supply. The only need is for affordable housing and the only point of building them is if they remain affordable. The village does could support another few larger houses as family housing is in big demand with the great school, that combined with affordable will be fine.</p>
64	<p>There is so much water in Ickford that more housing is going to mean there is even less areas for the water to disperse there will be more road drainage with nowhere to go. The more that gets concreted over the more problems we are having. The water doesn't go away it just gets pushed to the slightly lower houses with a disastrous outcome. We have, down Church Road bowsers to take the water away when it is raining this is a temporary fix and they can't get rid of enough. We cannot understand what on earth the Council is thinking about considering adding more concrete and houses in such a vulnerable area.</p>
65	<p>Flooding of drains/roads.</p>
66	<p>Traffic increases. Limited infrastructure to support the growth in population. Excessive expansion of school on relatively constrained site. Nothing for teenagers so they 'hang around'. School access & choice for secondary school. Medical services.</p>
67	<p>Traffic already bad, especially around school. Two small bridges in Bridge Rd are also a problem already.</p>
68	<p>Pressure on the existing failed sewer systems and river flood levels. The feeder roads into the village must raise concerns. School development - How do they propose to improve parking issues. We must be over capacity NOW!</p>
69	<p>That the infrastructure should support any increase in the population and the development work may be very disruptive.</p>
70	<p>My concerns: Increased traffic, sewerage/water - this could become overloaded. Also need to keep a shop in the village especially for older people.</p>

Q 5

71	Increased risk of flooding to the lower lying parts of the village and more traffic.
72	1. The sewerage system won't cope! Thames Water must be made to invest in the system so that our toilets/showers work in periods of wet weather. 2. Surface water drainage. We are very vulnerable to flooding and more development won't help.
73	Impact on flooding. Current infrastructure cannot cope. Loss of outlook/amenities for current housing.
74	I am concerns that there is too much at one time. A gradual increase would be more acceptable.
75	Too many are proposed: there is not sufficient infrastructure, no easy access to town, & the strain extra housing will put on drainage/sewerage will be excessive.
76	Can the existing village infrastructure cope with a rapid increase in housing? Can the school accommodate the influx of children. None of the proposals have adequately explained the potential impact on drainage and sewerage systems in the village. Ickford sits on a flood plain and is periodically flooded . The pumping station cannot cope at these times now so how will new housing impact this situation in the future? Will the new housing significantly increase traffic in the village? Not just cars, but delivery vehicles and others.
77	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.

Q 5

78	<p>There are a number of concerns: infrastructure – the road over the historic humped-back bridges over the river (bridge has a date of 1685 on it), is narrow and not designed for large construction lorries or the volume of traffic that 3 new developments would bring. The removal of the historic stone bridge in Shabbington, and its replacement with a mundane metal construction has done nothing to enhance that village. There would be an outcry if any attempt were made to 'upgrade' the river crossing in Ickford. The school is a tremendous asset for the village and wider area. Can it cope with an increase on the scale foreseen by these proposals? The head teacher clearly thinks not. I am concerned that developers would fund their proposals by building large expensive houses, rather than the starter, or affordable properties that are needed to sustain the village. The average house price in the village is way beyond the average wage. The Pound Ground area has medieval ridge and furrow which is an important part of the heritage of the village and its agricultural, working class history.</p>
79	<p>The main issue I have is with increased volumes of traffic through the village and access to the new houses. For Turnfields a second route of access should be included so that traffic can enter via the road leading from the pond to Ickford Road. This would avoid additional traffic on the difficult corner by the pond and through Turnfields. For Pound Ground Field the access to Ickford Road or the top of Worminghall Road would prevent vehicles having to travel through the village. I am also concerned about the lack of facilities for young people (especially young teenagers) and ways in which they can be kept entertained. We do not want groups of youths hanging around the bus stop and field, especially at night.</p>
80	<p>The proposal for the land east of 42 Worminghall Road is far too large and encloses the current houses, so that it will be more like living in a town than a village. The access roads are not sufficient for a large number of additional people (2 of the 3 access roads have single track bridges) moving in and out of the village, particularly at busy times and during school drop/off and pick up times. The current sewerage/water system cannot cope with the number of people who live here now. The proposed system for holding back water/effluent on this large development is very unlikely to work and will just create problems later on. We do not need additional large houses proposed on this site.</p>
81	<p>The village will lose its rural feel. We moved here as we liked the small size of the village and the community spirit that comes with this.</p>
82	<p>Impact on roads, waste water.</p>

