

Stratford Neighbourhood Development Plan

Representations on Pre-Submission Draft Received On-Line or on Paper Forms

Summary of Results for those submitting online or via email/letter that were entered into system - 270 responses

A list of those, with an identifying Code Number, who submitted Representations in this form is shown on a separate document.

Capacity in which commenting on Plan.

Resident	236 (89%)
Business/Work in area	15 (6%)
Resident's Association Representative	4 (2%) (Included in Total for Resident above)
Statutory Consultee	5 (2%)
Other	14 (5%)

Are you content with the Neighbourhood Development Plan as a whole?

Yes	133 (49%)	No	101 (37%)	Unspecified	36 (13%)
------------	------------------	-----------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------

Comments submitted against each Policy are included in the tables below. Those who indicated they did not wish to comment on a Section are totalled, however not all respondents made such indication thus the total of Yes and No does not always add up to 270.

Representations Organised by Policy

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Housing Section?

Yes 110 (45%) No 135 (55%)

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H1
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Good idea
018	Stephen Wreford		Housing applications within the built up boundary should be supported - whether they be single, smaller or medium sized developments.
022	Quentin Willson		The number of approved developments will need significant transport infrastructure changes. SDC seems unaware of the debilitating effect nearly 3,000 new homes within the town will have on pollution, congestion and access. Without improvements to the road system the town will become gridlocked. Where is the world-class transport planning expertise at SDC?
024	Michaela Willson		Too many houses and not enough infrastructure. Doctors, schools, roads, broadband. This is badly thought out
025	Jane Dodge		I agree that there should be Built Up Area Boundaries and that the principal of confining development within these boundaries, however, I do not agree with the submitted BUAB for Alveston which excluded the Red House.
038	Amanda Waters		Support
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We do not object to the definition of built up area boundaries for Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston. However, these should not be drawn too tightly so that there is insufficient land to deliver housing to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy and to provide flexibility to respond positively to longer term housing requirements (indeed we already note that the overall housing provision for Stratford –on-Avon District will need to be increased if the Core Strategy is to be found sound and therefore be adopted). Specifically, we note that the plan does not make adequate

			<p>provision to meet the housing requirement for Tiddington (around 90 compared to a policy requirement of up to 113 (refer Proposed Modifications to Core Strategy Policy CS.16), and also at Alveston where only windfall development is proposed for this Category 4 Local Service Village, yet the proposed modifications to Policy CS.16 indicate that such villages should provide up to 32 dwellings. Given the recommendations of the Planning Inspector to the Core Strategy Public Examination for SDC to review its Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) with a view to increasing the overall housing provision, it will be important that sufficient land is allocated in Tiddington and Alveston to deliver housing towards the top end of the ranges set out in the Proposed Modifications to Policy CS.16. We therefore propose that the built up area boundaries for Tiddington and Alveston should be amended to enable housing sites to be allocated to meet the housing requirements at the upper end of the range set down in the Proposed Modifications to Policy CS.16 of the Core Strategy. For Alveston we have annotated an amendment to the built up area boundary on Figure 15. This extends the Built Up Area Boundary to Wellesbourne Road to the south between Kissing Tree Lane and Alveston Lane to include the whole of the Alveston Village Conservation Area.</p>
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree
063	Tony Goddard		It is critical to create a clear BUAB for Stratford. This will prevent the current ad hoc urban sprawl being created by developers building on the green edges of the town. The current situation just erodes the character of the town.
065	K Tandy		This plan would significantly impact on Alveston in a negative manner
066	Brenda Stewart		Agree with boundaries to be set up. Strongly oppose building between Bishopton Lane and A46. In particular I feel the traffic congestion must be much improved before so many more houses are built in this space.
068	Geoffrey James Benney		I believe that the BUAB for Alveston should be extended along the Tiddington Road to include the Red House, at least. This side of the road is already developed and therefore should be included in the BUAB for either Tiddington or Alveston.
069	Judith Benney		The BUAB for Alveston should include The Red House, this property is part of the village.
070	Matt Sharpe		General comment on housing: It would be good to see the plan make reference to building efficiency

			and sustainability, perhaps even a mention of solar panels.
071	John Lavelle		Why have the BUAB been changed, all the village consultations were based on the BUAB showing the Red House in the BUAB.
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree. Especially for Alveston which has its own special characteristics, defined by the river, the conservation area and the listed buildings.
084	Mrs Jill Focardi		I strongly agree with the Built up Area Boundaries as proposed, but think that The Red House should be included in the BUAB for Alveston, as it is recognised as part of Alveston and should not be included in the Strategic Gap
088	Mike Surrey		The village of Alveston has met and consulted on the BUAB. Policy H1 ignores the views of the residents as it excludes the 'Red House' from the BUAB. The BUAB should include the Red House.
089	Stephanie Surrey		The village of Alveston has a Villagers Association who has consulted with the whole of the village. The output from various village surveys and meetings was that the Red House is part of the ALVESTON BUAB. This proposed policy H1 has NOT incorporated the views of the residents as it excludes the 'Red House' from the BUAB. The BUAB should include the Red House which is the wishes of the residents.
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
096	Nicholas Richard Chester		The Strategic Gap places some dwellings outside the Alveston built up area boundary which have direct links with Alveston. These dwellings are the Vicarage and the Old Rectory both of which either serve or have served St. James Church in Alveston. The Alveston Villager's Association map which was submitted to the Neighbour Plan Steering Committee included the Red House inside the Alveston built up area boundary. These three properties and their grounds should be within the built up area boundary rather than being included in the Strategic Gap.
102	Mike Storey		I should like to comment on the Policies H1 and H2 regarding the BUAB and the Strategic Gap between Alveston and Tiddington, as shown in Fig 15. The proposals shown differ from the map that was consulted upon in our village meetings and the 2014 survey. In these the Red House was included in the BUAB. I fail to understand why the Red House has been excluded. The Strategic Gap can be drawn on just the south side of the Wellesbourne road would be more logical.
103	Joy Hawker		The Alveston Proposed Built Up Area Boundary is fundamentally different from the details of a previous map that our village has reviewed during consultation and our 2014 survey. In these the Red

			House was included within the BUAB. I do not understand the reason why it has been excluded.
110	MARGARET & Peter Woodhams		In general we are supportive of the BUAB.
115	Mr Philip Brown	Savills on behalf of Mixed Farms Ltd	Stratford on Avon is the most sustainable settlement in the District as a result of the wide range of employment opportunities, services and facilities that it provides. It is an accessible location both from outside the town and within it by modes of transport other than the car. The emerging Stratford on Avon Core Strategy is under review and the Inspector in charge of its Examination in Public has indicated that the District must increase its housing target significantly. Once the Objectively Assessed Housing Need for the District has been established via the Examination process it is anticipated that there will be a requirement for greenfield sites to be allocated for housing outside of the defined settlement boundary of Stratford on Avon town. In light of the above and the likely outcome of the Core Strategy Examination process, Policy H1 must be amended in order to make allowance for the requirement for greenfield housing site allocations. The plan must also assess and identify those areas of greenfield land on the edge of the town that are not materially constrained and that therefore have the potential for allocation in order to accommodate new housing required by the Core Strategy once adopted. If these steps are not taken it is very unlikely that the Plan will be in accordance with the emerging Core Strategy meaning that it will be unsound.
118	Ann and Trevor		The BUAB map of Alveston on page 127 (figure 15) in the Draft Plan shows The Red House outside the Alveston BUAB. The map which was submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee, included The Red House within the BUAB and we Strongly feel that The Red House should be put back within the BUAB map of Alveston.
120	John Michael Jesse		The area boundary at the top of Alveston Lane should include the Red House which has always been considered as part of Alveston - the entrance is on Alveston Lane, so why do you not include this property within Alveston Village ?
122	C J Pepper		I am agreement with the policy of making maximum use of brownfield site and the using of empty properties. New developments which may not need to be the full additional houses should be:- On the S side of the A46 between the Alcester Island and Bishopton Island. On the SE side of Trinity Way between Rosebird island and the Banbury Road island. It should not be outside the present SDC boundary.
126	Clarissa and David		700 houses that is planned for the Town is not designated and currently applications for the

	Roberts		additional dwellings such as the Arden Heath and Tiddington applications have not been notified. Since Stratford is revisiting its core strategy it is probable the 700 houses referred will increase. We are totally against the encroachment on previously nominated agricultural land and any additional land. Housing should be planned for brown field sites in Town.
127	Oliver Spicer	Studio Spicer Architects	Policy H1: Built-up Area Boundaries Our client objects to the Built-up Area Boundary for Tiddington. It is premature to define the boundary without the Core Strategy being completed and based on a known under supply of housing numbers within the district and the current Core Strategy. Defining the built-up area boundary in advance of the housing numbers being agreed within the Core Strategy is premature, given the need identified by the Inspector for additional housing across the district. Tiddington is a local service village identified to accommodate additional housing. The level of housing has not been finalized and is likely to be increased before the Core Strategy. There is no flexibility within this policy for additional housing and until an assessment of alternative sites for the additional housing numbers has been carried out the Neighbourhood Plan cannot proceed.
131	Clive Alan Griffiths		The built up area boundary is outlined in this section. I live at 117 Tiddington Road SOA and my property is in fact L-shaped, taking in the large area of land behind Reading Court and is used as my garden and an open paddock, being regularly mown and tended to over the last 14 years. The BUAB cuts right across my land taking no account of my garden whereas elsewhere along the Tiddington Road, the line correctly follows the full garden space and property boundaries. In these maps, only the area behind my property does this occur, this cannot be correct. The maps should be modified.
133	Mr David Ireland		I support the position of Tiddington Village Residents Association with regard to the proposed housing developments in the vicinity of Knights Lane/Loxley road which threaten the green belt gap which separates Tiddington from Stratford. I wish to see Tiddington remain a village separate from the Stratford Conurbation. I, with TVRA, will support housing development of the Tiddington Fields site provided there is no vehicular access into Oak Road or Townsend Road. This site, together with small infills should handle Tiddington's quota of new houses.
139	Renny Wodynska		I am EXTREMELY happy if there is no further development allowed of any shape or form along Kissing Tree Lane so that the 2 fields which back onto Avon fields Close remain as fields, given we are living in what is supposed to be a protected village.
140	Alan George		I do not wish to have any further development allowed in any shape or form along Kissing Tree lane so that the 2 fields which back onto Avon fields Close remain as fields.

143	Chris Strangwood		Housing should be spread across the whole of the district with emphasis on affordable housing in villages as well as the town itself
154	Wendy Appleby		It is really important that Tiddington remains a separate settlement to Stratford upon Avon and a strategic gap is maintained at the Knights Lane / Loxley Road junction.
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		I strongly support this policy.
174	Sarah Eglin		Agree
176	NEIL JOHN FARMER & ROSEMARY CLARE FARMER		THE BUAB MAP OF ALVESTON IN THE DRAFT PLAN IS DIFFERENT TO THE MAP WE CONSULTED ON THROUGH VARIOUS ALVESTON VILLAGERS` ASSOCIATION MEETINGS AND THE NOVEMBER 2014 SURVEY. THIS SHOWS THE RED HOUSE OUTSIDE THE BUAB AND AS BEING PART OF A STRATEGIC GAP. THE ALVESTON VILLAGERS` ASSOCIATION MAP, WHICH THE VILLAGE SUBMITTED TO THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE, INCLUDED THE RED HOUSE WITHIN THE BUAB.
180	Evelyn CONN		The Town Council MUST please continue to support the over development of the Town. The quality of some of the new local housing, especially the carbuncles on Birmingham Road is tacky, environmentally retarded and over dense with no space for community recreation, play and traffic free areas.
181	Carl CONN		In coming years residents will look on this plan, and if enacted as written, will be incredibly grateful that the over development of the town was stymied. I would also hope that the quality of the local forthcoming developments could be improved as they detract from the town, for example the new overly dense, low quality housing on the Birmingham Road.
183	Sharon Taylor	Tiddington Village Residents' Association	P124 The Map of the Built Up Area Boundary: need to differentiate site 2 into specific areas and clarify the white space adjacent to Tiddington Fields • The map and key clearly do not differentiate between sites 2a and 2b on Tiddington Fields. This DOES NOT reflect our consultation results and we would like to see a clear marking in this extract. See comments above and our consultation results for further information. • The key does not make clear what the white space is between the boundary of Site Proposals SSB4 and 5 . This needs clear definition and clarification. TVRA would prefer it to be part of the strategic gap.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways	Pleased to see no proposed increase in built-up boundary

		Assoc. (Warks branch)	
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		I support the principle of the "built up area boundary" but it seems to have no "teeth" since the Core Strategy now includes land outside the boundary e.g. the large plot of land at Bishopton, between the A46 and Bishopton Lane.
208	KEVAN STUART RUSSELL		<p>Due to its lack of user friendliness this is my 3rd attempt at completing this form. My comments are a mixture of general and policy specific. I had composed my response in the form of a word processed document with the intention of cutting and pasting my comments into the response form. However the form is not designed in a way which readily enables me to do this. I am not prepared to waste time dissecting my submission. Therefore although none of my comment are specific to policy H1 please find my comments on the Plan in their entirety below: A lot of hard work and effort has clearly gone into the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan document and the volunteers involved can only be commended for this. Thank you for caring about our town. However there is maybe a danger of the team's work being devalued by the method of consultation maybe failing to engage the Stratford community and extracting their thoughts. Due to its' scope the document is fairly substantial and takes several hours to read thoroughly, something I do not believe people generally have the time or inclination to do. I would be surprised if there is high response rate from the general public unless they have an issue with a particular aspect or policy. Obviously there would have been greater costs involved but I believe it would have been far better to have additionally held a well-advertised event similar to the previous one at the Town Hall backed up by a series of presentations at community centres across the Plan area and maybe even utilise an empty shop similar to the recent Town Square re-development consultation. This would have enabled people to give their opinions on-the-spot. The response rate will evidence but I would not be surprised if significantly larger numbers attended the Town Hall event than respond to this consultation. I would very much have liked an opportunity to express my views in person and ask questions and maybe received answers without me appearing purely negative. There is a possibility that my submission will appear that way as although there is much I broadly concur with I have mainly confined my comments to those areas I have concerns with. Currently I have a neutral stance on my contentment or not with the Plan, although as it presently stands I have enough dissatisfaction to prevent me from voting in favour of it. * The call for joined up thinking in the planning process is admirable. Whilst it ought to be a basic principle for planning, it has been sadly missing in and around Stratford for a number of years. . * The Plan contains a lot of blue sky thinking without always detailing exactly how the policies will be implemented. Every policy</p>

		<p>should provide the reasoning behind it and how it can be guaranteed to be delivered (in terms of cost, location etc.). For example where is it envisaged additional river crossings should be located, new allotments (Policy CWL 10) or health care facilities (Policy CWL12)? A lot will depend on a possibly unrealistic expectation of the goodwill of developers and enterprise. Policies H6, H7, H8 and H9 are worthy but are examples, unless enforceable, of policies that will rely on the goodwill of developers. Recent history with the Redrow involvement on the Cattle Market site is an example of a developer's attitude towards the types of restrictions being proposed. * Locating and re-locating employment opportunities in accordance with Policy E2 (Core Strategy SUA2) looks to be an excellent means of keeping distribution traffic away from the town centre as the starting point for the best routes for reaching any part of the country would seem to be via the A46 either north east or west from the Wildmoor roundabout. * On the assumption that there is demand for 'High Street' shopping as opposed to other forms of shopping e.g. internet, then, given that it seems to be accepted that footfall within the Town Centre is already fairly high, surely the best way of meeting the Town Centre Objective A: Promoting the Vitality and Viability of the Town Centre, is for the retail businesses to be able to provide products and services that people want to buy at prices they are willing to pay whilst at the same time remaining profitable to the same extent as those business located and particularly re-located at the Maybird Centre. Car parking at the Maybird Centre is free and adjacent to the retail units. In my opinion ease and cost of car parking is another thing that influences people's choice of where to shop. A big advantage of the Solihull Touchwood Shopping Centre is that it is virtually possible to step from one's car straight into John Lewis. * Traffic flow through the Town Centre is not helped by on street parking (where queues develop waiting for spaces, overlaying of buses, which will still happen irrespective of the provision of a bus station unless the bus stop locations are lengthened, and the failure to enforce daytime no waiting and no loading regulations. * I am struggling to understand how removing filter lanes (Policy INF1 – 5 Birmingham Road) will improve traffic flow. I would have expected the opposite to be true i.e. moving vehicles turning off Birmingham Road into a filter lane first surely improves the flow for those vehicles continuing straight on. Off the top of my head has anybody looked into whether there is anything to be gained from restricting the current two entrances/exits to Tesco/Maybird Centre to one entrance only and one exit only. It should be remembered that Birmingham Road is not the only place that traffic congestion occurs. However the Plan does not seem to contain policies to ease this. * As a general principle I approve of the policies under Section 10 Infrastructure: Objective B - Improving Conditions for Cyclists and Pedestrians. Cycling and walking are heavily promoted throughout the Plan. However, I am of the opinion that</p>
--	--	---