83	Drainage problems Traffic, especially around the school Noise
84	This is just greedy property developers that have all jumped on the band wagon to make money whilst ruining the village we chose to live in.
85	Traffic increase on single tracked roads i.e. bridges & Rocky Lane. Sewage & flooding increasing. Any development on the North side of Sheldon Road would cause more water "run off" which has to go thru the village to get to the river. Most people chose to move to a small village for its character with the "village feel". We are a small village but have been classified as medium due to the amenities which have been kept going by the villagers. So we are now being penalised for doing that by being made to have 50 more houses because of the classification. Once the 50 have been allocated, property developers will continue to push for more developments to the village in the future.
86	One of the village's assets in the unique variation of houses on 1 road, e.g. Ickford Road, Little Ickford. This will be spoilt with large estates. The village facilities - roads, shop, school cannot accommodate much more growth.
87	Infrastructure to support all services. Especially sewerage, tankers used to empty sewerage & flood water now without additional housing.
88	Additional school places for primary age. Additional school buses for senior age. Increased traffic on village roads. Increased noise levels in rural area.
89	Traffic - congestion
90	The infrastructure of Ickford could not cope wit more houses. The village needs a massive upgrade in both sewer and stormwater. Also the road cannot possibly cope with the heavy plant requirements.
91	Serious drainage problems every year in Sheldon Road and Worminghall Road.
92	Even though Ickford has been classed as a medium village, it still maintains a character of a small quaint English village. Last of old English strongholds. So many villages and small towns have lost their original characters, due to the incompetence of successive governments. I know that we must move with the times, but lets not kill Ickford with building expansion that greatly exceeds the current infrastructure.

Q 5

93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Too many people too few facilities. * Schools capacity (Ickford & other villages). * Profiteering by landowners.
94	Traffic access, movement. Pressure on village school.
95	More traffic. More noise. School not big enough. More people!! Roads not able to cope. Danger to school children with more traffic. Village losing its village "feel".
96	Too many houses would change the character of our village & make it into a small town. The infrastructure cannot cope now.
97	Flooding/sewage. Impact on local amenities - school/roads/environment.
98	If too many houses are built, the impact on local resources i.e. school, GP. Primary school in Ickford is already massively over subscribed so too many new homes increase this. Drainage & sewers are already a problem in the village, so addition of houses will increase this problem.
99	Wrong & unfair to affect lives of existing villagers.
100	Too much traffic going through village. Can school accommodate?
101	Water Supply. Also flood water - drainage.
102	The present village has approx 300 homes and 550 residents. The three proposed developments together would add another 150 more, an increase of 50% on a village that has one already oversubscribed school, narrow and winding access roads and a very poor and overwhelmed sewage system. There is absolutely NO requirement for so many new houses, we are a village, not a suburb of Thame.
103	More traffic. More parking problems.
104	The totality of applications would swamp the village and totally change its character.
105	Traffic - on weak bridges - for construction and new residents
106	Ickford is a rural village not a suburban dormitory. The proposals seen so far will not add to the village in a positive way but will spoil the character of the village whilst not bringing the things it needs.