		<p>there is a need for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians to each be allocated their own exclusive and clearly identified zones and routes and I am not convinced, even with the suggested changes to thoroughfare designs and priorities, that the roads and streets of Stratford are capable of accommodating this. Further I do not believe that encouraging cycling and walking will significantly reduce vehicle numbers and thus ease congestion. Cycling is largely viewed as a leisure activity rather than a means of undertaking a journey. People will not walk or cycle on shopping trips which involve carrying bulky purchases home and as stated elsewhere in the Plan much of the employment in the town involves commuting from farther afield i.e. outside reasonable cycling and walking distance. * Any proposals for additional river crossings, whether for vehicles, cyclists or pedestrians need to take account of the final destination. Stratford already has a second river crossing with Seven Meadows Road but it carries a much lower volume of traffic than Clopton Bridge. I suspect this is because it is essentially a road to nowhere, just the opportunity to join the congestion around the Town Centre from a different direction. * The Explanation for Policy CLW2 provides a significant list of potential new leisure facilities. However are any of these realistic? If any of them were viable wouldn't some entrepreneur already have opened such venues? * Policy SSB1 misses a great opportunity to take some local traffic away from Birmingham Road. A new road joining Timothy's Bridge Road with Wharf Road, albeit requiring some means of crossing the railway line, would enable people residing in the area north of Alcester Road and east of Bishopton Lane to access the Maybird Centre with a lesser contribution to Birmingham Road congestion. In addition this could possibly alleviate pressure on Birmingham Road arising from any new housing development near Bishopton as included in the revised Core Strategy. * I am a resident of Tiddington and a member of the TVRA Planning Sub-committee. I played a significant role in designing the Consultation Questionnaire and compiling the results. I am therefore particularly interested in the section of the Plan that deals with Tiddington. There is nothing in the Plan that is contrary to the results of the questionnaire, albeit that it attracted a fairly limited response, and I therefore endorse the submission that TVRA has made in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan consultation. However, despite the principle of localism which the Plan should be built on, it has appeared to me, although I can see no particular reason why, that from the time of their first engagement with the residents of Tiddington, the public meeting held at Tiddington Community Centre in February 2014, the Neighbourhood Plan team have been keen to promote development on Tiddington Fields rather than elsewhere in the village. Great weight has been placed on the response to the consultation question regarding the desirability of a strategic gap. However the questionnaire results are unable to quantify the extent to which residents would be prepared to</p>
--	--	---

			sacrifice part of the strategic gap farthest away from their residence to avoid having new housing in their immediate vicinity. By the very nature of Nimbyism I suspect that had it be possible to evaluate this, an equally one sided but divergent result would have emerged. There also appears to be no definition (in meters) as to the minimum width that could be considered a strategic gap. Given that the Core Strategy considers Tiddington as separate from to Stratford why isn't there a clear indication of the exact whereabouts of the wider boundary of Tiddington, i.e. beyond the built up area boundary, particularly that between Stratford and Tiddington? Identification of this boundary would assist with safeguarding any strategic gap in future as it would be clear what part belonged to Tiddington and is therefore under its control whilst localism persists.
210	Rachel Syson		Agree, but disagree with BUAB for Tiddington - see later responses to Section 12
212	David Tucker		I do not support the BUAB for Alveston excluding the Red House. A consultation within the Village approved the Red House to have 2 additional dwellings subject to retaining an unchanged street scene. These dwellings contribute significantly to Alveston's LSV4 quota. The remaining BUAB of Alveston defines the Village and protects the vital corridor to the south up to the Wellesbourne Road and is strongly supported.
213	John Fleming	Gladman Developments Ltd	Gladmans' representations to the Neighbourhood Plan have been submitted via email to enquiries@ourstratford.org.uk
215	Portia Hazel Conn		Please improve the use of above shop premises for residences. Also, more single bed units and better designed houses. The design of the new modern estates in town is truly awful with tight density, no community feel and poor crime prevention designed into the estates.
221	Lindsey Quinn		Too many houses are planned for Tiddington. The village cannot support the increased volume of cars or school children without further provision.
228	John Campton		Strongly support concept
229	Dr Ian Allwood		I agree with the proposed northern boundary of the BUAB for Tiddington. This boundary edge is close to the River Avon and adjacent to this is land which is referred to as an "area of restraint" in the previous Stratford-on-Avon District Local Plan. This is described in Section 4.4 of the Saved Local Plan as Policy EF.3. I cannot see any reference in the NP to an area of restraint. I think that the Neighbourhood Plan should, therefore, reference this saved policy, using the same wording and definitions to protect this "area of restraint". The intention of the policy is to protect the "inherently

			open character" of such areas, limiting any development of such areas, except in specific circumstance, described in the policy.
230	Mark Taylor		Firstly, I object to all and any further housing development in Stratford-upon-Avon. The town does not have the infrastructure - roads, parking, town centre shopping etc. to support our current community. Above all, Stratford-upon-Avon should be protected as a tourist and cultural centre of world-wide importance - the countryside and the nature of the town and village enable visitors to gain some lost flavour of the countryside which Shakespeare could recognise - not endless housing estates.
253	Daniel O'Donnell		Policy 1 is contrary to the cost/benefit approach of the NPPF, it should instead identify the limit of the urban area only.
256	Valerie Ansfield		Developments already approved on green fields on the Birmingham Road do not have "easy access to public transport & the highways network". This statement should be strengthened. Flooding of the Race Course Brook must be solved by Environment Agency works BEFORE any more houses are built.
281	Michael Craig Scott		Built up Area Boundary. I cannot see the relevance of the above as the two large planned developments in Tiddington fall outside of the suggested BUAB for the village. Are we to assume that greenspace is less valuable around Tiddington than elsewhere? The comment that "Any development on greenfield sites should be located to make best use of existing or planned infrastructure including easy access to public transport and the highways network "does not seem to apply in the case of the Tiddington Fields site as the initial plan is to use unsuitable residential roads to access the site (Oak Road & New Street). The possible use of an access from Main Street through the Home Guard development addresses the access issue but ignores any other requirement as fa as infrastructure is concerned - public transport, doctor surgery, school places and traffic congestion in Stratford.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Difficult to see difference between Existing BUAB and proposed BUAB on map, similarly for Existing Town Centre and Proposed Town Centre Boundaries therefore not easy to comment on this section. Agree that new housing outside these BUAB should be strongly resisted.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where	Policy H2
--------------------	------------------	--	------------------

		applicable)	
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Agree with keeping a gap between!
018	Stephen Wreford		The "white land" to the East of the land labelled SS85 needs to be re-defined as "strategic gap". In its current form the proposed development on Tiddington Fields could then expand eastwards over these fields currently used to grow asparagus. The result would be a huge traffic issue on Oak Rd and New St as there would be no access to Main Street for cars from potentially up to another 2-300 houses.
025	Jane Dodge		None of the houses on Main Street, Tiddington/Wellesbourne Road, Alveston should be the strategic gap between the two settlements. Making the Red House the strategic gap is dangerous as it could be considered as a very convenient space for a Relief Road in years to come.
038	Amanda Waters		Support
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We object to this policy as it is not necessary. There is no requirement to identify a strategic gap to prevent coalescence between Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston. As it is intended that all new development will be confined to within the built up area boundaries (Policy H1) , as defined on the Proposals Map, any development outside these built up boundaries will be determined in accordance with policies regarding development in the countryside (refer Core Strategy Policy CS.25 Countryside and Villages). In recent years Planning Inspectors at Public Examinations of Local Plan documents have removed such policy designations as being unnecessary as they duplicate other policies of the plan. In any event the countryside gaps between Stratford upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston cannot be regarded as being strategic. Strategic gaps in my opinion relate to separation areas between major urban conurbations. By no stretch of the imagination are these settlements major urban conurbations. We therefore propose that Policy H2 be deleted, and any reference to strategic gaps on the Proposals Map be removed.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
061	G Smith		The proposed developments are greatly in excess of any requirements by the residents of the village and will result in the village becoming a commuter area. The local school and surgery are not large

			<p>enough to absorb further growth. Bidford is a main through route, despite the A46 bypass, for large HGV vehicles, further housing will increase the traffic and the risk. The recent damage to Bidford bridge is an example of the result of overlarge vehicles using roads not designed for such vehicles. It is doubtful if the present drainage etc. can sustain further development The areas off Victoria Road H2c etc., presently absorb rainfall. They will not do so if concreted over with likely run off to local housing. Access to these areas will be via Victoria Road which is already overwhelmed by traffic.</p>
063	Tony Goddard		<p>The strategic gaps defined for Stratford/Tiddington and Alveston are important to avoid the creation of one sprawling urban mass. Each area currently has its own distinctive character. There is a danger currently that Tiddington will just become a part of Stratford. It's about one field away from happening with current developer plans.</p>
065	K Tandy		<p>This plan would significantly impact on Alveston in a negative manner</p>
068	Geoffrey James Benney		<p>The Strategic Gap is already in place as being the allotments, Memorial Field and open fields to the far side of Memorial Field. Including the already built up area on the river side of the Tiddington Road as part of a strategic gap does not make sense.</p>
069	Judith Benney		<p>The proposed strategic gap is neither necessary nor appropriate. The land is already developed. There is a natural separation of Alveston and Tiddington created by The Memorial Field, the allotments, and the open fields between the Vicarage and Pimlico Lane.</p>
071	John Lavelle		<p>On the map given to the Alveston Neighbourhood plan steering committee, the Red House was included in the BUAB. Why has the boundary changed? The Red House should be included in the BUAB for Alveston. Any plans for a new road within this strategic gap would have a major impact on the village of Alveston and the rural setting of the village. It would also have a major impact on the wildlife and the environment.</p>
074	Roger & Lesley Read		<p>Agree We disagree with the location of the strategic gap between Alveston and Tiddington. The Red house should be included in Alveston, not as part of the strategic gap. The character of the Red house is that it is hidden behind a high wall - consistent with the style of houses described in the Alveston VDS and Conservation area document. Further, any development within the grounds of the Red House should be viewed against the criteria set out in the Alveston VDS that is to have particular regard to the street scene.</p>
077	Anne Parker		<p>Overcrowding mix of pedestrians, passengers disembarking and passenger's waiting.at the bus stops at the bottom of Bridge St and there are no bus shelters. Also there is no safe crossing between the</p>

			two sides for passengers. I would suggest bus stops be moved to the centre of Bridge St, outside M&S and Sainsbury's. This would also allow bus shelters to be erected and make a safe crossing to the centre island for those 'onward' passengers. To avoid buses waiting 'layovers' need to be provided at ? Current coach station. Also no mention for the provision of 'safe routes to school' in the plan for children and students to walk and cycle. If there is provision why is it not advertised in street plans etc.
084	Mrs Jill Focardi		The Red House, Tiddington Road should be excluded from the Strategic Gap as it is on the boundary of Alveston.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support, especially the gap between Tiddington and Stratford-upon-Avon along both Tiddington Road and Loxley Road / Knights Lane
088	Mike Surrey		I am in favour of a strategic gap between Alveston and Tiddington; however it should be on the south side of the Wellesbourne Road and the Red House should be within the BUAB of Alveston.
089	Stephanie Surrey		I am in favour of a strategic gap between Alveston and Tiddington; however it should be on the south side of the Wellesbourne Road and the Red House should be within the BUAB of Alveston.
095	Eric Ward		Reword: delete "should" and substitute "will"
096	Nicholas Richard Chester		The Strategic Gap places some dwellings outside the Alveston built up area boundary which have direct links with Alveston. These dwellings are the Vicarage and the Old Rectory both of which either serve or have served St. James Church in Alveston. The Alveston Villager's Association map which was submitted to the Neighbour Plan Steering Committee included the Red House inside the Alveston built up area boundary. These three properties and their grounds should be within the built up area boundary rather than being included in the Strategic Gap.
102	Mike Storey		I should like to comment on the Policies H1 and H2 regarding the BUAB and the Strategic Gap between Alveston and Tiddington, as shown in Fig 15. The proposals shown differ from the map that was consulted upon in our village meetings and the 2014 survey. In these the Red House was included in the BUAB. I fail to understand why the Red House has been excluded. The Strategic Gap can be drawn on just the south side of the Wellesbourne road would be more logical.
103	Joy Hawker		The strategic gap between Alveston and Tiddington can be drawn just to the south side of the Wellesbourne Road.. This appears far more logical to me. How can an existing property represent a gap?

105	Brian Johnson		Why does the Strategic Gap include two significant houses: the Red House built as the vicarage in 1847 and Avon Court, much more recent, but still a significant property? It would, in my opinion, be better to include the plots of these two houses in Alveston's built-up boundary.
118	Ann and Trevor		Should it transpire that a Strategic Gap is agreed upon, then in our view this should be on the south side of the Wellesbourne Road and would, therefore, exclude The Red House which We have already stated in our comments on Policy H1 should be within the BUAB Map.
120	John Michael Jesse		The Strategic Gap should not cut off the Red House from Alveston.
139	Renny Wodynska		The Red House should be within the BUAB. This is what was submitted by the Alveston villagers' Association, following consultation with us, to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee. I strongly am opposed to leaving large gap close to the River Avon, The Strategic Gap should be on the south side of the Wellesbourne Road and the Red House should be within the BUAB for Alveston.
140	Alan George		The Red House should be within the BUAB. This is what was submitted by the Alveston Villagers' Association, following consultation with us, to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee.
143	Chris Strangwood		I don't understand why the gap between the town and Alveston and Tiddington
153	Janick McOwan		It is a very important that a significant strategic gap should be maintained in order to prevent coalescence between Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston and therefore preserve the character and individual identity of each settlement and community. I am pleased to see that the Stratford Neighbourhood Development Plan acknowledges the importance of maintaining a strategic gap.
154	Wendy Appleby		I agree that Tiddington should remain as a separate and district settlement to Stratford-upon-Avon.
174	Sarah Eglin		agree
176	NEIL JOHN FARMER & ROSEMARY CLARE FARMER		WE, LIVING IN THE VILLAGE OF ALVESTON, BELIEVE THAT LEAVING A LARGE GAP CLOSE TO THE RIVER AVON ALLOWS A CONVENIENT SPACE FOR A 3rd RIVER CROSSING ALONG WITH AN ASSOCIATED BY-PASS LINKING THE BANBURY ROAD TO THE OLD WARWICK ROAD. OUR VIEW IS THAT A STRATEGIC GAP IS VERY MUCH IN ALVESTON'S INTERESTS, BUT THAT IT SHOULD JUST BE SHOWN ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE WELLESBOURNE ROAD AND THAT THE RED HOUSE SHOULD BE WITHIN THE BUAB FOR ALVESTON AND NOT BE PART OF A STRATEGIC GAP.
180	Evelyn CONN		Yes - the gap is very important.

183	Sharon Taylor	Tiddington Village Residents' Association	3. P121 Description of Site 3 in the proposed Strategic Gap The SHLAA Review of 2012 only rejected one side of Knights Lane as being "identified with the Landscape Sensitivity Study as unsuitable for residential development due to unacceptable impact on the landscape character of the area" as the other side (Stratford Football Club's side) wasn't considered in the SHLAA. TVRA would like the wording of this to be more precise and accurate.
183	Sharon Taylor		I agree that a strategic gap is needed to maintain Tiddington's status as a separate settlement. It would be very helpful if there was a clear definition of this.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Strategic gap should be preserved
210	Rachel Syson		Agree to the policy, but disagree with the Strategic Gap on the Proposals map
212	David Tucker		Subject to the amendment above (Policy H1) to exclude the Red House, the Strategic Gap around Tiddington is supported.
219	Steve Duddy		I strongly support the need to maintain a strategic gap between Stratford and Tiddington. Therefore I would not support the developments at Arden hill farm or on Knights lane. I believe the Tiddington fields north represents a much more suitable development for Tiddington.
228	John Campton		Strategic gap - sound principle
230	Mark Taylor		The boundary between Stratford-upon-Avon and Tiddington must be maintained in full - the space to breathe between Tiddington and Loxley Road must be maintained. The Arden Heath development on Loxley Road would destroy the aspect towards Alveston Hill - a vital part of the local countryside. The children in Alveston School must be able to use their forest school with an aspect towards the hill - not to be surrounded by development.
253	Daniel O'Donnell		The preservation of the setting and character of Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston can be preserved without the need of a strategic gap.
281	Michael Craig Scott		Strategic Gap. Again, the plan seems to contradict itself here when stating that "Progressive encroachment of the countryside by infilling parcels of greenfield land on the edges of the built up areas has begun to erode this character and further development should be avoided unless clear positive benefits for the Neighbourhood Area can be demonstrated" then supporting the Tiddington

			Fields application. Surely no positive benefits to the neighbourhood have been demonstrated. It can only prove to be to the detriment of existing residents.
--	--	--	--

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H3
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		No comment
018	Stephen Wreford		The NP for Tiddington are should support windfall development within the BUAB as per Alveston NP.
025	Jane Dodge		I agree with the maximum number of houses for Tiddington and the proposed allocation for Alveston of up to 32 windfall houses.
038	Amanda Waters		No view
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We object to this policy as it does not make adequate provision, as noted above, for sufficient housing to be provided in Tiddington and Alveston to meet local housing needs and the wider housing requirements of the Core Strategy (Proposed Modifications to Policy CS.16). Specifically, NDP Policy H3 only supports windfall development in Alveston – previous analyses of the potential development opportunities in Alveston have demonstrated that less than 10 new homes are likely to come forward from this source during the plan period. As such it is necessary to identify at least one and potentially two housing allocation sites in the village, which as noted above is a Category 4 LSV where up to 32 new homes should be provided over the plan period. The policy, as written to support only windfall development, will only provide open market houses, and will not enable other types of housing such as local needs houses (affordable homes), housing for the elderly, and housing for young people to be provided in accordance with Policies H6, H8 and H9 of the NDP. Also, the policy on market housing mix (policy H7) will not be met, as most of the infill houses, will have 4+_ bedrooms, based on an analysis of previous applications, most of which have been refused. A housing strategy for Alveston based on windfall (infill) development will lead to an even more distorted demographic structure in the village with an increasing proportion of elderly people, rather than its rejuvenation, a key objective of the Village Design Statement. We therefore recommend that housing allocation sites for

			around 20 dwellings be identified on the Proposals Map for Alveston. We have annotated a plan for Alveston identifying a site for around 10 new homes on land off Church Lane in front of the church. We note that this site was recently subject to a planning application for 15 dwellings which was refused and subsequently subject to an Appeal. Although the Appeal was dismissed, the Inspector concluded that the proposed scheme would cause less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area, the Listed Buildings and the parkland setting of Kissing Tree House. We believe that a smaller, high quality designed scheme which delivers an element of local needs housing, benefits to the church in terms of off street parking, an extension to the burial ground (ashes only) and which enhances the setting of the church and other heritage assets will meet the tests set down in the NPPF under Section 12 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
061	G Smith		The design of recent developments is very poor The development of Waterloo road is best described as "little boxes all the same". If there is further development then such designs should not be accepted. Affordable should not mean design.
065	K Tandy		This plan would significantly impact on Alveston in a negative manner
067	Richard Edward Hooper		The problems relating to the potential 90 houses in Tiddington also apply but on a much larger scale to the proposed development of 270 houses on the Arden Heath Farm which is coming up to appeal in October. This is prime agricultural land ,would detract even further from attraction of the green countryside but more importantly considerably add to the traffic congestion particularly around Clopton bridge with perhaps 500? More cars coming on to the Loxley road. There is not the infrastructure to support this particularly schools
068	Geoffrey James Benney		I think that anything other than windfall development in Alveston would undermine the rural location and harm the village structure.
069	Judith Benney		I agree that only windfall development should be permitted in Alveston. There are several sites where this would be appropriate. The recent Village Survey showed that there is no significant demand or more housing in the village.
071	John Lavelle		The proposed development of 90 houses in Tiddington and 32 in Alveston would put immense pressure on the local facilities.