Q 5

107	Flooding risks and sewage capacity plus roads and access are limited. Poor public transport would mean increase traffic, noise and air pollution.
108	Too big
109	<p>In the case of the proposed Turnfields development, extra traffic including the construction traffic along Turnfields a residential road. with 30 plus houses proposed on Turnfields development that would increase traffic by at least 30 cars but reality up to 50plus cars. It is a real worry of residents in Turnfields that the road will become very busy with extra traffic. With the obvious extra traffic it seems No thought given to a further entrance to site from the main entrance road into Ickford. One narrow residential road already clogged with cars is expected to cope with a big increase in traffic, and with any largish development in village two entrance exits from any development should be consider.</p> <p>The road system in the village is old most in bad need of repair and exit from the village at the Little Ickford end is Narrow and badly maintained . With extra traffic generated this will only get worse, unless action taken to improve .</p> <p>The sewage and water system is not up to coping with even 30 extra houses , sewage is a problem now plus flooding may become a problem despite the planners obvious input on the flooding issues.</p>
110	Ruining character of village; development outside the curtilage; flooding; sewage and foul water removal; traffic in around and through the village; light pollution.
111	<p>The excessive housing development in the village that has been proposed will inevitably detract from the character of the village and have a negative impact on the close community feel that currently exists. I have witnessed first-hand the detrimental effects of excessive local development on the 'feel' of a local community.</p> <p>Additionally, the growth in traffic, both within the village itself that would result from the additional 2+ cars per additional household would cause considerable increase in both noise and traffic. There would also be a similar growth in the volumes of traffic on Bridge Rd and Ickford Rd,</p>

112	<p>Increased traffic on Worminghall Road, especially from access road to potential site next to the Rising Sun. Plans for 66 houses could result in a further 120 cars using already crowded and dangerous road and hazards to parents and children going to and from the school and the nursery. There is only one footpath, and this is very narrow, especially near the Rising Sun.</p> <p>School places. The school is currently unable to provide places for all children of primary age in the village, which means that some parents have to drive their children to Oakley. Even without the construction of more houses in Ickford, the school needs additional classroom space. If more houses were to be built the school would not cope.</p> <p>Flooding. Worminghall Road has frequently been flooded. Over the past few years tankers have been employed day and night to transport flood water mixed with sewage from the drain at the top of Church Road to prevent flooding of houses in Church Road. Ditches in Church Road. Many houses in Church Road and Worminghall Road have been flooded due to height of water table and overflowing of main drains which cannot cope with drainage from the present number of houses in the area. The field and car parks behind no 42 Worminghall Road flood every winter.</p>
113	<p>The layout and density of buildings will impact upon the drainage/sewerage services as well as traffic/parking/access and highway safety - particularly in Turnfields.</p> <p>The site, Pound Ground Field, proposing 49 houses is unacceptable in scale.</p> <p>Site east of 42 Worminghall Road proposals is also unacceptable in scale</p>
114	<p>I am concerned about this development in Ickford.</p> <p>The 3 planned housing developments are very large and will change Ickford from a village to a town overnight. (I am not including the School development in this).</p> <p>They will alter our community idea of being a village.</p> <p>They will affect many families re sudden loss of privacy.</p> <p>They will affect many families financially as their environment will change, they will be affected daily for years by the building works.</p> <p>They will risk all our houses re floods.</p> <p>The local roads are ancient and so narrow that they are not able to cope with more traffic, let alone lorries delivering materials.</p> <p>Ecological habitats will be destroyed and the land being suggested is home to many owls and other rare animals in this area. (I have witnessed this over 40 years).</p>
115	<p>Potential flooding, even though the survey said it was no risk, have lived here long enough to have seen plenty of flooding, with a pumping station that cannot cope and the damage to houses in Church Road.</p> <p>The traffic will increase considerably, during school days, there are so many cars parked on the road, it is becoming a hazard , particularly for buses and therefore emergency vehicles.</p>