074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree. We especially agree with the statement: Stratford-on-Avon District Council also indicated at a planning appeal in February 2015 that there should only be minimal development in Alveston during the plan period.
077	Anne Parker		I did not know which policy no to insert this under: Bridge 68 on the SOA canal needs a longer hand rail by the flats - the steep slope always looks as though it could be slippery in wet weather and I avoid it when there is any hint of frost. The towpath is great for cyclists but under the bridges between the town and Timothy Bridge Road some are "blind" for both walkers and cyclists: Why are there no 'cycle speed bumps' to slow cyclists down as on the Lancaster Canal?
084	Mrs Jill Focardi		I support Alveston as a LSV Category 4, with only windfall development within the BUAB, any development is very limited by the Conservation Area and the flood plain.
088	Mike Surrey		The infrastructure on the south side of the river cannot support the proposed expansion of Tiddington by up to 113 dwellings in addition to other development off the Loxley Road.
089	Stephanie Surrey		The infrastructure on the south side of the river cannot support the proposed expansion of Tiddington by up to 113 dwellings in addition to other developments off the Loxley Road.
095	Eric Ward		Agree
120	John Michael Jesse		Alveston should not be considered a Local Service Village - no services exist.
127	Oliver Spicer	Studio Spicer Architects	Policy H3: Local Service Village Allocations Tiddington has been acknowledged as having to provide up to 100 new dwellings across the Plan period 2031 to conform with CS.16. It is unlikely that the proposed housing need within the village will be met without the development of Greenfield sites such as those identified as Site 2, Tiddington Field's, or Site 3, Land of Knights Lane. Both of these are contrary to other policies for development of Greenfield sites and impact on the Character and Conservation Area.
139	Renny Wodynska		I am totally against further building, especially on green belt land in Tiddington. We cannot afford to keep building on green spaces. The road is already badly congested and we don't want a dual carriageway like the A46 as a result of the extra traffic backwards and forwards from Tiddington, via the edge of Alveston, towards the motorways. We are very happy for extremely limited development within Alveston, in the odd garden or green space ONLY. We are not aware of a lot of people desiring to move to Alveston !

140	Alan George		I am totally against further building, especially on green belt land in Tiddington. We cannot afford to keep building on green spaces. The road is already badly congested.
153	Janick McOwan		The exact number of dwellings to be allocated to Tiddington and Alveston should be clearly defined. 80 to 90 houses maximum for Tiddington would be a more suitable number, 112 would be too much. The proposed site identified for development known as Tiddington Field should be split into two sites 2a and 2b as in the TVRA survey to residents, site 2b being kept as a green space or woodland area.
157	Richard Parry		I do not agree with the plan to build on Tiddington Fields ref SSB5. I do not agree with this because:- - access to this development is through knight's lane and oak road which are very narrow residential streets that would not cope with the massive increase in traffic and parking. There are other sights on knight's lane in Tiddington that are more suitable as they will not impact on the core residential roads of the village. - the fields are used for walking, crops and are key to people's lives in Tiddington - the amenities cannot deal with the increase in people, the school is already to full and this will impact people who have lived in Tiddington years not being able to send their children to the school. - I feel there is no need for new housing but if it has to happen there are much better sites which will impact the village a lot less such as on Knights lane, if KL site is adopted by the plan then any planning should only be permitted if it commits to providing sufficient public open space to protect a strategic gap between Tiddington and Stratford. I hope there is a sensible decision made which will provide the needed number of houses, for benefits of Tiddington and not developers or land owners pockets, the plan for Tiddington fields SSB5 if ludicrous with a number of better options to adopt that will not rid it of precious fields where people exercise, walk dogs, etc. and make key residential roads of Tiddington an absolute nightmare and dangerousness for residents to use. Thanks
159	Richard Applin		Related to Tiddington plans, specifically the fields behind Oak Rd. The village is a thoroughfare for traffic already. Oak road or New Street or Knights Lane would be strained further by proposed housing. The fields are used by many villagers as footpaths for dog walking, jogging, walking etc. Access to Oak road has not been stipulated, this is concerning. I would like to see plans for a 2nd bridge, or Eastern Rd connecting Alveston to Trinity Mead area , before any houses were built. Any building south of the river is adding to the already gridlocked at busy time's Clopton bridge.... Taking away green space , used for footpaths by residents must be a last resort.
162	Sarah Bramble		Tiddington cannot cope with additional housing unless services are increased too, specifically schooling and medical services. Traffic is already busy along the Tiddington Road and parking is particularly difficult, especially along New Street. Any additional housing should be on easily

			accessible sites, e.g. Knights lane and only if absolutely necessary. The council should adopt the original proposals of housing in Long Marston which incorporated a 6th form college, medical facilities, shops, schooling and adaptations to the infrastructure within Stratford.
167	Lucy French		It is essential that Tiddington remains a separate village and is not incorporated into Stratford upon Avon. As such I support the selection of Tiddington Fields as the preferred site for further building but in order to prevent complete mayhem on the local residential side streets access must be from Main Street only.
171	Emma Scott	Save 'Tiddington Fields' Oppose Planning (STOP) - action group STOP is an action group set up to campaign against any development proposed for Tiddington Fields. A number of residents have submitted the same/similar evidence in support for STOP.	Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they

		<p>lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the "Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service</p>
--	--	---

			Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people". There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.
171	Emma Scott		<p>Preferred sites: Knights Lane I consider that the sites at Knights Lane provide superior option for any substantial new housing development needed to fulfil our housing quota. This site limits disruption to the rest of the village and is far more in keeping with the area. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses, there is a tree buffer shielding the majority of Townsend Road and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a sustainable strategic gap. This should be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites (inc Arden Heath, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6) on its outer edge, furthest from its closest settlement. This strategic gap comprised of public open space, publically owned or managed through a private company has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Any development could be encouraged to introduce additional traffic calming measures, so improving the current issues experienced with people speeding past the school. Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields should not be the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land. It provides a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and via which residents from all over the village enjoy excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only possible option is for their planning application to be resubmitted (and risk rejection) and access to be provided over the area they've determined as green space. Based on information provided by planning officers at the town planning committee this would not likely be permitted. There is also a suggestion in the SNDP that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However this would be in</p>

		<p>direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Additionally, permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. The residents of Margaret Court have purchased their homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Church who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to a question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. At no point was it made clear that these two questions would be considered together or that any question had a higher weighting. The view was taken that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. There needs to be some protection for the village to prevent a developer gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the "Unrestricted Natural Accessible</p>
--	--	---

			Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.
174	Sarah Eglin		agree
176	NEIL JOHN FARMER & ROSEMARY CLARE FARMER		IT IS ESSENTIAL TO RETAIN ALVESTON`S STATUS AS A LOCAL SERVICE VILLAGE
178	Andrea Fleet		I am not objecting to all development in Tiddington, I appreciate that the Home Guard development proposal has been approved, and we will no doubt have to have another small development. I am however objecting to the number of attempts by several developers to secure every bit of available land on the outskirts of our village, seemingly before a limit is set by a Neighbourhood Development Plan – which is yet to be adopted by the Stratford upon Avon District Council, for developments that are just far too big to fit comfortably within the infrastructure of the village – The land that is under constant aggressive threat is an invaluable green resource, and its existence is part of what gives Tiddington its identity. Over development on the Knights Lane sites will result in coalescence with Stratford upon Avon, which has already happened on the Tiddington Road side of the village. With increasing erratic weather patterns, torrential downpours and resultant flooding are more and more a feature of our lives. A lot of older houses in Tiddington have cellars which are prone to flooding – I know this from personal experience, having had mine flood twice due to existing old and unkempt storm drains being unable to cope with the volume of surface water pouring into them – so the idea of covering yet more open space with concrete seems like madness to me. The roads infrastructure is already unable to cope with the increase in traffic. Parking in the village is already a contentious issue, with increasingly more and more households supporting more than one car, with many of these cars being parked on the public roads. Often, people can’t park in the road in which they live, thereby causing friction by taking up space in surrounding roads where there is a similar pressure. There is often quite simply no parking available for visitors. New housing developments tend to offer the minimum parking space per household, which given today’s general increase in cars per household, is simply unrealistic. New developments will inevitable cause more parking pressure on already congested roads. New Street and Oak Road are simply not equipped to cope with the volume of traffic that a new development off Oak Road will create. Knights Lane is already under pressure with a

		<p>school, a football club, and a residential home for the elderly located along it, not to mention being a car park as well. Recently we also had issue with employees from the NFU using the side streets as an overflow car park, but that has perhaps been resolved. There are already safety issues on Knights Lane for children and the elderly. It would be utter madness to increase the volume of fast moving traffic even more, which is what would happen were any of the proposed sites in the village to be realized. Travelling into Stratford has become untenable. It seems ironic that with more and more houses being built in and around Stratford, providing more and more purchase power, the town has seldom appeared as bleak as it is now with so many empty shops. More and more people from Tiddington travel to Warwick, Leamington Spa and Coventry to shop. Why should I have to travel all this way when I have a potentially perfectly good town 2 miles away from me? The proposed installation of yet another set of traffic lights on the south side of the river will, in my opinion, completely strangle traffic flow into Stratford. Cycling is simply not a safe option, and were I a mother of school going children, I would certainly not entertain it as a viable method of transport. Schooling in the village is another concern. Alveston C of E junior School is a wonderful village school, and by definition, that means small and intimate. Increasing numbers at the school will lose the school this character, and exacerbate the already critical traffic issues experienced by both people dropping off or picking up children, and residents on Knights Lane who suffer this traffic chaos. And then there is the question of where all these children will go to high school. Stratford High School is already oversubscribed. The catchment area for this school must have to be regularly altered to reflect the increasing number of houses within the town. At what point will Tiddington no longer fall within this catchment area? Students from Alveston experienced difficulty gaining access to SHS several years ago, Tiddington will be next. The next nearest, Kineton High School, will in turn will have its own pressures from developments there. There has been no mention at all of a new High School being built. Doctor's surgeries are under extreme pressure. To get an appointment with a popular doctor of choice, can take up to two weeks. Although sadly, that is almost hardly relevant as each doctor has so many patients on their books, that I think they hardly remember one from one visit to the next. Again, no mention of new surgeries being built to cope with all the people all these new developments will produce. The environmental surveys completed by all the separate developers paint a rosy picture of life for wildlife in the remaining green areas after they have built -in isolation. Has any attention been given to the impact on the environment should several of these proposals actually come to fruition? A lot of people choose to live in Tiddington because of what it is and has to offer – a village with easily accessible green space. It is tragic that the heart and character of the village is under constant threat</p>
--	--	---

			of destruction by over building. If not this threat this week, then another next week. A lot of residents are either elderly and unable, or young with families and getting through a week is trouble enough, and so unable, to be constantly campaigning and objecting to development proposals to keep our village from becoming an urban sprawl. This lack of complaint may be taken as acceptance, but it most definitely is not.
183	Sharon Taylor		I believe the housing allocation for Tiddington is way too high. The village does not have the infrastructure (roads and education) to sustain such an increase in homes. As recently as 2008 a further 40 homes were added to the village and I believe this should be taken into account. Within the BUAB there is nowhere near enough space for another 100+ homes so it's necessary to build on open countryside to meet this number. I find this completely unacceptable. With a lack of any real communal open space within the village (nowhere near enough to satisfy this NP's plans own policies or CS.24 (Core Strategy), a much smaller number of housing would have been suitable, leaving the fields alone for our unofficial breathing space.. More like 5 - 10 % of the 635 current housing stock., many of these flats for old people so don't take up too much land.
184	Brian Rose		Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any

		<p>development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We</p>
--	--	--

			<p>also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>
185	Wendy Harris		<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park</p>

		<p>of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that</p>
--	--	--

		there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.
186	Douglas Harris	<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development</p>

		<p>and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>
187	Pan Birch	Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have

		<p>the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that</p>
--	--	--

		<p>site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>
188	Doris Jeffs	<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building</p>

		<p>Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not</p>
--	--	---

		<p>provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>
189	Terry Jeffs	<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the</p>

		<p>village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better</p>
--	--	--

		<p>position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>
190	Jonathan Webster	<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents</p>

		<p>from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>
191	Dorothy Hodge	<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with</p>

		<p>housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic</p>
--	--	--

		<p>gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>
192	Barry Robinson	<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk</p>

		<p>from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington</p>
--	--	--

			to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.
194	Kerry Gulley		<p>The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is totally disproportionate to the current size of the village and the infrastructure that supports it. Local roads in to town are frequently congested and the addition of traffic lights at Clopton Bridge is a long way from being proven as the solution. Tiddington has no doctors or dentists, no public recreational facilities and limited shops. Alveston school is already expected to be at capacity for the foreseeable future and secondary school children do not qualify for free bus travel to Stratford schools. All of this results in frequent short journeys to and from town by residents. In addition Tiddington, a relatively small village, contends with a large volume of commuters working at the NFU and using their Social facilities, plus users of Stratford Football Club and traffic for two local schools. If the current allocation of additional housing MUST be maintained, I believe the least impact on the local roads would be achieved by utilising land at the end of Knights Lane which would have access directly on to Knights Lane and encourage exit from the village at the Loxley Rd end, thereby minimising the impact on internal residential roads. However, careful consideration must be given to maintaining a strategic gap between development here and existing / new housing on Loxley Rd, in order to maintain Tiddington as a separate village entity. If this option is not possible and housing MUST be on Tiddington Fields this should be limited to the area currently identified as 2a to prevent future development sprawl across green space behind Hamilton Rd. Bearing in mind that access to sites 2a and 2b through Oak Rd and Hamilton Rd would not only increase traffic on these roads but would also impact on Knights Lane as a feeder road and New Street, no access to 2a should be allowed through Oak Rd or Hamilton Rd. Tiddington Fields is currently used by local residents as recreational space and accommodates permissive footpaths. Development of this area should include a guarantee that adjoining green space is protected from future development and given over as recreational space to replace that lost to development of 2a.</p>
200	Susannah Parry		<p>I object to the Neighbourhood plan of Tiddington Fields being the preferred sight for new houses in Tiddington for the following reasons: - The proposed access from Oak Road and New street is unsuitable as these roads are small residential roads which are already very busy and could not take more traffic. There are many hazards already from parked cars and children playing in the street and increased traffic would lead to these roads becoming more dangerous. The turning from Knights Lane into Oak Road is sharp, meaning traffic has to swing out to get round it. This and the positioning of the a bus stop on one side make it a hazardous junction which with increased traffic could cause many problems. - It would be detrimental on the whole village to lose the fields which contain many footpaths which are used by public for exercise and dog walking. - The local amenities including the</p>

			school would not facilitate an increase in villagers. The school is already full and difficult for villagers to get their children in to. - I feel that if the Village has to expand there are other more suitable sites available such as Knights Lane which have less impact and disturbance on the village. Although I feel Knights Lane is the more suitable site for such expansion I still feel it is important that Tiddington remains a separate village from Stratford and that a suitable strategic gap is maintained.
204	Mr and Mrs Pritchard		Tiddington Fields as 'preferred' site in Tiddington: only 20% of Tiddington Residents completed the survey on where proposed housing should be in the village. We are concerned that many villagers did not have their say, and as such the assertion being made here is not representative. There needs to be further consultation with villagers. A follow up survey to select preferred actual proposed developments should take place. The survey took place in August 2014 when there was no imminent planning applications, which may be the reason for the low response rate ... i.e. people didn't see any significance. Also, the Neighbourhood Plan states that access to Tiddington Fields 'should' be via main road . This has to be 'MUST' be via main road. Access to this development via Oak Road is simply not safe; it's a narrow residential road where children play and there are lots of parked cars.
210	Rachel Syson		Agree
211	Alex Quinn		The maximum number of houses allocated to Tiddington should be reduced, particularly as there is no provision for improved services to support the additional strain on roads, schools, parking, access, public spaces and services such as GPs, dentists etc.
212	David Tucker		The LSV Allocations should recognise the special nature of Alveston, which is unique in the District, having most of the Village as a Conservation Area with several important Heritage Assets and significant Flood Plain constraints. Development should be limited within the BUAB to small scale and appropriate housing, which conforms to the Alveston VDS 2015.
221	Lindsey Quinn		Greater effort should be made to avoid developing green field sites - these should be used in exceptional circumstances, not as an unfortunate side-effect.
222	Gareth Walton		Any development on Tiddington fields would have major negative impact on the residential centre of the village, where parking and traffic is already at its limits. Local infrastructure is simply not up to the extra traffic and would make it a far more dangerous place for local residents, especially for the high percentage of elderly and children who live in the area.
227	Maggie Greaves		Tiddington is in danger of being swamped by housing with all the proposed planning in the pipeline. How can residents make decisions when the answers/proposals are not fully there? Tiddington Fields

			does not have the correct access/exit through Oak Road on to an extremely busy Knights Lane. Planning permission has already been granted for 32 homes on the Home Guard Club that the village has yet to absorb.
230	Mark Taylor		Any of the developments suggested for Tiddington involve the destruction of arable land with huge diversity of wildlife. In the fields of Tiddington people can hear the larks which inspired the poetry of Romeo and Juliet - it will be a cultural crime to wipe them out.
253	Daniel O'Donnell		The policy, through the upper limit of the number of houses looks to promote less development than the local plan, as such would undermine the policies of the local plan.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H4
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Important that contamination aspects considered. We bought our house a year ago and the assessment for contamination of land and prior use was a very important factor.
018	Stephen Wreford		The existing brownfield sites within Tiddington should be released immediately by SDC for development i.e. the gravel pit. It is shameful that large developments are proposed in Tiddington when land exists within the BUAB which could be used in preference - but sadly SDC is actively resisting and release. Please refer to Tony Perks for further details of this site. Another site is owned by Orbit i.e. the garages and these are expected to come up for disposal soon.
025	Jane Dodge		A very sensible solution.
038	Amanda Waters		Strongly support. There can be no argument and this should go a long way to meeting housing needs.
048	David Bowie		Protection of greenfield land is very important, so I strongly support this policy. I have concerns over the ability to enforce it, given the clever arguments put forward by developers. 'Exceptional circumstances' need to be defined better, e.g. what would NOT qualify as 'exceptional'
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. We must use all brown field sites especially around the canal before any further greenfield. If necessary and if owners refuse to release them, empty warehouses should be subject to

			compulsory purchase at undeveloped prices.
067	Richard Edward Hooper		There should be a requirement for new developments to be on brownfield sites before greenfield sites are even considered
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree
077	Anne Parker		I would definitely support 20 mph zones in all residential streets - be bold!
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support. Keen to see positive work with landowners and partners in the town to enable brown field sites to come forward throughout the planning period
092	Suzanne Helen Bower		The strategy of choosing brownfield over greenfield would not only preserve our green spaces but regenerate empty unused homes & buildings which are an eyesore around the town. I fully endorse this.
095	Eric Ward		Too weak: should read "Proposals for development on greenfield land will be resisted as long as brownfield land is available"
116	Thelma Bates		More housing on Birmingham Road will only add to the traffic problems. I do not agree with this.
125	Mandy Last		There should be no building on green belt at all ! I am worried that building on brownfield sites will increase the likelihood of flooding. The more we build on or concrete over or build roads on such places the less places the rainwater has to drain through the land. The pipes and drains struggle to cope as it is now. It is however preferable to building on greenfield sites.
135	Kate Bates		Strongly support the use of brownfield sites over greenfield
139	Renny Wodynska		I would be extremely concerned if Wellesbourne Airfield was deemed brownfield site that can be developed on. Firstly it is an incredibly historical site for its connections to WW2. Secondly the local area would be horrendously and adversely devastated - from a quiet rural area to busy town - it is NOT what local people want and it is inappropriate to build a new town there.
140	Alan George		I would be appalled if Wellesbourne Airfield was deemed to be a brownfield site that can be developed on. This is a very historical site due to its connections with WW2 and has visitors from round the country to see the Vulcan and to see shows there. Secondly the whole area would be utterly decimated if a housing development of any proportion, hundreds or thousands, was allowed there. It is in the middle of the country and NOT suitable.

143	Chris Strangwood		I agree that you should first consider all brownfield sites as a priority.
174	Sarah Eglin		any development along the canal must involve a better commitment to keep the canal clean
180	Evelyn CONN		Brownfield development should be the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th priority before any possible consideration given to permanently remove any more green space. Single agenda developers and the out of touch, greedy Stratford Town Trust should be fought for not just my younger generation but those of the 22ndC. Secondly, the Brownfield space by the old cattle market must please be turned into environmentally sensitive housing for the younger community and old with single bedroom units forming the majority of the plan. These should not be just social housing but aspirational units that youngsters can start to buy/rent from sympathetic developers/owners. Mine and other Universities manage this why not the Town/District Council ?
181	Carl CONN		Brownfield development should be able to meet our local housing needs on a pro rata basis. Of course the rapacious developers will want the Council and District to meet the whole of the long term plan in the very shortest time but this should be resisted and development allowed only on a pro rata basis. I also feel that the Town Council needs to work very quickly with local retailers and introduce the European norm of having residential units above retail units. This is especially effective in creating one bedroom housing that the youngsters in the town so desperately need.
182	David White		I strongly believe that there is slack of desire and imagination in this area. There are many small parcels and larger areas of brownfield land which could provide homes, but a reluctance to use them. It took ages for the developments on Evesham Place (Old Town Mews) and Chestnut Walk (former surgery) to be built. Better work must be done in this area.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Fully agree with proposal to utilise brown sites fully before other sites
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		There should be a much stronger emphasis on the use of brownfield sites ahead of ANY greenfield developments. The Council should maintain a register of potential sites and ALL developers should be forced to exhaust these before submitting proposal for swallowing up greenfield sites for bigger profits.
210	Rachel Syson		Agree

212	David Tucker		In strongly supporting the use of brownfield sites, how does the District propose to deal with Wellesbourne Airfield in the light of new Government Guidelines? The close proximity of this site to Alveston renders its sympathetic development a matter of considerable concern, giving the chance of a low cost Eastern Bypass to link from the Banbury Road to the Wellesbourne/Barford Bypass and the M40/A46 and a mixed use development of housing and commercial property.
215	Portia Hazel Conn		Please continue to pursue Brown field and garden infill as a way to for fill our quota of government decreed housing.
228	John Campton		Brownfield v Greenfield definitely good policy although do not trust government as will promote housing at the expense of anything and everything . Government will ditch Localism as it suits them.
253	Daniel O'Donnell		The presumption against development of Greenfield Land is not in accordance with the NPPF.
278	Joan Graham		I think redevelopment of brownfield land - so that green field land is left undeveloped - is very sensible.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H5
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Garden land should be protected. It should be ensured that this is only used when there are no other options,
018	Stephen Wreford		This policy is limiting opportunities for development within the Tiddington BUAB where many huge gardens are in evidence. This policy is as odds with NPPF Para 65 i.e. Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal's economic, social and environmental benefits)
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
038	Amanda Waters		No view

056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
064	Richard Eden		Housing Needs Survey is essential. How can solutions be devised if the requirements are not clear?
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree. This is consistent with the Alveston VDS.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Support, important to preserve the character of the town. Any development in gardens needs very careful consideration, increase in traffic, parking and compromising important town settings should trigger refusal.
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
116	Thelma Bates		I do not think we should have high density housing with rat runs.
135	Kate Bates		Feel far more use should be made of garden sites which tend to involve small sustainable numbers of new build houses to a high design spec.
148	MRS NICHOLE SOUTH		Aside from the fact that it is ridiculous to build on Tiddington Fields due to traffic, taking open space from its residents and the planning consultant stating "he is concerned about erosion of the strategic gap between Tiddington and Alveston along with the related traffic. It would be far more viable to have Knights Lane as the preferred site, as it would mean less traffic on the smaller roads in the village and a genuine strategic gap between Stratford-upon-Avon and Tiddington. e: Tiddington Fields
174	Sarah Eglin		agree
195	Alan John Whiting		I support all the comments made by the TVRA in their response Email on 21/7/2015
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Greater powers are required to stop "garden grabbing"
210	Rachel Syson		Agree
211	Alex Quinn		The policy should be much stronger on the use of garden sites for development - they should be considered under extremely exceptional circumstances.

212	David Tucker		Support, but there must be recognition that some very large gardens are now inappropriate to modern lifestyle and sympathetic development may provide a limited source of housing in sensitive areas such as Alveston.
221	Lindsey Quinn		Greater effort should be made to avoid developing garden sites - these should be used in exceptional circumstances, not as an unfortunate side-effect.
228	John Campton		Good policy
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Look at Shipston or Alcester to see very good example of H5 (a/ b/ c/ d)

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H6
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Overall when compared to Leamington and Warwick Stratford is on par with these housing markets. If anything Stratford is slightly slower and cheaper. Therefore affordable housing should be considered but it shouldn't be pushed too far.
018	Stephen Wreford		I support this policy
025	Jane Dodge		Affordable housing should only be for people who actually work in Stratford and should be supported by a Housing Need Survey to ensure there is a need and that it is in a sustainable location. We should not be providing affordable housing for people who live in other major conurbations.
038	Amanda Waters		No view
049	Gillian M. Hayward		Affordable housing, this needs to be restricted to shared ownership schemes rather than rentals. At present so much is rented which seems to defeat the purpose which is as I understand it to enable folks to get onto the property ladder, but wealthy landlords are snapping these cheaper properties up first.
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We support this policy. However, for it to be relevant other policies need to enable this policy to be implemented across all settlements in the NDP area including at Alveston. As noted above Policies H1, H2 and H3 as currently written will impose severe constraints to the delivery of local needs housing in Alveston.

056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Continuous monitoring of provision and need is essential
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree but the definition of "affordable" needs to be looked at- the reason why so many younger families do not live here is simply the excessive price of housing.
063	Tony Goddard		For the future of the town it is critically important that developers are required to build specific proportions of affordable housing.
070	Matt Sharpe		Regarding affordable housing I am left wondering whether such housing will ultimately serve its purpose of being affordable for young people, or simply be snapped up by buy-to-let landlords.
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree
086	Jenny Fradgley		Important to maintain 35% by floor space. When conditions allow affordable housing to be constructed off development site this needs to happen within a reasonable time span
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
139	Renny Wodynska		I am totally opposed to the building of rented affordable housing which will be pepper potted amongst owner occupiers. I say this as someone who works in the housing sector, with people who rent. The no of problems and issues from people who are renting, anti-social behaviour for example, makes me feel that in today's society this no longer works. Having lived myself until last year by council housing and then by tenants of Orbit Housing I am totally against being in the vicinity due to the no of problems caused by a few anti-social tenants.
140	Alan George		I am totally opposed to the building of rented affordable housing alongside that for owner occupiers. Due to people's changing natures and an increase in anti-social behaviour I am against this.
143	Chris Strangwood		This should be a priority for all arears and not necessarily the town
174	Sarah Eglin		strongly agree
182	David White		Vital to keep our children in the town. There is too much four and five-bedroom developments which encourage wealthy outsiders when we should be helping our own youngsters.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Happy to support more affordable housing

202	Mr Mark Rowlands		I disagree with this policy. There is no justification to have such a policy to change the profile of Stratford residents.
210	Rachel Syson		Agree
211	Alex Quinn		The policy should lay out some guidelines on the quality of new homes, not just the mix. Standards should be applied to the number of parking spaces, the sizes of gardens, the width of the roads and the supporting services that must be included for developments of differing sizes. Generic, cheap, red brick boxes are an eyesore and serve nobody in the long run.
221	Lindsey Quinn		The quality of housing, roads, parking and other provisions should take equal precedence as the types. The council should set standards as to how much garden and how many parking spaces are provided, as well as the width of roads.
253	Daniel O'Donnell		The policy is not in accordance with national guidance limiting S106 contribution for developments under 10 dwellings.
256	Valerie Ansfield		Affordable Housing should be prioritised in areas where car ownership is not a requirement to get access to shopping and other facilities i.e. towards the Town Centre. Brownfield sites offer an ideal opportunity for concentration of these.
257	Bennet Carr, Headmaster	King Edward VI School	Affordable Housing. The requirement for and provision of affordable housing especially for keyworkers such as state school teachers.
278	Joan Graham		Affordable housing, particularly for growing families who work in the area is badly needed. (1,2 and 3 bed).
282	Anne Marian Kiely		IMPORTANT to use criteria under Policy SSB4 / SSB5 for Social Housing to be used for whole of BUAB proposed new boundaries. Recent events in Grove Road / Arden Street / Birmingham Road emphasise the importance of EXCLUDING undesirable people from Neighbourhood.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H7
018	Stephen Wreford		I support this policy

025	Jane Dodge		I agree
038	Amanda Waters		No view
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We generally support this policy. However, whilst on bedroomed dwellings may be appropriate in Stratford –upon Avon, demand in Tiddington and Alveston for such small units is likely to be weak. We therefore recommend that separate market housing mixes be included in this policy for Stratford upon Avon and for Tiddington and Alveston. For Tiddington and Alveston, the one bedroomed requirement of 10.4% should be added to the 4+ bedroomed mix. For the other house size categories the mix should remain broadly the same.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed but needs to be firmer "Developments of 10 or more units MUST meet the ..."
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
125	Mandy Last		There already enough properties for higher earners. There is more need for affordable homes with a priority to young Stratfordians and lower paid workers so they don't have to pay exorbitant rental charges. My husband and I live in a 1 bedroom flat the mortgage all paid and would love to move to somewhere with 2 bedrooms but are in low paid job so just can't afford to. I'm a Stratfordian of several generations and was told before I moved out of my parents' house at 29 that I should become pregnant to get a council house by a councillor canvassing for votes prior to a local election.
143	Chris Strangwood		This does not make any sense
174	Sarah Eglin		strongly agree
210	Rachel Syson		Agree

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H8
018	Stephen Wreford		Tiddington already has a large older population given the number of retirement's homes. The village

			needs a wider age base to keep it vibrant. This policy should be resisted in Tiddington.
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
038	Amanda Waters		No view
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We support this policy. However, for it to be relevant other policies need to enable this policy to be implemented across all settlements in the NDP area including at Alveston. As noted above Policies H1, H2 and H3 as currently written will impose severe constraints to the delivery of housing for an ageing population in Alveston
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	The figure of 10% of dwellings to be bungalows appears both arbitrary and high. With land being a scarce and finite resource this is not an efficient use of space, especially in an urban environment. Appropriate use of lifts/stair lifts should be encouraged to enable less able people to continue to live in multi-story properties. Some indication should be given of an acceptable level of growth in care home capacity during the plan period.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed. Housing should incorporate what is suitable for all ages to avoid "ghettos"
059	Maureen Dartnall	N/a	Older residents housing...I & many others have been searching to downsize in Stratford - but no suitable accommodation exists....moving from a 3 bed house to something smaller is impossible as any decent new build house is too expensive. Will the council ensure affordable bungalows/flats/houses are built in the private sector for older residents thereby freeing up family homes?
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
102	Mike Storey		I agree with the provision of housing to meet the needs of an ageing population
103	Joy Hawker		I fully support the provision of providing housing for an ageing population as part of the plan. Such provision would encourage older residents (who are most likely to be one or two people size units) to downsize thus freeing up larger houses for family units - win: win.
116	Thelma Bates		I think a large number of bungalows should be available for the large retired number of people living in Stratford. This could possibly for up larger 3 bed houses for families.
125	Mandy Last		There is a danger of Stratford becoming a town for older people partly because of lack of affordable

			housing.
131	Clive Alan Griffiths		More high quality housing is required for individuals within the area, wishing to downsize for their retirement to be able to move in to. Individuals with large houses and significant gardens and land should be encouraged to in fill with smaller, purpose built properties, specifically targeted to fulfil this need.
143	Chris Strangwood		You need to be careful that you do not agree to old age ghettos. Any housing development should include small bungalows and accommodation suitable for both the elderly and starter homes.
173	Neil Williams		Larger developments (and all the developments put together) require proper facilities. Currently schools are over-crowded and I am not aware of plans to build new ones, there are few shops available and too few car parking spaces. Developers are completely unrealistic when they consider how many cars families require.
174	Sarah Eglin		don't agree - older people have plenty of provision from my perception
210	Rachel Syson		Disagree for Tiddington - we have ample provision of retirement accommodation already.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H9
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Housing for young people and families is important to us. We see the ageing population and it's nice but we feel it can lead to activities in the areas being driven by those who don't work.
018	Stephen Wreford		I support this policy
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
036	Kathleen Margaret Dews		Excellent. Homes, especially bungalows, for older people and affordable homes for young families - yes!
038	Amanda Waters		No view
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We support this policy. However, for it to be relevant other policies need to enable this policy to be implemented across all settlements in the NBD area including at Alveston. As noted above Policies H1,

			H2 and H3 as currently written will impose severe constraints to the delivery of housing for young people and families in Alveston
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed. The main developments should be along the canal and close to schools and shops and the train stations to provide sustainability.
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree
086	Jenny Fradgley		Concern re Key Worker developments that do not take reasonable car ownership into account. The town does not have good transport links so car ownership is seen as important by key workers.
125	Mandy Last		Any new housing MUST have parking for at least 1 car per household. Most families have 2 cars so what is the point of building properties with little or no parking e.g. the new development proposed for the site on the corner of Clopton Rd and Birmingham Rd.
143	Chris Strangwood		The attraction of younger people into the town is a good idea but a review of schools is a priority.
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		I mildly disagree with this policy. I was unable to afford to live in Stratford upon Avon myself when I originally took a job in the town as a single 26 year old. There was such a wealth of options for nearby towns where I could afford to live that it didn't bother me at all. I saw it as a perk that I had a job in such a desirable location that I couldn't afford to live here! I think there is a risk that too much affordable accommodation would dilute the character of the town. Better transport links to nearby towns seems more desirable to me.
173	Neil Williams		Young people need to be attracted to the town as a whole. This does not just mean housing. Too much consideration is being paid to the older demographic in comparison with younger people.
174	Sarah Eglin		don't agree - Stratford is full of new housing estates suitable for first time buyers with young families and the primary schools are all full
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		I disagree with this policy. There is no justification to have such a policy to change the profile of Stratford residents.
210	Rachel Syson		agree

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Employment Section?