Q 5

116	The infrastructure isn't good enough to support the current level of housing. The sewers overflow when it's raining. The roads are falling apart. The school is full and when it closes the village is completely full of cars
117	No
118	Priority should be given to people living in the village on any affordable housing that is built.
119	Increased in traffic. Effect on amenities such as school and doctors places.
120	The roads through the village are already busy and the bridges are old and not designed for lots of traffic. The traffic around the school is already a hazard at peak times There are flood risks and it would be crazy to build on land where the water drains
121	None it should be welcomed
122	Increase in traffic. Load on overflowing drainage. School capacity. Visual impact on the rural perimeter.
123	Flooding as we are in a flooding area.
124	Issues with village infrastructure especially sewage and foul water alongside the inevitable increased surface water run-off from any large scale development. Significant transport issues would need to be addressed as the current bridges in Ickford and Shabbington can barely cope with current traffic levels. Major concern with any housing development is retention of the essential character of the village.
125	Nothing it is wholly positive
126	Traffic increase School parking issues road
127	Any scale of development will overwhelm what is already a v poor infrastructure - the bridge the corner of little ickford and church lane both prone to flood and sewage overflow the expansion of school and effect on traffic utilities etc etc

Q 5

128	<p>NO NEW HOUSES SHOULD BE BUILT IN ICKFORD UNLESS MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS ARE MADE WATER DRAINAGE AND SEWERAGE DISPOSAL. THE CURRENT PUMPING STATION IS TOTALLY INADEQUATE. ICKFORD HAS HAD TOO MUCH FLOODING OVER THE LAST 30 YEARS AND LORRIES HAVE HAD TO BE CALLED OUT TO PUMP OUT BOTH WATER AND SEWAGE TO MANY TIMES</p> <p>THE PUMPING STATION CANNOT COPE NOW WHEN WE HAVE HEAVY RAIN BECAUSE ROAD DRAINS OVERFLOW, POOR ROAD DRAINAGE SYSTEM WHICH ALLOWS SURFACE WATER TO ENTER THE SEWAGE SYSTEM AND THEREFORE SPILLS OUT AND ONTO THE ROAD.</p> <p>IT HAS HAPPEND NEARLY EVERY YEAR USUALLY AFTER HEAVY RAIN AND WINTER MONTHS</p>
129	<p>Current sewerage system is hardly adequate as it is. Constructed in 1953 it was designed for a village half the size it is now. Any further development should be dependent on updating the whole draining and sewerage system.</p> <p>The potential huge increase in private vehicles. Modern housing developments fail to provide sufficient parking areas. Except for properties occupied solely by the very elderly, most properties have cars, many have 2 cars, and some 3 or more.</p>
130	<p>I have major concerns over the flooding issues. What measures will be put in place to make sure that these extra homes do not add to the existing flood problems. Also the pumping station in Church Rd cannot handle the sewage when it is flooding. The new homes would create extra traffic, Sheldon Rd is sometimes impossible to drive through now!!!!</p>

Q 5

<p>131</p>	<p>As I understand it the Government has reduced housing targets for Aylesbury Vale in recent months, and the Council have stated that percentage based targets will no longer be applied; they will instead be looking at capacity. I do not feel that Ickford has the capacity for such large scale house building proposals, without harming the intrinsic peace and quality of life in this rural settlement.</p> <p>Below are comments on the specific sites off Worminghall Road</p> <p>Pound Ground Farm: Over development. Should the Turnfields site go forward then only an additional 29 houses will be required during the life of the Local Plan to 2033. Pound Ground Farm proposes 49 dwellings. The site is open agricultural land with remnants of historic ridge and furrow. The site adjoins a listed building, the setting of which at the village edge will be severely compromised. The site will have an impact on the conservation area; which is linear in form, reflecting the historic settlement pattern in this part of the village. The proposed access will be detrimental to the rural approach to the village, requiring large visibility splays, street lighting etc. Part of the site lies within the flood plain.</p> <p>East of 42 Worminghall Road: Currently open countryside adjoining the conservation area. A number of listed buildings will be affected - as will their setting, as will a number of unlisted buildings which are still of heritage importance. Contrary to conservation area policies. Does not preserve or enhance the adjoining conservation area, but rather will destroy the linear form of historic settlement pattern. Impact in terms of traffic levels on Worminghall Road, impact on access from exiting properties on Worminghall Road, Impact of street lighting and rural outlook from properties on Worminghall Road</p> <p>School: Whilst the school is expanding, it cannot currently cater to the number of children in the village. Adding another 100 plus households will exacerbate the problem.</p>
<p>132</p>	<p>More traffic and more importantly the views that will be taken away from existing residents. If any houses were to be built near my home everything we love about our house would be ruined.</p>