Yes 31 (14%) No 193 (86%)

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy E1
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		This is not directly linked to the policies mentioned not your consultation. An additional note is to realise that many people who live in Stratford don't work in the town, thus this impacts employment at a different level. It also impacts traffic.
017	Yvon Ashfield		Lots of good intention, but we need to make Stratford attractive to businesses entering the town.
022	Quentin Willson		Growth jobs and inward investment won't happen unless infrastructure is improved. Companies are leaving Stratford because the existing infrastructure can't cope.
024	Michaela Willson		We won't encourage businesses to invest and employ people when they can't park, have nowhere to go in the evenings and long traffic jams
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed but we need to encourage industry to move out of the town centre and to relocate off the A46. Employment is clearly important but as the town has grown, the historic sites off Masons Road are no longer ideal and would be better used for housing.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Concerned that the small area of green belt land, which already has a business located there, has Ben defiantly ruled out. Land suggested by the inspector, South of the town, is not, in my opinion, suitable for development in this planning period
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
124	John Brennan		Protection of existing employment sites should be vigorous and no more conversions of employment sites to residential should be allowed.
125	Mandy Last		It is very unfair to force small local businesses to relocate because they are in the wrong place when they are in places that were built for that purpose. The businesses at the top of Western road for

			example. The independent garages etc. are in an easily accessible place for people to drop their cars off for MOT's and then pop into town, go to work, go to the Maybird centre: also if they are moved it'd probably be to a place with higher rates so they wouldn't be able to afford the move so putting them out of business and killing more of the town
170	Peter Emmerson		The reference to Manor Farm should be removed from the Explanation section of this policy. There are no converted farm buildings ion in use as commercial premises at Manor Farm.
181	Carl CONN		The town has to embrace the increasing trend for more "working at home". For example, IBM Warwick used to employ over 5, 000 people based at its Warwick location, now nearly all of these are home based and only go into IBM Warwick for occasional face to face(f2f) meetings. Call centre technology will facilitate home working et al. Therefore, we need, an infrastructure that supports better broadband speeds if we are to compete with the Continent where 1TB download speeds is the norm, in say Brussels. Plus more home working and living within the community. Otherwise, we need to keep embracing the service economy in serving visitors better and the workers who work within the sector often younger people.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	These proposals appear satisfactory
228	John Campton		Support
282	Anne Marian Kiely		(a / b / c) SJ - is it not possible to convert some of these office premises into flats / they have been lying empty ever since constructed (new part of Timothy's Bridge Rd) approx. 15 years ago = Shottery Brook Business Park.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy E2
003	William Bruce Horton		Promoting new employment areas outside town centre (Alcester Road/Wildmoor roundabout) will inevitably increase traffic around these areas. Priority should be given to employment in town centre

			which would benefit town centre shops and (in conjunction with other policies in the Plan) increase likelihood of people commuting by foot, bike, etc.
038	Amanda Waters		Strongly Support moving existing employers in town (other than associated with the tourist industry and therefore with a need to be in town) to the A46 to avoid traffic going into town. Suggest provision of essential retail facilities (e.g. sandwich shop, petrol station, cash point, etc. close by to service employees.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	While we support the proposals for the Land South of the Alcester Road, we are concerned about traffic safety on this already busy and dangerous stretch of the A46 and we would like to see the development linked to road improvements in the area.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed that new employment site should be provided off Wildmoor, but why drop the Langley Farm proposal? Even if the Planning Inspector felt it was unsound, if the People of the town feel it is right, then it should go back into the proposals. Major commercial development south of the river makes no sense.
081	Nicholas Oliver		Not appropriate for policy to support locations as yet unknown.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Support exploring the DEFRA land to provide possible extra land for business attraction and relocation
095	Eric Ward		Agree
109	Richard Thomas		Developing this land with its better transport infrastructure is a sound idea.
124	John Brennan		It would seem that large amounts of house building has occurred and will occur south of the river. Corresponding amounts of employment provision should be made even without infrastructure improvements it may well reduce bridge congestion. More provision is needed north of the river.
143	Chris Strangwood		The support for employment near the A46 should not be considered until a clear traffic management strategy is in place. The current delays on this road would cause problems for both current road users and the new businesses
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		I have a nimby concern about this one. Over recent years, as employment at Timothy's Bridge Road has increased, traffic along Bishopton Lane has increased dramatically. My quiet, peaceful garden is now mainly just on Sundays. I worry that the use of Bishopton Lane as a rat run would increase yet further as a result of this development, particularly for people moving between Timothy's Bridge Road and the new site.

182	David White		I strongly oppose this scheme. There is sufficient scope for industrial units on existing sites without another ill-considered development. Count the number of industrial units which have been empty for some time and use them for their original purpose. If they are not wanted for business, reallocate them for housing.
205	Trevor Bruce		Any new development for employment should have a compulsory segregated cycle path included in the plan linking in to the existing cycle network.
212	David Tucker		It would be appropriate to develop new employment opportunities to the north of the Town, served by the A46 and possibly to the east with the additional development considered around Wellesbourne Airfield, which has appropriate north/south links running to the east of Stratford.
228	John Campton		Support
256	Valerie Ansfield		Employment opportunities on the edge of town won't work unless efficient transport into town is available to connect people with their homes.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		There is already concrete evidence that the A46 at this location is extremely dangerous, due to idiotic way in which people drive - some sort of change will be necessary to accommodate extra traffic created by this Policy E2.
295	Cllr Charles Bates		Page 31 There seems to be some confusion between various sites on the outskirts of the Town, where land for employment use could be made available.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy E3
028	Gordon Harrington		This low key statement requires a higher priority. There needs to be more emphasis on the financial/job creation benefits of tourism, with proper recognition of the risk to this of increasing traffic congestion and the real damage to Stratford's heritage aspects resulting from poorly located housing developments (e.g. Shottery).
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Proposals for substantial, permanent art installations should be subject to public competition and consultation

057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed
095	Eric Ward		Very strongly agree
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We welcome recognition of the value of cultural, media and tourism services with the Neighbourhood Area, the explicit acknowledgement of the value of the town's association with Shakespeare and the Theatre and the support for development which creates or maintains employment in this sector. As the theatre is specifically referenced, we ask that the plan references the Royal Shakespeare Company or Theatre. We also suggest the text includes 'a destination for visitors to its historic houses, cultural offer, and attractive riverside setting. We note there is a strong relationship between jobs and public transport and traffic management in the town - and employment cannot be looked at in isolation from the need to provide suitable, reliable and cost-effective options, particularly for lower paid workers.
124	John Brennan		There is no more need for tourism services especially Hotels - tourism is declining, and Stratford needs to diversify.
170	Peter Emmerson		This policy should be strengthened with wider references to the Creative Industries. The current references to Culture, Media and Tourism are too bland. With its existing brand image and concentration of creative skills in both large employers (particularly the RST) and smaller businesses, the town is ideally placed to develop entrepreneurial activities in areas such as video and software design, as well as more traditional creative arts. The visual arts are not mentioned; yet there is already a concentration of visual artists and crafts people working in the town and wider neighbourhood area , as is seen every year during the Warwickshire Open Studios event. There is also a strong, supportive infrastructure in the form of Escape Arts and Stratford VisArts. An imaginative policy to support this group (for example with reduced rents, business rates etc. could, in time, lead to the creation of a location similar to the Jewellery Quarter in Birmingham (if on a smaller scale) which would in itself become a visitor attraction.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Would not wish to see excessive weight given to tourism
228	John Campton		Too much emphasis on tourism etc. at the expense of resident's quality of life. It is a relatively small

			market town which is positively heaving with hordes of visitors - no more.
--	--	--	--

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy E4
003	William Bruce Horton		Replace "Be in reasonably accessible locations to service facilities by means other than a private vehicle" with "Be in locations accessible to service facilities by means other than a private vehicle and where alternative means of transport (walking, cycling) are given priority"
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	We would like to see the addition of a criterion along the following lines: Would not cause nuisance or disturbance to nearby residents through noise, odours, movements (e.g. of customers, agents), or unsocial working hours
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agreed. We need a new "artisan" quarter to attract small businesses, artists etc. That approach minimises travel and ensures that housing, small businesses, shops, restaurants etc. can exist side by side.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Very much support providing small units aimed at local start-ups, cost is a major consideration, we need to structure start up units to be affordable
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	I think this is a great idea, would encourage smaller businesses to be able to open
170	Peter Emmerson		Remove the reference to independent service facilities in Section C.
180	Evelyn CONN		I am appalled by the lack of coordinated, and integrated development of the Town's future. Why can't you take a leaf out of Holland/France/Germanys books and have small, housing units above EVERY SHOP. If you walk along the town, it is a sad testament to the old days of having to keep stock above the shop but in an era of JIT deliveries, direct home delivery and holding very little stock - a huge number of these shops as left waste and underutilised. Younger people often work in these shops and restaurants but have to travel miles away when we would much rather "live above the shop".
201	Graham John	The Inland	Fully support home/work units

	Nicholson	Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	
--	-----------	---------------------------------------	--

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Town Centre Section?

Yes 65 (29%) No 162 (71%)

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC1
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Good idea, interesting to hear how they will make their presence known to residents in the town, not just visitors. It's important that the type of shops we have here are right for the area. It's a strange mix of big chain shops and some boutiques. I'd personally prefer to have a more unique feel to the town, with more independent shops. I worry that the main shops take up the 'main drag' of our high streets, meaning we lose the feel of a market town. A feel like they have in Alcester for example would be lovely.
022	Quentin Willson		Intolerably draconian parking regulation is driving away visitors and residents. They go to Leamington or Solihull because they can park. When parking revenue generation prevents consumer activity it won't be long before the town becomes empty. SDC need to manage their socially destructive parking policies.
024	Michaela Willson		Town centre cost £25 to visit because I always get a parking ticket. There's not enough time to do any shopping because of warden so I go to Solihull
038	Amanda Waters		Support
040	Mark Dickin		Widening of footpaths is well and good BUT the materials should be changed so that broken uneven pavements become a thing of the past; trips and falls by residents / visitors are traumatic and costly. Claims on SDC for injury are costly and avoidable.
050	Andrew McLauchlin		Stratford's heritage, its main attribute and the reason the town attracts tourists worldwide is completely ruined by traffic. Ask the tourists! They cannot believe that cars take precedent over heritage! The most popular and heritage-laden Bridge Street, High Street, Sheep Street, Union Street and Waterside have become little more than congested car parks. Suffocating the historical atmosphere of the town. The other main streets, especially Wood Street, Rother Street and Greenhill

			Street and of course the Clopton Bridge and Gyratory are clogged with heavy traffic. Buses have to use Bridge, Wood and Greenhill Streets. There is no coach station!. It is unbelievable that this problems has been allowed to continue and fester for years with great 'plans' always mere tinkering impotently around the edges! Will this one be the same? Apparently so!
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	We support the proposed formation of a Town Centre Strategic Partnership and the issues it should address. We consider that membership should include representation from residents, or residents' groups, in addition to the bodies listed.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Why consider the old Town centre and the Maybird as different places? Clearly the Town centre will never compete with free parking at the Maybird where the major national stores should be based. The Town should offer a greater range of smaller shops. Needs coordinated approach by Owners and Councils to offer realistic start up rents/costs for first two years.
078	Melanie Jane Forse		I would stress the need to support independent businesses. Stratford has no identity as a shopping centre as it is full of chain shops and tea rooms; we need to diversify
080	Roger Francis Harris	Friends of Lucy's Mill Bridge	The town should have a proper museum so that it's heritage, history and diversity can be celebrated other than just Shakespeare.
081	Nicholas Oliver		I am pleased to see the aim of improving the cyclist and pedestrian experiences.
085	James Furness		The following is a copy of a letter I wrote to the Herald back in April. Until now, I had now idea about this website or a working group which covers the bulk of the points I raised in my letter. Is ask that you consider the following letter and the points I make in your consultation process: York House, 17 Rother Street, Stratford-upon-Avon, CV37 6NB 5th April 2015 James Furness 4 John Street Stratford upon Avon Warwickshire CV37 6UB Dear Editor, I wrote the following in the hope that it might reach out to those who can make a difference and drive thoughts and ideas forward in a positive direction. Undoubtedly it may also provoke discussion. If you choose to publish it I respectfully ask that my name and address be removed. I am happy for my name and email to be supplied upon request. Stratford is good but what could be done to make it great? In recent years town centres, Stratford included, have become tired and a wash with empty shops and poorly used spaces. Stratford has the draw of the Bard and his related tourist attractions but we should not only target our Shakespearean visitors but look to cater for locals and visitors from the surrounding area. There is an abundance of coffee shops and restaurants in the town but very few of these seem to care about the locals and give the impression of a "get them in, take their money and get them out" establishments. As per many

			<p>town centres up and the country the shopping experience is suffering thanks to out of town retail parks. Whilst we need to accommodate, care for and consider our elderly residents we also need to ensure that the town is thriving and desirable for future generations. Night life in the town is scarce and this will only drive the younger generation away in years to come. I believe a successful town should mirror the philosophy of life in that it should have a measured and balanced approach to work, rest and play whilst catering for all ages. So if I were to describe Stratford as great I'd like to see the following: 1) Traffic flow and congestion sorted out with the highest of priorities. 2) Town Square redeveloped to include a nightclub venue. 3) Greenhill Street to be tidied up and to "tie in" with the town 4) Wood Street to be tidied up and to "tie in" with the town 5) Limit the number of charity shops - I understand they pay little or no business rates and subsequently add little value to the town. 6) Train connections to/from London and Birmingham to be faster, more frequent and with earlier starts and later finishes. 7) More high street shopping i.e. Topshop, Next, River Island, John Lewis 8) Kwikfit to relocate out of town and site redeveloped to suit surroundings. 9) Younger chain restaurants to include: Yo Sushi, Gourmet Burger Kitchen, Chiquito's, Nando's 10) Bards walk, to be tied into the new town square development. 11) Old Red Lion Court to Waterside to be tidied up and made more obvious to shoppers. 12) IF Bhs is to close the site to be utilised as an Anchor Shop such as John Lewis. 13) The barns adjacent to Bridgeway Carpark and the Pen and Parchment to be demolished and a more suitable red bus area and taxi rank to be established. I thank you for your time and assistance in this matter and respectfully ask that you advise me if you chose to publish my "wish list". James Furness +447977150997</p>
086	Jenny Fradgley		Leadership will be paramount, and partnership working key to making this approach work and the Town Council is the body to facilitate and lead
095	Eric Ward		Excellent idea
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Football would be increased if parking and traffic were not such huge issues, lots of areas of the town suffer from pavements in bad state of repair and this reflects the first appearances of the town. Great ideas in the policy, Town centre manager would hopefully do a better job than Stratforward
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We are again grateful for the explicit reference to the Royal Shakespeare Theatre in the introduction to this section and applaud the expectations of the plan here. We strongly welcome the idea of a Town Centre Partnership and will certainly be delighted to be included in it. We strongly support Stratforward (or any successor body as its current term is to 2019) leading it.
125	Mandy Last		Stratford used to have a large amount of small, independent retailers in all sectors e.g. greengrocers,

			bakeries, gift shops, ironmongers etc. Now it is overrun with cafes, restaurants a lot of which close down within a year. There are only so many cups of coffee a visitor can drink. The only other shops that tend to stay open are the large national chains, the designer outlets that are well out of the price range for most people and charity shops. We need more seating & public toilets
143	Chris Strangwood		The council needs to consider what Stratford is. At present it's a tourist town and I can't see that changing it is not a place designed for the residents.
173	Neil Williams		You only need to read the comments in the local newspapers or social media to realise that peoples' views on Stratford are not as good as we'd like. Too often the complain of the untidy streets and parks, expense, plus the congestion.
174	Sarah Eglin		agree
205	Trevor Bruce		If the town centre can be closed off to private cars, then the streets can be improved to create a much more inviting experience for visitors. More space to walk/cycle, no noise & pollution, more greenery, open terraces will ensure more people choose to go to the town centre rather than the commercial centres on the outskirts.
212	David Tucker		Whilst broadly supporting the TCSP, it is to be hoped that there is recognition which supports local residents in the District visiting the Town Centre for shopping needs and makes appropriate provision for easy parking as the loss of these year-round customers would further hinder the viability and range of shopping within the Town Centre.
215	Portia Hazel Conn		I would welcome more traffic free areas in town centre especially High Street and please resolve the Henley street traffic free responsibility. Please consider more Moro traffic free areas but allow more cycle traffic.
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	The Board of Stratforward BID Ltd support policy TC1 and feels that Stratforward is best placed to provide the strategic lead for the town centre for the duration of the current BID term to March 2019. In the event of a successful re-ballot in subsequent years we would envisage this role continuing.
230	Mark Taylor		Parking in Stratford-upon-Avon town centre should be restricted to CV37 permit holders only, so that a genuine living town centre can begin to return.
257	Bennet Carr, Headmaster	King Edward VI School	Town Centre Strategic Partnership's As one of the largest employers in the Town Centre, and custodians of one of Stratford-upon-Avon's most important building, we would welcome the

			opportunity to join a partnership of key stakeholders.
295	Cllr Charles Bates		Page 37, Policy TC1. There's no information/explanation as to how funding will be generated to pay for the Town Centre Partnership.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC2
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		With both TC2 and 3 it's important to consider how the shop owners may respond. It think it's a good idea to ensure the town keeps its feel.
038	Amanda Waters		Support
040	Mark Dickin		Cycle routes are varied [Alcester Road v. Banbury Road : Birmingham Road compared with Waterside], not joined-up, without continuity/uniformity and no provision on either bridge for cyclists.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support, in principle. An exception may be Henley Street where Shakespeare's Birthplace and the associated Birthplace Trust building, together with the library, already take up a significant proportion of the street frontage. Further non-retail museum/educational facilities in this area should not be precluded by the 10% rule.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed
080	Roger Francis Harris	Friends of Lucy's Mill Bridge	Commercial property owners should be made to keep empty premises clean, smart and tidy [including painting frontages] and if necessary put temporary displays or artwork in windows. My daughter did an artwork for free on a Wood Street shop hoarding during a renovation when she was still at High School. It got a lot of attention and praise.
095	Eric Ward		Delete "(north side only)"
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24	Great idea, important to minimise the mix of housing and shopping in key areas

		Sheep Street.	
174	Sarah Eglin		agree
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
217	Karen Wild	Stratford Business Improvement District Ltd	Broadly supportive however recognise the need to avoid an increase in vacancies in units that do not afford retailers the correct footprint for their needs.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Why is Sheep Street north side only? (I work in Sheep Street, south side).

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC3
038	Amanda Waters		support
040	Mark Dickin		Buses and coaches should be re-directed to a special area beyond the Leisure Centre; free parking for tourist coach operators, and, " stands " for public transport operators with shelter for queuing passengers.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed. All external For Sale and To Let signage should come down and be replaced with signage within the shop window only.
086	Jenny Fradgley		It has always been problematic to ensure the rigour of the Shopfronts Scheme with SDC. It was accepted, some time ago, as supplementary planning guidance, but has not been systematically applied. Due to lack of SDC resource this policy requires partnership working to ensure its effectiveness
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree

108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Where this has already happened it has made a huge difference to the feel of the town, existing retailers should be encouraged to make positive changes too
109	Richard Thomas		Good to see the initiative of The Stratford Society being taken on.
121	Helen Rowena Warrillow		I support a town centre shop front scheme. The overall appearance of many parts of the town centre is degenerating into a hotch-potch of colours, styles and particularly standards. Such a policy should include the need for signage to be tasteful, restrained and well-designed in order to allow the underlying historic character of the properties, and the town centre as a whole, to be appreciated. I would even support a scheme limiting styles and colour palette.
125	Mandy Last		We are in danger of becoming snobs in regard to shop signage. There was a great amount of complaints to the signage of Pound land when it opened so the company changed it then over the road the French shop opened with bright yellow signage and nothing was said.
174	Sarah Eglin		shop fronts should definitely be kept in keeping with the historic nature of the town - good examples of this are Jack Wills & Marks and Spencers - bad example is BHS which looks horrific
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		I do not agree with a grant to subsidise the cost. Why should the council be subsidising commercial ventures?
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We support this policy
257	Bennet Carr, Headmaster	King Edward VI School	Shop Fronts. We support the plan to extend the scope of what has proved to be a successful scheme to protect the architectural heritage of the Town.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Phase 2 / LEISURE should NOT include cinema. There is already a first class cinema "The Picture House" in close proximity to Town Square. I go here fairly regularly and it is rarely full, or "sold out" except for first couple of days of blockbuster films. Also, the work-out / fitness centre has recently closed down. The inclusion of RESIDENTIAL sites in Town Square would mean the area remains "alive" at all times of day / night. Policy TC3 & TC6 CAR PARKING needs to be set at a realistic level to encourage users not at a prohibitive cost. Perhaps some sort of season ticket for Stratford residents?

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC4
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Great idea. Promoting the market would be great.
038	Amanda Waters		support
040	Mark Dickin		Lighting should be year round- not just for Christmas : the bridges, the Bancroft and Tramway footpath, should have decorative lighting a la Tivoli Gardens all year round. A delight for visitors and residents alike.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. Greenhill Street should also be included as this is the first street seen by persons arriving by train.
095	Eric Ward		Agree
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Agree with this.
116	Thelma Bates		I do not think another cinema is necessary, the one we already have is adequate and rarely full to capacity. A bowling alley is an excellent idea. Perhaps a youth club in the centre to give teenagers somewhere to "hang out". Also shops for locals to use and no more eating establishments or tourist shops.
123	Christopher John Cornford		Although in complete agreement that Town Square is in desperate need of redevelopment (though not a multi -screen cinema) I am concerned about the proposed "upgrading" of the Rother Market area. In my view this area has a villagey ambience and is charming and unspoilt as it stands, an area that should be primarily for the benefit of residents, not visitors and one in which any attempt to make it more attractive is very likely to have the opposite result. Please leave well alone!
174	Sarah Eglin		agree
205	Trevor Bruce		A market place should have easy access and parking for bicycles. Currently there is none of either.

217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We support this policy
278	Joan Graham		All these areas need to be improved, and I think increasing housing in the town centre would enhance the feeling of a market town. People like being close to shops and amenities. We don't all have cars.
295	Cllr Charles Bates		Page 41. Map is out of date as is the one on page 49.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC5
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Think this is a great idea - there is an existing shopping "centre" in the centre of town, linking Debenhams, with the zebra crossing on wood street. This is hardly used and deserted. Time and effort needs to be spent identifying a new use and getting more people to use it.
018	Stephen Wreford		Another cinema is NOT required. This will simply kill off a much loved and supported Picture House cinema. It will be to our detriment.
038	Amanda Waters		support
049	Gillian M. Hayward		I attended the display in Town Square, I consider there is little planned for locals, we need green grocers, fishmongers, a supermarket better than the Sainsbury's we have. We don't need a multiplex cinema as we have an excellent cinema already, and it would be a pity if that was forced to close. We need more individual, independent retailers. At the moment our High Street looks like a myriad of others, at least Worcester's has individuality. A good department store like John Lewis would be fab, we don't need BHS and Debenhams, they try to improve and always fail.
054	Nick Asbury		The permission seems already to have been given for a corporation with no real interest in the town coming in and developing the area, turning it into a bottom line driven, bland, nondescript area. How do we circumvent this once it has been built? What do you put in there? My vision would be to promote, foster and support a 'Borough Market' style Market. (http://boroughmarket.org.uk) Being in

			<p>the centre of the country, we could easily attract suppliers/farmers nationwide. This would create fresh footfall, promote more local business and increase Stratford's identity as an interesting cultural attraction. It is important that it be run by a local business as the import of Geraud Markets (UK) Ltd to run the markets in Stratford has proved such a disaster. Witness the desecration of the Farmer's Market at the expense of the bottom line as an example. This 'Borough Market' could take place all through the environs of the Town Square and the Rother Triangle creating a vibrant, living Countrywide market, an answer to the capital's monopoly, and would be not only a Tourist Attraction, but create jobs and raise Stratford-upon-Avon's name still further in terms of quality and taste. It may also take away the need for things like a 'Multiplex' cinema, which will be a huge white elephant, and leave the Town Square deserted once more in a few years' time. Even with the projected increase in housing, Stratford cannot support even the Picture house, let alone another few screens. It is a sweetener from the developers that we do not need.</p>
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	<p>We strongly support the stated policy. We do not support the plans for which permission has been granted and would like to see the sentence "The first priority is to ensure that the scheme for which permission has been granted is implemented..." removed from the Explanation. A new scheme has been proposed, which would surely require a new planning application. This is a much better scheme, although we are not convinced that a cinema is the best way to anchor the scheme.</p>
057	Trevor Honychurch		<p>Support redevelopment of the Town Square but not cinemas- why not 10 pin bowling to attract all age groups? There would need to be closure by 11pm to avoid noise for residents. Make sure that public toilets are kept. Reference is made to "The scheme for which permission has been granted.." - I thought that a new scheme was coming forward?</p>
064	Richard Eden		<p>The multi-story car park is a unfortunate eyesore. Can the bottom floor of the car park between Rother Street and Town Square be improved to assist the pedestrian link between the two areas? Ideally with shops along that walk way? This would create a parallel shopping zone to Wood Street all the way through to High Street.</p>
069	Judith Benney		<p>I think it is important that the Town Square is redeveloped ASAP. The vistas should be more open to encourage footfall. The development should be very high quality and in keeping with the historic surroundings.</p>
086	Jenny Fradgley		<p>Town Square is missed opportunity now as plans are moving forward. I regret lack of a residential element. Care must be exercised to ensure secondary trading areas in the town do not suffer with increased competition, i.e. Greenhill Street, Union Street, Church Street and the shopping arcades.</p>

092	Suzanne Helen Bower		I agree full with the proposals set out in the Neighbourhood Plan but do not think the proposed multiplex cinema is a good fit with Stratford. We already have a high quality independent cinema.
095	Eric Ward		OBJECT to NCP car park. If retained, serious conditions must be imposed to regularise charging system - e.g. display prices before entrance.
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Anything is better than the eyesore we have been left with since the lovely Bell court was developed. Agree with this policy. If the carpark could be made cheaper too, that would help
125	Mandy Last		Why is the council wasting more money on Town Square, it's a white elephant. Thousands was spent on the consultation and planning of the current design. At first we were to have a covered mall but then it was left uncovered. Most of the shops came and went and most is left empty because of high rates. Now again money has been spent on consultation, talk of a covered area and again this idea has been rejected. The plan is for the square to be filled with cafes and restaurants - surely we have more than enough, and a cinema to put the other out of business. Can the council not give a premises to charities such as Springfield Mind that works to reduce the stigma of mental health etc.
139	Renny Wodynska		I am totally against a 2nd cinema - we cannot manage to fill the Picture house half the time.
143	Chris Strangwood		The town square development needs to ensure that it gives something that the residents require and will be able to use. The car parks must be accessible and at a reasonable cost.
147	Cllr Tony Jackson		I am concerned at the proposed loss of the Rother St car park as part of phase 2. Parking within the town is already limited and this particular car park is ideally situated to service the increased number of people who will be making good use of the enhanced facilities provided by Phase 1. This loss of car parking becomes even more acute if the Windsor St car park is to be lost as part of the proposals in TC10
173	Neil Williams		I don't understand why there is a car park on Rother Market. It is the centre of town, yet people get to see a car park and taxi rank. I appreciate the need for disabled parking, but the rest is unnecessary and is too small to make much difference. There must be a more suitable, attractive use for the area when the market is not there.
174	Sarah Eglin		I don't understand the comment saying phase 2 will be reserved - does this mean it will or won't happen?
201	Graham John	The Inland	Agree

	Nicholson	Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	
205	Trevor Bruce		There needs to be safe segregated cycle access to this new development, along with adequate cycle parking.
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We support the current plans for the Town Square Re-development, including retaining the existing parking provision. We recognise that a residential content may not be appropriate for this site. This site provides the best opportunity for the town centre to address existing gaps in its retail and leisure offer for the 18 - 35 age group that are currently lost to competing centres, e.g. Leamington Spa.
228	John Campton		Hope they make a better job of it this time. Town Square currently a disgrace.
278	Joan Graham		All these areas need to be improved, and I think increasing housing in the town centre would enhance the feeling of a market town. People like being close to shops and amenities. We don't all have cars.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC6
038	Amanda Waters		What will the traffic impact be? It's difficult. We need less traffic in the town centre, but more people!!
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Not really sure about this- the Waitrose development is on the outskirts of town and means that traffic from the South does not have to cross town- that must be good.
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Agreed
109	Richard Thomas		Is this one too late, but of course I support it.

143	Chris Strangwood		If you stop any further retail development then more of your residents will go further afield. I very rarely shop in town because I queue to get in and parking is too expensive. Also there are very few shops to attract me in on a weekly basis just when I need something specific.
173	Neil Williams		There is no need for any further out-of-town supermarkets - 4 is enough for a town of Stratford's size. The Maybird is adequate for Stratford's needs. Any further developments will further decrease shopping footfall in the town centre, where a lot of shops are struggling already. Local developments are fine and there are too few in some areas of the town.
174	Sarah Eglin		agree strongly
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We support this policy.
278	Joan Graham		All these areas need to be improved, and I think increasing housing in the town centre would enhance the feeling of a market town. People like being close to shops and amenities. We don't all have cars.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Policy TC3 & TC6 CAR PARKING needs to be set at a realistic level to encourage users not at a prohibitive cost. Perhaps some sort of season ticket for Stratford residents?

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC7
038	Amanda Waters		Yes, agree with increasing living space above shops, and this will help with increasing the number of younger people in the town. Can this contribute to reducing the number of new houses which we are told must be built?

039	Katherine Burnett	Canal & River Trust	Within the Explanation for Policy TC7 – Increasing the Presence of Housing in the Town Centre, it states “particular locations for housing development or conversions are...the canal frontage...” We consider the canals can be used as tools in place making and place shaping, and contribute to the creation of sustainable communities. However, we would require any development at the canal frontage to not adversely affect the integrity of the waterway structure, quality of the water, result in unauthorised discharges and run off or encroachment; detrimentally affect the landscape, heritage, ecological quality and character of the waterways; prevent the waterways potential for being fully unlocked or discourage the use of the waterway network. We would seek for any development to relate appropriately to the waterway and optimise the benefits such a location can generate for all parts of the community. Within the Explanation for Policy TC7 – Increasing the Presence of Housing in the Town Centre, it states “Housing within the Regeneration Area will have access on foot or cycle along an improved canal side...” While we welcome proposals for an improved canal side, we wish to understand what improvements are proposed? We would welcome engagement to identify what improvements are needed, how these will be funded and maintained. This is particularly important if improvements are proposed to our land.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed
059	Maureen Dartnall	N/a	Conversion of first floor premises sounds like leasehold...this is NOT what older residents want.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Very much support residential use of spaces over shops where appropriate.
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree - important to boost town centre vitality
109	Richard Thomas		I strongly support the encouragement of first floors above retail premises for housing.
135	Kate Bates		I strongly support infill housing in the town centre. A far better solution than greenfield development.
143	Chris Strangwood		As above , we are the residents and tax payers. Think about our needs.
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We support this policy
278	Joan Graham		All these areas need to be improved, and I think increasing housing in the town centre would enhance

			the feeling of a market town. People like being close to shops and amenities. We don't all have cars.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Look at developments in Shipston and Alcester Town Centres (conversions or new build) to see buildings are designed in keeping with existing properties. Parking needs to be based on at least two cars per household.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC8
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Finally all your environmental policies sound good.
038	Amanda Waters		support
048	David Bowie		There should be proposals for tree planting and green 'oases'
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree- This is a key area
064	Richard Eden		Agreed that Greenhill Street needs upgrading. Possibly wider pavements and narrower road? How can you keep traffic out of town? - By making it turn left along Arden Street. E.g. like when the MOP is on. This would help Wood Street which is very congested. The roundabout at the top of Bridge Street is a pedestrian and traffic crossing point. If all the traffic could be made to go down Guild Street, A3400, this would relieve the town centre. Many cars going via town do so to look at shops and people rather than to find the best way through town.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Work has begun on Greenhill Street, but much more needed. Lobby government to give more powers to local councils to force landlords to address maintain acne on their properties and address voids within a reasonable time scale. Rents in secondary business streets need to be structured to encourage independent business. When the Gateway development comes forward this is the agreed area for a bus layover / station to take busses out of Bridge Street, leaving this as just a pick up, drop off point

095	Eric Ward		Agree
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Agreed about the shop fronts
123	Christopher John Cornford		In your document Bridging the Gap I am not entirely sure what is meant by the term "Rother Triangle" and I dare say other people are equally uncertain.
126	Clarissa and David Roberts		Regeneration of land in the Canal Corridor between Mason Road and Birmingham Road is the most cost effective and sensible achievement of the additional 700 plus dwellings required.
143	Chris Strangwood		Move the Bus station as it is, and the coach park by the railway station. Anyone coming in by train can then get a bus into town.
205	Trevor Bruce		Creating a segregated cycle link between the station and town centre is way overdue. Why not extend it all the way up to the end of Alcester Road?
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	Broadly supportive however consideration should be given to the direction of traffic movements. Currently it is not possible to turn right from Alcester Road on to Grove Road. This forces all traffic along Greenhill Street in order for them to turn Right into Rother Street; including through traffic. During the MOP traffic is permitted to turn right into Grove Road from Alcester Road, allowing this movement generally could assist in making Rother Street a more attractive area for investment.
278	Joan Graham		All these areas need to be improved, and I think increasing housing in the town centre would enhance the feeling of a market town. People like being close to shops and amenities. We don't all have cars.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Timing of light on heavily-trafficked crossroad is TOTALLY in favour of cars. It is just about possible for me (with a bad back) to cross Arden Street (at either side of Greenhill Street) in the time allowed when I am alone. Faced with an approaching band of visitors with wheelie suitcases, or mothers with prams, people pushing bicycles, etc. - or as one person within such a band, the phasing for pedestrians is ludicrous and you are reliant on cars not starting to cross the junction while pedestrians are on the road. Surely it must be technically possible to make this light phasing pedestrian sensitive?