Q 6

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

1	Not just applicable to Ickford, but infrastructure improvements should be made in parallel with housing development rather than long afterwards i.e. School places, Doctor surgeries, car parking facilities etc.
2	Piped gas Improved flood defences / provision
3	The proposed developments should not go ahead they will spoil the village. If it goes ahead, I may have to think of moving out of the village which I have liked since I moved in some years ago.
4	I think we should have a village EVENING meeting for all points of view to be discussed
5	Additional pumping station, drainage, classroom, speed humps, bus service & better road surfaces
6	Drainage Roads - speed humps, pot hole repairs Pavements More street lighting Better facilities for teenagers / Youth centre?
7	All of the above (except number 1)
8	Improvements to drainage
9	Increase in public transport to decrease cars on the road Drainage Stores and amenities
10	Drainage definitely needs to be improved.
11	Make a parking area on the village playing field - use of which must be obligatory for depositing of and collection of school children so to avoid potential accidents at the T-Junction of Bridge Road and Sheldon Road.
12	Improved bus routes, the school needs work.

Q 6

13	<p>Roads Street lighting Drainage system Currently no gas pipe connection Internet to the village is poor Public transport availability is limited School capacity would be severely impacted on.</p>
14	<p>BEFORE the developments: Improve the road network - developers should contribute to the upgrade of existing infrastructure Improve the bridges Explain how everyone is going to get to work, school or the shops (the answer is by car, which flies in the face of government directives on sustainable development. Bring gas to the village or explain how the housing will meet code 4 for new buildings improve the bus service or explain how schools should be accessed.</p>
15	<p>Roads / pathways Drainage Small health centre / pharmacy</p>
16	<p>If the developments other than Turnfields go ahead, i.e. 100+ homes, then all roads around Ickford should be raised above the flood level to allow continued access to the village.</p>
17	<p>The flooding problem Roads to be upgraded School parking to be regulated</p>
18	<p>Gas supply</p>

Q 6

19	<p>Bridges Roads Busses Parking Drains Flooding This village may have space for homes but no roads, recreational space. Our children need green space for healthy life not more pollution and buildings. STRONGLY OPPOSE - KEEP OUR VILLAGE!</p>
20	<p>Improved bus service Widening and resurfacing of roads towards Thame, Tiddington New and improved footpaths, cycle routes - these to be kept clear and not overgrown</p>
21	<p>If Turnfields goes ahead traffic management must be improved and issues over surface water</p>
22	<p>Improve quality of roads in / through and out of the village Sufficient parking in the development to prevent parking on road verges Improved drainage - scheme to slowly release water / sewerage impractical - better clearance of water needed out of the village.</p>
23	<p>Better management of traffic through the village. Maintenance of pathways and verges.</p>
24	<p>Surface water drainage Upgrade the sewerage system to prevent overflows of raw effluent into the roads and streams.</p>
25	<p>Drainage Sewerage Power supply Roads</p>
26	<p>Sewerage system Surface water drainage Road conditions</p>