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented	Policy TC9
--------------------	------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------

		(where applicable)	
038	Amanda Waters		support
048	David Bowie		There should be proposals for tree planting and green 'oases'
049	Gillian M. Hayward		The so called Art House, quite a disappointment. Beautiful dance floor very little used these days, such a shame as it used to host some wonderful fund raising dances for excellent causes. Over the last few years these events have pretty well all fallen away because the hire fees have been raised to such a high level. This issue really needs rectifying. Added to this the Market area leading towards the multi storey carpark is where the alcoholic drop outs tend to gather, it can be quite intimidating there for a lone shopper and this is happening in broad daylight.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support, conditional upon the preservation of the gardens at the tip of Rother Triangle, especially the mature trees. This area is much loved by Stratford residents, forms an attractive entrance to the town and acts as the setting for many Bed & Breakfast businesses, which are one of the core tourism attractions of the town. The trees may, in some small way, serve to counteract the very poor air quality in this location. This valuable resource should not be traded for a (much lesser) public area contrived as part of the Master Plan.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree- we need much more green planting and cycle friendly routes through town
095	Eric Ward		Addition needed: . . . mixed uses including residential . . . However, this area should be considered for the much needed BUS STATION, which is not in conflict with TC9.
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We generally support this policy.
278	Joan Graham		All these areas need to be improved, and I think increasing housing in the town centre would enhance the feeling of a market town. People like being close to shops and amenities. We don't all have cars.

Code	Full Name	Organisation	Policy TC10
-------------	------------------	---------------------	--------------------

Number		represented (where applicable)	
038	Amanda Waters		Somewhere we need to have a 'gateway ' to the town. Currently tourist coaches can offload here. There needs to be something either here or (preferably) at the railway station which creates a transport hub for tourists, with tourist information here perhaps as well as at the bottom of town.
048	David Bowie		There should be proposals for tree planting and green 'oases'
049	Gillian M. Hayward		Well some work also needed here, only yesterday on Birmingham Road area in the mid-afternoon there was a pretty horrific incident, involving a group of "unfortunates", one of whom I believe lost his life in the incident. This is not the first violent assault in this area, which I believe is the preferred location for a group of drug addicts.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support. For clarity, Mansell Street should be included in the boundaries. Designs which would impact adversely upon the visual amenity of Henley Street should not be permitted. This would preclude buildings of more than a given (to be specified) height and would encourage the use of traditional materials.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree with Cultural Quarter
064	Richard Eden		It would be great if Birmingham Road could be turned in to a tree lined boulevard with wide paths.
078	Melanie Jane Forse		This area on the Birmingham road is an eyesore of boarded up buildings. These offices/dwellings need to be brought back into public use asap. It is a shocking sight when driving into affluent Stratford.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Commented on Gateway in TC8
095	Eric Ward		Include residential use, with parking, and parking for all the uses listed
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Agreed, this leaves a terrible first impression of the town when arriving from the station
143	Chris Strangwood		The Birmingham road is a mess and need more than prettying up.
147	Cllr Tony Jackson		The potential development of the new Gateway proposal may mean the loss of the Windsor St car park and we must have some contingency to protect any remaining car park space. As such I would

			suggest that the potential loss of Rother St in TC5 should be removed from phase 2 (see comment under TC5)
173	Neil Williams		Currently the area is a bit of an eyesore, so it is good to see the plans to redevelop the area. It needs to be sympathetic to the town, with proper consideration taken for potential traffic issues.
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We generally support this policy.
278	Joan Graham		All these areas need to be improved, and I think increasing housing in the town centre would enhance the feeling of a market town. People like being close to shops and amenities. We don't all have cars.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Why is land immediately south of Ct and Police Station, in Figure 6 not shown as "Parks and Gardens"?
295	Cllr Charles Bates		There's no mention of Windsor Street Car Park in Policy TC10. However, the vision set out in the policy seems to have little in common with a car park. The need for car parking close to the Town Centre has been emphasised within the Neighbourhood Plan, and as such TC10 seems to be at odds with policy TC14. Page 56 & 57.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC11
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Learning quarter sounds good - need to make sure it's is used and becomes a hub for residents and visitors alike
038	Amanda Waters		support
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support. Designs which would impact adversely upon the visual amenity of Henley Street should not be permitted. This would preclude buildings of more than two stories in height and would encourage the use of traditional materials.
057	Trevor		Agree- this whole area needs to be traffic free during the day

	Honychurch		
095	Eric Ward		As TC10
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We are surprised that proposals for a Cultural and Learning Quarter would not explicitly reference the Historic Spine nor acknowledge the cultural and learning offer at the other end of the spine. We welcome support for proposed development of the offer in Henley Street, but would be strongly opposed to any naming of this area as a new 'Cultural and Learning Quarter'. As the text rightly acknowledges, the Plan should reference 'Stratford: A Cultural Town'.
170	Peter Emmerson		I disagree with the statement that there is "no evidence that there is a need for a large-scale development of visitor facilities". In my opinion, much of the initial experience offered to the independent visitor is of poor quality. Firstly, most independent visitors will begin with a search of the Internet. This is confusing with a plethora of amateurish websites. The whole on-line identity of Stratford should be reviewed and brought together effectively. Secondly, the town's car parks compare very unfavourably with those at major tourist towns abroad. The so-called Shopper's Car Park in Windsor Street (actually used by many visitors) is particularly bad, being dirty, dark, and badly maintained, with no functioning lift. Thirdly, the physical tourist information office no longer provides a fully effective service. Fourthly, with no bus station, there is no integrated public transport hub. Although the Plan makes reference to this lack, the policy to remedy it is not clear. Limiting the location of new museum, education and public exhibition facilities to the Henley Street/Meer Street/Windsor Street areas seems very limiting, The need is not so much for a new Shakespeare museum (which is relatively well provided for in the Birthplace Trust properties), but for a museum of the non-Shakespeare history of the town, such as Escape Arts has started to provide in the Old Slaughterhouse in Sheep Street. Harvard House could provide an excellent location.
174	Sarah Eglin		How is this further established? Platitude unclear what it means
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement	We support this policy.

		District Ltd	
230	Mark Taylor		It is impossible to create a cultural centre for visitors when their experience involves seeing endless housing developments more in keeping with Slough and Warrington, and the experience of sitting in permanent traffic congestion before arriving at what will be a fake cultural experience set in a modern homogeneous horror.
255	Sylvia Morris		This is not clear - cultural area seems to exclude N side of Henley St and SBT property. SBT has plans to build on its property at end of Henley Street which would make this unnecessary (if it isn't already). But the diagram contradicts the words.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC12
038	Amanda Waters		support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree but is not the car parking & coach parking well used? If we lose that where do the visitors & leisure centre patron's park?
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		I do not support this proposal. The town does not need a conference centre to bring additional traffic chaos to the town when there is already a lot of capacity for conferences at the large Stratford hotels.
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We generally support this policy.
226	Debs Campton		Developing a conference centre near the Leisure Centre will further exacerbate congestion and gridlock with additional traffic on the Warwick Road and Birmingham Road - roads already overburdened with traffic. A site off the A46 would be a better site and prevent further traffic passing through the Town Centre.
228	John Campton		No conference centre for Town Centre - already heaving

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC13
010	David Izen		<p>Please do not even think about closing the High St to traffic unless you consider opening the Waterside to two way traffic. As a resident of Old Town there will be no other way out of town by car. There are four schools in old town if you include Shottery Girls, and parents struggle through the High St to get out of town. If you close the High St can you tell me and all the other car drivers how we can get out of town towards Warwick? I think closing roads thinking that all the cars will just disappear and go somewhere else makes no sense and is not born out by any evidence. In fact closing the Waterside to two way traffic has forced more cars on to the High St, creating the problems you are now trying to solve. Using the Henley St closure as good evidence is disingenuous as you must know that all the cars have simply gone onto the surrounding roads - they haven't disappeared! We can't look misty eyed back to some bygone age before the car was invented. Closing busy roads to traffic just because you don't like the cars is like trying to put the genie back in the bottle. Better to accept that cars are a reality and open the Waterside to two-way traffic to reduce the number of cars going through the centre of town - which is what you want to achieve.</p>
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Very important!
038	Amanda Waters		<p>Completely agree. But it's key to keep motor vehicle access before and after these times to ease congestion. Also, there should be cycle lanes to enable cycles to continue to use these streets during closure to other vehicles</p>
048	David Bowie		<p>This is an absolutely essential policy to improve the town environment. As well as widening pavements etc. I would like to see much more positive intention to pedestrianize the main shopping streets. Despite the whingers, this has worked very successfully in many other towns. The need for different traffic management is recognised, but is secondary to the key objective of making Stratford attractive again. And what about tree planting???</p>
055	Dr Ian G Heggie		<p>Improvement (b). I would have preferred to see a shared space demonstration scheme in High Street. In due course, it might also be applied to the roundabout outside Barclay's Bank. The demonstration</p>

			would introduce residents to the concept and, if successful, could then be rolled out to other parts of the town centre.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed. We need to be bold and to break the hold of cars & coaches through the town.
064	Richard Eden		A) Sounds good. B) Sounds good. C) See TC8 above. Also, good town centre roads will help cyclists. And possible more cycle rails for locking bikes up.
066	Brenda Stewart		As a cyclist I find it dangerous and difficult to cycle .Present cycle provision is very patchy and discourages cyclists. There should be a more integrated approach to cycle provision and more priority should be given to cycles and pedestrians in the town centre.
070	Matt Sharpe		I would much prefer this area to be entirely car-free, and for use only by pedestrians and cyclists. On the rare occasions such as Shakespeare's birthday when cars are removed from the town centre, the place is greatly transformed.
078	Melanie Jane Forse		We need more pedestrianised streets. The proposal is still too cautious. In Worcester the main shopping streets are all free of traffic and it is a joy to walk there. Bridge street should be traffic free after 9am.
081	Nicholas Oliver		Creation of 20mph zone would be of next to no benefit in improving cyclist experience - the vast majority of traffic already travels at 20mph or less, due to the nature of the streets. In Bridge Street, retention of four lanes of traffic, with car parking at 90 degrees on both sides of the road, does not represent a reasonable, balanced and fair apportionment of the space available for pedestrians, cyclists and motorised traffic. Nothing written in TC13 will be beneficial for cyclists.
083	David Sheen	Sporting Barbers	Peoples main concern is the lack of free parking and the lack of available space you seem to want to take away concern is the lack of free parking and the lack of available space you seem to want to take away available parking causing more dissatisfaction with the general public
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support a trial of shared space High Street, possibly Sheep Street. We need to understand the impact on traffic before any more permanent schemes are proposed
095	Eric Ward		a) Add a pedestrian crossing at Red Lion Square (to reduce jay-walking); b) agree, with misgivings!
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The	Agree that some pedestrianisation would help, but need more parking close to shops if this happens

		Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We support broad proposals to improve the balance between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists and urge planners to actively look at shared use schemes where possible, to slow traffic and improve pedestrian circulation. We do not want to see pedestrianisation which removes cars in the evenings and at night. A shared environment provides greater personal safety for late night visitors in the town centre, for instance, walking to the station after a performance.
121	Helen Rowena Warrillow		I am broadly in favour of an experimental closure for Henley Street but would suggest that only vehicles for emergency or essential access should be permitted thoroughfare at the experimental stage, thus testing it as a true pedestrian zone.
125	Mandy Last		Making High St pedestrianised is quite a good idea but must NOT be contemplated or put into practise until the traffic situation has been improved. There is enough chaos when roads are closed for the mop, Christmas market etc. Bridge St pavements should not be widened until there is better provision for buses.
143	Chris Strangwood		This proposal makes no sense, how do you get from Church street into town except through to Rother street which you are going to redevelop? If you want to pedestrianize an area make it bridge street. Traffic that wants to come into town can go either down waterside or Guild street, , make Windsor street one way the other way and traffic wanting to leave the town can use union street and, Windsor street and Arden street, Rother street.
147	Cllr Tony Jackson		I am a big advocate of pedestrianisation so in principle a pilot scheme has my full support. However the wording of TC13 is potentially too prescriptive and some flexibility might make the objective easier to achieve. e.g. a) can we also include Sheep St within the proposal as a street for the potential to be pedestrianised b) a successful pilot will almost certainly be dependent on reconfiguration of the existing road network e.g. change of Riverside to two way traffic between Bridge St and Sheep St c) a definite commitment to a 6 month trial will cause significant issues if the pilot is quickly shown to be unfeasible. We need to have clarity over potential break clauses.
154	Wendy Appleby		I fully support the introduction and reinforcement of proposed and existing cycle routes. There are not enough safe cycle routes in the town and cycling is dangerous and not encouraged. Children should be able to cycle to school safely and pedestrians and cyclists should share common spaces, particularly from Tiddington (where there are 2 caravan parks) to Stratford town centre.

173	Neil Williams		Bridge Street is unnecessarily wide for vehicles. The footpaths should be widened - it is currently very difficult to walk down there at certain times of the day. It is also often untidy and filthy with a lot of litter (particularly near McDonald's). It is the least attractive street in the centre of town and is in need of an uplift. As long as parking is improved, Stratford can handle further pedestrianised areas. There is a vast improvement in the ambience of the town centre when the streets have been closed (Christmas Market, Car Festival etc.) and it would be nice to have that the whole time. High Street is the obvious choice, Bridge Street should be improved in terms of pedestrian access and Sheep St could be considered.
174	Sarah Eglin		I think pedestrianisation of this area is a good idea - I would like to see more street markets and cafe frontage to add to the historical and cultural charm of the area
180	Evelyn CONN		My biggest criticism of the plan is your lack of understanding of the benefits and essential need for more cycling in the town. It should be your priority. Other bodies will highlight driving and commuting routes, however you have the most to lose/gain by a much more comprehensive cycling plan. Cycling should be the default way for people in the town to get around the town. It works in Holland, Denmark, increasingly so in Bristol and London but your plan is underwhelming in its plans to embrace the inevitable rise in cycling within the town.
205	Trevor Bruce		No private cars should be allowed to park on the street in the town centre. Only public transport, delivery vans and emergency vehicles should be permitted. If cars are removed, people will be encouraged to walk/cycle into town. Historic buildings should not have parked cars in front of them spoiling the appearance.
210	Rachel Syson		It will be essential to provide additional on-street parking spaces if you remove those on the South Side of Bridge Street (Boots side). These spaces are vital for the quick pop into town for essentials. If we can't get parked, we will go elsewhere, and the town centre shops will lose trade.
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We support shared space. Additional crossing areas required at the roundabout linking Bridge Street, High Street and Wood Street.
226	Debs Campton		Given the difficulties experienced by residents in negotiating their way around and through the Town Centre with the current congestion problems I do not think it is a priority to improve the visitor experience by restricting traffic flow with road closures. Think of the traffic disruption engineered

			during the Mop - a nightmare. Already residents find Stratford a "no go area" at weekends and at times on weekdays before 4pm.
228	John Campton		No already difficult enough to navigate way around and through town.
255	Sylvia Morris		Support pedestrianisation and particularly 20 mph speed limit in the centre. Plans must show they will cope with the extra displaced traffic. On-street parking should not increase - it encourages more traffic on streets where it exists.
256	Valerie Ansfield		The High Street is the most sensible access route by car to Chapel St. Sheep St. Church St. areas and should not be closed to traffic. Movement keeps it looking like an alive Market Town! Short term parking is the key to use of these shops by RESIDENTS.
257	Bennet Carr, Headmaster	King Edward VI School	Improving the balance between Vehicles, Pedestrians and Cyclists. We strongly support the two proposed schemes. Widening pavements in Bridge Street will provide more space for passengers (including our students) waiting for buses. We strongly support the proposals for High Street and WOULD SUPPORT AN EXTENSION OF THIS PROPOSAL ALONG CHAPEL STREET.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		In HIGH STREET, a pedestrian / zebra crossing is required b) between exit from Town Square (opp. Tesco proposal store) to get across road in relative safety. Pedestrians in rush hours rely on drivers being considerate (huh!!) This is even more the case at roundabout between High Street / Wood Street / Union Street / Bridge Street - utter nightmare in the summer, pedestrians feel like skittles waiting to be mown down. Policy TC13 Explanation:- balance in Henley Street now seems to have been lost? With cars able to drive through here at any time of day?
295	Cllr Charles Bates		The idea of closing High Street to traffic between the hours of 11am and 4pm is totally impractical (indeed stupid), if Waterside continues to be one way towards Old Town. However, it could be acceptable, should Waterside be returned to two ways between Sheep Street and Bridge Street. I would dispute the fact that Henley Street has achieved a successful balance between day time and evening use. Although very well used during the day, it becomes a dead area in the evenings, and appears to be a no-go area after about 7pm. This, I would suggest, is due to the design and layout of the street.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented	Policy TC14
--------------------	------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------