Q 6

27	Foul drainage capacity improved School size Improve surface water drainage Review of twin bridges road
28	New drainage system Better parking arrangements around the school and village shop Better signage and restrictions for heavy vehicles using bridges
29	Better public transport / nature reserve
30	More off road parking especially for school drop-off and pick up on Sheldon Road
31	A bypass around the village
32	Better, more professionally run shop with a wider range of goods and longer opening hours. Fewer children brought into the village to school from outlying area by car each day. Too many cars parked by the school.
33	The village could probably cope with development of Turnfields, depending on extra resources for the school and a better bus service. The other sites would require major extra resources for the school and shop which would be unlikely to ever happen.
34	Turnfields and 42 Worminghall Road developments will increase traffic into and around the area - another access in would effect less people. No matter what happens now, within the next 10 years we will need more housing - so it would be better to look long term NOW. The easy development is Turnfields, but once this has been accepted, then all the fields North of it (i.e. Pound Ground & Worminghall Road) will likely gain permission. Why not make the developers put any access in from the main Ickford Road which will have less of a traffic impact on the village? Once the Turnfields development goes ahead, all the extra traffic will then have to come through the village.
35	Ditches to be cleared out
36	Mains gas, improved sewerage & surface water drainage, more reliable electricity supply. 20mph speed limit - no further street lighting
37	Mains gas, improved sewerage & surface water drainage, more reliable electricity supply. 20mph speed limit - no further street lighting

Q 6

38	All too expensive for the council at this time. There would be damage to our ancient bridges - local roads require attention.
39	Better park facilities and money available to the school
40	Improvement to the junction on the Shabbington Road (nearest to Shabbington)
41	Currently the pumping station sited on Church Road does not cope when there is excessive rainfall, leading to raw sewerage appearing in the road. This has led previously to lorries being deployed to deal with this issue. The current road layout is insufficient.
42	Both clean & dirty water drainage needs to be improved & working. Thames Water says there are no problems, they should try living here watching sewerage bubbling up through the manhole covers. When questioned they said the clean water is leaking into the drains. But nothing has been done to stop that from happening .
43	Better public transport
44	Better roads Up grade sewage pipes Better footpaths Wider roads More primary school classrooms and teachers
45	New roads, drainage that doesn't flood outside the house every year, piped gas to the village.
46	Improve drainage.
47	The proposed developments should not go ahead.
48	All the above! Better public transport (reinstate bus link to Oxford) and more frequent service, drainage and sewerage improvements, cycle paths to A418 through Shabbington and Tiddington, and also to Worminghall, Waterperry and on to Wheatley
49	Rural roads, not suitable for large traffic at bridges, near Waterstock turn out of Ickford.
50	Improved bus service, more attempts to bring the village together with a social hub, road surface improved, drainage sorted out to ensure that all drains flow freely
51	The flooding problem sewer problem Transport bus services

Q 6

52	In terms of roads, there is nothing that can be done or which the village would want to be done. The access from Tiddington is via a 17th century bridge across a floodplain and is not designed for heavy traffic. This narrow access has protected our village from too much through traffic in the past. The bridge should not be augmented. It has once before been partially demolished by an oversized lorry trying to squeeze across it and I fear this would happen again with construction lorries trying to reach the sites, especially when unable to approach the village from Thame due to flooding. Should the unwise and unwelcome developments go ahead, the sewerage system would have to double in capacity and substantial flood defences and drainage systems would have to be installed in an attempt to protect the village from flooding. A regular and effective bus service would need to be reinstated to ease the amount of traffic through our quiet village and ferry children out to other schools. Public footpaths should be protected and preserved, not reduced to corridors of nettles between fences.
53	1. Drainage 2. New improved sewage network 3. Generally my attitude is that I moved to a small village over 20 years ago that had a great heart and community. We are now classed as a 'medium' village. I believed that once one development is passed, others will follow and this village will be in danger of losing its community by becoming a 'large' village.
54	Gas supply.
55	Completely renewed drainage Looking into improving the flood plain Looking into not closing the sluice gates when the Thames water is high Improved electricity as it goes off very often Improved internet it is very slow
56	New drainage system & pump station. Bus service.
57	Adequate drainage. Better access to the school - i.e. parking on side or road. Make cars park in village hall car park & make this bigger.
58	Shops. Meeting spaces. School. More significant site review. Explicit consideration of knock on effect on secondary education.
59	Double yellow lines on Bridge Rd/Sheldon Rd junction.
60	The sewer systems are a must for improvement, but how could the river levels be decreased - a NO GO!

Q 6

61	Improved bus service. If the development is off Turnfields, that access road will need improving.
62	Flooding must be considered.
63	It is essential that the surface water drainage system and the sewerage system are repaired and upgraded to cope with any increase in housing. An improved bus service would also be helpful.
64	As above, the drainage in the village. If the school is going to get bigger we need proper provision for parent car parking.
65	Drainage inc. sewerage. Roads. Bus service.
66	Hopefully more council tax will enable the Parish Council to do more to engage engineers to look at how best we can manage surface water.
67	Thorough investigation & solution for existing drainage problems. Additional shop, additional pub, GP surgery, road widening, new bridges, old people's home.
68	Guarantees that sewerage and drainage systems can cope Additional playground equipment Upgrade to existing tennis court in Village hall grounds. Additional school recreational facilities. Additional classrooms will reduce playing area within the existing school boundary? High speed internet access alternatives to gigaclear. mains gas access
69	Nothing should be allowed to go ahead without improvements and increased capacity to the school first. A second shop would probably be necessary. Road calming measures to prevent speeding. Essential would be an improved bus service to Thame and Oxford. The reduction of the bus services in recent years, especially for at morning school times has increased the need for car travel substantially.
70	Restrictions need to be put into place to reduce the areas where you can park near the school and shop. It is often very difficult to travel through the village with cars parked on corners or opposite each other on Sheldon and Bridge Road. The village needs some dedicated parking areas in general and specifically for the new houses to ensure that roads are not blocked. The sewage system in the village cannot cope with the current houses during periods of heavy rain and it will not cope with additional housing - this all needs replacing/improving.

Q 6

71	Improved road surfaces for all the roads out of the village. Improved drainage and sewerage system. Flooding is a regular event down the main roads through the village and something should be done to alleviate this. There are certain limitations to Ickford village in terms of access roads and this should be used to argue against the number of houses we are being asked to build in the village. This remains a small village, despite the AVDC classification as a medium village and the Parish Council should make sure they include this in their discussions about housing.
72	None. We do not want the village to increase to such a size where further amenities are needed.
73	Bus service, activities for young & old.
74	Better drainage Improved traffic flow, especially at school start & end times Bus service improvement or a good service to take people to Tiddington for the 280.
75	None will be needed if no houses are built. If we must end up having to have more buildings, it must only be at a minimum and definitely not exceeding AVDC's requirement of Ickford.
76	Pot holes repaired more quickly & yellow lines by the shop to stop people parking antisocially in a morning. More rubbish bins.
77	Sewerage insufficient now!! School will not have enough capacity. Medical support struggling with current number of patients.
78	Priority - more frequent bus service, routing to Oxford & Aylesbury.
79	Traffic lights on bridges. Connect new development to Rocker Lane. Enlarge shop. More buses & to Oxford.
80	A complete new sewer system to prevent raw sewage coming out of manholes in Sheldon Road, as had happened in the past.
81	Completely new drains in Sheldon Road & Worminghall Road.
82	I would say none, but thats wishful thinking. Building will go ahead so the roads, water, sewers and maybe gas will all need upgrading but then you open the door to further building and expansion.

Q 6

83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sewage/flood improvement - street lights - road access - schooling
84	Adequate access for traffic. Additional places in village school.
85	Flooding stopped/improved. Better parking area for the school & shop. Keep as much green as possible. Planting lots of trees etc.
86	Better sewage and drainage system.
87	Sewage and drainage. Roads/footpaths.
88	Improvement of the surrounding roads. All roads in & out of the village are in a very poor state. Increased traffic will cause more damage (not to mention construction traffic). Drains & sewers. As above. Public transport needs to be increased.
89	None
90	Certainly no more 4/5 bedroom houses.
91	Improvement to state of roads.
92	There would have to be improvements to the surface water drainage and sewage, the Internet service, a gas supply, a bigger school and the parking arrangements on Sheldon Road which are already chaotic during school hours.
93	Sort out the sewage system.
94	Better drainage and better visibility at the road junction of Ickford Road and Sheldon Road.
95	Ickford is on the edge of a flood plain and cannot deal with surface and waste water - Thames Water continue to ignore the problem - unless this changes more houses using water will be disastrous.
96	Where to start? The reality is that the infrastructure has been neglected for years. Sewage and drainage need urgent attention, the power supply is not stable and mobile signals erratic. The roads are in a disastrous condition and it will not be long before there is a serious accident. None of these can cope with current demands and nothing is being done to improve them.

Q 6

97	Regular bus services and traffic calming measures.Road width a concern especially by shop and school - not sure what can be done to ease parking except to have a proper car park on the recreation land to ease congestion.
98	New drainage bigger school bigger village hall
99	Roads improved, better entrance exit to new developments , sewage waste system modernised, electric grid system improved , possible gas supply installed . If none of these takes place then Ickford as a village will slowly become a run down dormitory area for Oxford , Thame and Aylesbury . The roads will become more in need of repair and the sewage problems will become worse .
100	Any affordable homes need to have the criteria for purchase clearly laid out, and only be available to Ickford residents who have lived in the village for a minimum of 5 years. The traffic management and congestion over the bridge in Bridge Road and in Shabbington need attention. An indoor swimming pool for the school/village to use.
101	None. Changes to the infrastructure raises the risk of triggering further development, to the further detriment of the village community.
102	Under no circumstances should the proposed developments be allowed. Traffic congestion around the shop and the school, with overcrowded roads over the two bridges and along Worminghall Road would result in unwarranted traffic accidents and destroy the character of this desirable little village.
103	Roads Sewerage Drainage
104	I don't want to see the proposed housing developments going ahead. We need a lot more time to discuss this. It has been rushed through and the questions about why that happened need to be discussed before any decision is made about housing developments in our village.
105	Ensuring adequate parking, particularly for school. This would help with extra traffic through the village. If the school development goes ahead, this will lead to extra staff and more cars. The car park cannot cope now. When the carpark was built at the same time as the pre school building, two spaces in the car park were allocated for pre school workers, that does not happen now and during the day, it is gridlock with parked cars on the road, they need to make provision for staff and visitor parking during the day now and in the future.
106	Maintained roads. New pumping stations for the sewers
107	None

Q 6

108	Mains gas. Turnfields will become dangerous if it is the only access road to any developments at the end of the road. The sewerage already struggles to cope with the existing houses. Any additional houses would affect the pipework further.
109	Upgrading of the drainage system, resurfacing of roads.
110	Thames Water to sort out flooding
111	Upgrade to drainage and sewerage
112	Sewage needs to be upgraded
113	Upgrade of current sewage and foul water drainage. Implementation of flood prevention measures Improvement to road system (already dangerous around Sheldon and Bridge Roads at peak school times) School would need to increase in size (planning permission already requested for 3 additional class rooms)
114	I just hope one of the developers will aid us in solving the surface water issues
115	Road improvement. Flooding issues The developer help with cost of improvements needed for the village
116	Upgraded utilities - all of them - considerable improvement to dealing with waste water especially for church lane sheldon rd corner if 155 new homes are approved - all new large scale sites required to install grey water systems - bband maybe bt get off their lazy arse and upgrade
117	SEE AS ABOVE IMPROVED PARKING FOR SCHOOL ACTIVITIES INCLUDING CHILDRENS PARENTS DROP OFF AND COLLECTING POINTS
118	Replacement of sewerage system. Overhaul and improvement of drainage system.
119	Car park for all school traffic.
120	Access from Shabbington Road rather than close to the village. Buffer zone with landscaping behind Worminghall Road properties so the development does not impinge as much on views from back gardens. No streetlights