		(where applicable)	
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Agree. Parking is great in town and very reasonable price wise. The use of traffic wardens and consistent parking charges helps.
028	Gordon Harrington		There needs to be more emphasis on the need for the car parking charges policy and pricing to encourage more shopping in the town centre. The importance of more realistic and affordable business rents to encourage new businesses and discourage the loss of existing businesses should be included here.
038	Amanda Waters		Yes, agree. It needs to be sorted. One hour free at Bridge Street is perfect, as it allows residents long enough to pop to the shops. It could be changed to residents only? And extended to other car parks.
048	David Bowie		Pedestrianisation will require good parking facilities close to the centre. Church Street should be extended by a second storey and fully opened to the public. The Plan should specify sensible measures, not leave a key policy area to some advisory body - this is a cop-out.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support in principle, but the wording comes across as being very car-centric. Convenience of shoppers should be strengthened to include the creation of an enjoyable visit to the town, where traffic is removed or calmed, site lines of historic buildings and visas are not obstructed by parked vehicles, pavements are wide enough to accommodate all (including an increasing proportion of slower, elderly folk, and growth in the use of mechanical mobility aids), noise levels are low and air quality high.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed. The 1 hour free at the Gyrotory car park is very useful and should be extended to all car parks- payment on exit rather than buying a ticket at the start of the visit makes for a less stressful visit (don't need to keep watching the clock & bad news when visitor gets a ticket for being late back). Council needs to look on the car park as a service not as a money spinner.
064	Richard Eden		There are some existing car parks which could be made multi storey which would help. The bridges over the Avon should be revisited. The previous example was the wrong design. A good design might be more welcome. Lucy's Mill Bridge should be upgraded to enable easy access by more pedestrians, wheelchairs, pushchairs and cyclists. This bridge needs attention and not just left to get worse.
081	Nicholas Oliver		Disagree that the strategic objective for car parking should be determined by businesses. The strategic objective should be determined by the needs of all Stratford residents, of whom business

			owners form a small minority.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Major emotive issue but our Park and Rides do not work as well as they could.
095	Eric Ward		Advisory Body needs to work on this before Policy is finalised. NCP: See my comment on TC5
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Rosebird park and ride is unusable for anyone that works, 30 minute buses are just not practical, plus it is really expensive, Shipston side visitors and workers need something to stop them having to drive into or through town. Affordable parking for workers. Direct debit payments for monthly rather than 3 monthly for season tickets as is now. More pay on foot carparks. Great idea to implement a team
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We welcome proposals which acknowledge the prosperity, vitality and competitiveness of tourism and cultural attractions, as well as businesses and shops. We suggest this therefore also includes a reference to visitors as well as shoppers. We hope the policy also states that Park and Ride is not an effective option for late night audiences or employees returning after evening shifts.
121	Helen Rowena Warrillow		I believe a review of parking in the town is essential and would like to see the following on-street parking issues addressed, particularly for Stratford residents who are usually parking with a particular objective in mind. a) There is no opportunity for a quick 'pick up' stop. Initially we had 15 mins free - but this has long gone and forces shoppers to out-of-town locations for ease of access and parking. Please bring it back. b) There is too much intolerance with parking 'crimes'. Shopping requirements or appointments become very stressful if they have to be abandoned because there is insufficient time to get back to the car. We need a method for some lee-way. c) There are particular problems for churchgoers on Sunday mornings. Firstly, they are forced to pay, despite there being no competition at this time of day for the spaces, and secondly, even if they do pay, the maximum parking is for 2 hours. Charging for Sunday parking has come about as a consequence of the relaxation of Sunday trading laws but, in Stratford, this is now having the effect of penalising churchgoers. Also, churches are a place of community as well as worship and many people require or desire to be in attendance beyond the 2 hour maximum parking but are unable to do so legally. Knowing this, traffic wardens, in their teams, can usually be seen descending on a church area 2 hours and 11mins past the church Service time (the 11mins is thanks to the government). This is yet another example of parking intolerance and I would like to see parking charges removed prior to 12 noon on a Sunday and also after 5pm, if only for residents. I suggest the introduction of a 'residents parking tolerance permit' for car windscreens, giving special dispensation to Stratford residents for certain situations, may address these concerns and potentially any others which are raised. What is lost in parking fines would be gained in goodwill for the Council.

125	Mandy Last		The dropped kerbs in the town centre need to be improved as some of them are still rather high and are difficult pushing a wheelchair up them. I sometimes have to use a wheelchair and my husband who is in his thirties has trouble pushing me up them so how someone who isn't strong manages I really don't know. Particularly at the crossing by the Island by the One Elm
143	Chris Strangwood		Car Parkin should be totally reviewed with more park and ride schemes on the edge of town, especially the Warwick road car park to go with the Rosebird and Bishopton.
154	Wendy Appleby		Car parking in the town centre should be made for resident's local residents who use the on street parking to drop into the shops in town, usually less than 1 hr. The traffic around the gyratory system is unacceptable and must contribute to very poor air pollution levels.
170	Peter Emmerson		A growing problem in Stratford is all day on-street parking by office workers avoiding car-parking charges. This is a particular problem in the Western Road/Timothy's Bridge Road/Bishopton Lane areas. Traffic circulation is hampered and emergency vehicles would find it very difficult to reach the scene. This anti-social activity should be firmly banned with severe penalties in case of ignoring the regulations.
173	Neil Williams		All car parks should have a pay on exit format. No more pay and display. This would encourage people to park there, with no pressure to get back to their car. The car park on Church St used by the council should be returned to a public car park. There is no excuse for the council to have their own and they should be setting an example - no one else in town gets their own car parking. I think the P&R is a lost cause, unfortunately. There is no incentive to park there when the bus to town takes as long as driving themselves, getting stuck in the same Birmingham Rd traffic jams. Perhaps the council can use it. The recreation ground car park needs an entrance further up the Shipston Rd (next to the Rushbrook Stream) as it can take hours to exit!
174	Sarah Eglin		agree
205	Trevor Bruce		All on street parking for private cars should be removed to force people to use the designated car parks. This will give space for wider paths and missing cycle lanes.
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We broadly support this policy, consideration of the current pricing structure is required as many car parks are underutilised due to the high level of parking charges. More reasonable charges would increase usage and duration of stay; this would have the potential to reduce traffic movements.

228	John Campton		Good to regulate car parking - charges in Stratford so much higher than in Leamington and Warwick . Greedy
256	Valerie Ansfield		Car parking should not be considered in isolation from a Park & Ride Scheme; parking at the Maybird should be charged for & the income generated put to funding proper Park & Ride. The Park & Ride to the Maybird should be reinstated as a priority and traffic directed to use it on an ACTIVE basis.
257	Bennet Carr, Headmaster	King Edward VI School	Parking in the Town Centre. Car parking should support Town Centre businesses as well as help reduce congestion. A co-ordinated system to signpost drivers to all pay and display car parks including our own, and not just Stratford District Council's car park, would help reduce congestion particularly at peak times.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Perhaps look at how Ely (Cambridgeshire) manages its parking, for a small city. There are car parks where parking is free of charge for either one , two or four hours- people decide how long they are likely to be in the town and use the appropriate car park. Charges are then applicable after 1, 2, or 4 hours. As mentioned previously, Park & Ride now discontinued on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Perhaps cost per person is too high? Perhaps cost should be per car, with all the occupants at a very reduced (or free?) rate? Also, Knowle (nr. Dorridge) has Town car park f.o.c. for 0-3 hours during day, then charges per additional hour up to 6pm, when free all evening!!

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC15
038	Amanda Waters		See comments above re transport Hub.
055	Dr Ian G Heggie		It might be useful to add that WCC would be invited to establish designated advisory coach routes through the town. Coach operators would not be "forced" to use these routes, but encouraged to use them. One travel agent noted that her coaches travelled along High Street and Sheep Street because no one had asked them not to!
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed but we shall need to do more than "encourage".

095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Agree, coaches need designated route and drop down pick up zone
125	Mandy Last		No coaches should be allowed to go along Old Town beyond the end of Southern Lane as it is just too narrow and there isn't a lot of room for them to turn outside the Methodist Church. Would it not be a good idea to have a bus station either by the new station or Waitrose with just the buses for local estates, park and ride buses and small shuttle buses taking people from town to the bus station. This would then free the town of buses so improving traffic flow in Wood St and Bridge St.
143	Chris Strangwood		This should not be voluntary
174	Sarah Eglin		agree - motorbikes are an even bigger problem as are lorries which park in front of Sainsbury's taking out three or four spaces at a time
210	Rachel Syson		support
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward	We support this policy
228	John Campton		Needed

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC16
002	Susanna Sutton		Coach tours around town with registered Blue Badge Guides are very important to show visitors that there are more places to shop and eat than just Bridge St. I think all coaches doing tours should have qualified guides on them who know where they are going.
003	William Bruce Horton		Cycling into and within town centre is currently unpleasant and dangerous, especially for children. This policy should be significantly strengthened by extending to more areas and incorporating an integrated network of pedestrian/cycle paths that encourage non-car use and enable non-car users to move more freely and safely, and give priority to pedestrians/cyclists at crossings and junctions. The piecemeal approach proposed will not achieve this.

018	Stephen Wreford		A safer junction is required for cyclist from Tiddington/South of the river crossing Clopton Bridge. Cycle lanes should be provided to Tiddington using pavements where wide enough and cycle lanes on the road where necessary.
038	Amanda Waters		Cycling should be prioritised. But security for cycle racks also. I am discouraged due to the likelihood my bike will be stolen, as well as by the danger on the road. School cycle paths should absolutely be encouraged. At the expense of motor transport in the town centre if necessary.
049	Gillian M. Hayward		A lot of effort was put in to establishing cycle lanes on the Evesham Road, so now the road gets more congested than ever with vehicles and do the adult cyclists use it? No most don't, they just hurtle down the pavement and ring their bell at you, pedestrians go in fear of their lives sometimes because we think we are safe from cycles because they have their own lanes. Problem is they always get away with it. So I hope the expense and effort you put into TC16 will be worth it, cos for Evesham Road it sure isn't.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support. However, care must be taken to avoid creating traffic-free areas in the town centre which permit cycling and so create a hazard for pedestrians.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. All new developments must provide segregated cycle routes and pay their CIL contribution to be spent within the Town on improvement.
064	Richard Eden		Cyclists find it unpleasant top a) cycle on bad surfaces, b) navigate round parked vehicles near corners or congested areas, and c) to cycle on narrow roads with fast traffic going by. Cycling should be encouraged all the time by ongoing council members.
070	Matt Sharpe		I am glad to see cycling mentioned and I hope the plans are strong. The town is currently very cycling-unfriendly. Stratford at the moment feels like a cars-first town. When I see articles and videos about how cycling is prioritised (above cars) in towns elsewhere Europe, I feel that we could do much, much better here in the UK.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Stratford Town should be a cycle friendly town but it is not. Major consideration should be given to cyclable routes around the town and out of the town along the major roads, especially to the South
091	Chris Houghton		The wording of the plan is not clear about how pedestrians and cyclists are to be separated and could be taken to suggest that they share the same space. This would be a mistake as experience in London shows. Footpaths are used by the elderly, the infirm and disabled, young children and mothers with pushchairs none of whom should be exposed to cyclists moving at speed. It is hardly justifiable that

			because the roads have become too dangerous for cyclists they should themselves become a danger to pedestrians.
095	Eric Ward		Important. Strongly agree.
143	Chris Strangwood		Proper cycle routes not 'stupid' white lines on the roads.
154	Wendy Appleby		The cycling provision in the town is very poor and there are no safe routes to school, the cycling. Routes on the main roads are too narrow and the Clapton bridge is dangerous. More consideration needs to be given to linking cycle routes and sharing spaces.
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		FANTASTIC! Not really sure how you'll do it, but making Stratford cycle friendly would be fabulous.
174	Sarah Eglin		strongly agree - cycling is particularly difficult around the one way system around the leisure centre and Grosvenor Hotel area
180	Evelyn CONN		Again, far too cautious a plan for cycling . EVERY school should have utility cycle routes as a priority with three inch high kerbs removed at every junction an access route throughout the town. Just one small example, if a parent and child want to cycle from Birmingham Road along Clopton Road to the Thomas Jollyfe school, one is faced with either a narrow path on the west side of the road by the rear of Maybird shopping centre or a myriad of three inch kerbs on the wider east side of the footpath. The Clopton Road itself is far too narrow and dangerous for children to cycle along. This detailed planning should be done at every approach to every school. I would conservatively estimate that you needed to plan for a minimum of 500% increase in cycling around the town in the next 5 years
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
205	Trevor Bruce		Cycle to school routes have to be segregated from motorised traffic 100%, not "wherever possible". You can't expect parents to allow their children to ride on painted cycle lanes in the road with lorry's passing a few inches away!
210	Rachel Syson		The Tiddington Road/Clopton Bridge/Shipston Road/Banbury Road gyratory it particularly tricky to negotiate. Should we have to go ahead with the new junction design (apparently agreed under the Meon Vale development), cyclists need to be provided for

217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We support this policy
228	John Campton		Ok
255	Sylvia Morris		Support cycling routes. Rother Street / Evesham Place / 7 Meadows are very dangerous.
257	Bennet Carr, Headmaster	King Edward VI School	Cycling in the Town Centre. Proposals for safer cycling within the Town Centre which will actively encourage students to cycle to and from School.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC17
003	William Bruce Horton		Aesthetic appearance of Maybird Centre could be improved dramatically through planting (inc trees) and reducing area given over to car parking. This would also be consistent with policies to increase levels of walking/cycling and contribute to Env Improvement Area
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Improving the look and feel of this area would be great and be a great thing for Stratford.
038	Amanda Waters		Agree
039	Katherine Burnett	Canal & River Trust	Policy TC17 - Town Centre to Maybird Centre Environmental Improvement Area states “The creation of lively and active street frontages consisting of residential and mixed uses linked to the canal side proposals in accordance with Policy H3;” We would welcome clarification on the reference to policy H3 which appears to relate to Local Service Village Allocations. Policy TC17 - Town Centre to Maybird Centre Environmental Improvement Area states “The creation of a pedestrian and cycle link using the existing disused railway bridge over the canal to facilitate links with the Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone as well as with the Maybird Centre via the canal towpath.” We would welcome engagement to identify if new pedestrian and cycle links are proposed to the towpath.
048	David Bowie		There should be proposals for tree planting and green 'oases'

056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. We need to link Town Centre and Maybird and the new Canal Quarter and not think of them as separate units.
064	Richard Eden		Yes, all good and in line with an international boulevard atmosphere.
066	Brenda Stewart		Strongly agree with this. The Birmingham Road approach into town could be made much more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists.
070	Matt Sharpe		Glad to see this mentioned, as this area is pretty grim at the moment. A crossing making use of the old railway bridge would be excellent.
091	Chris Houghton		As above. There should be clear separation between cyclists and pedestrians.
095	Eric Ward		Well thought out. Strongly agree.
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Great Ideas
125	Mandy Last		The proposed development of the area on the corner of Birmingham Rd and Clopton road needs to have provision for at least 1 car for each apartment.
143	Chris Strangwood		Before this is considered, first look to see if widening this road would be advantages for through traffic. This road is everyone worse nightmare and is about to get worse with some of your plans.
174	Sarah Eglin		very good idea
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		To further support this policy, there should be no McDonalds drive-through take-away on the junction of Western Road / Birmingham Road. Such a development is totally contrary to the vision for this area and should never have been granted planning permission.
210	Rachel Syson		support
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward	We support this policy

		Business Improvement District Ltd	
226	Debs Campton		Invest in the infrastructure and long term strategies to improve traffic flow in the area. Do not invest in traffic calming, pavement widening and the like which will further slow an already clogged area.
228	John Campton		Cosmetic - sort the real problems. There has been inadequate investment in infrastructure by Warwickshire County Council.
278	Joan Graham		Improvement much needed.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Traffic is a major concern in this area - how to reduce number of cars needing to use this route? See idea re: Park & Ride (above). Do not understand location of "existing disused railway bridge over the canal..." in final bullet point.
295	Cllr Charles Bates		Currently Windsor Street is one way towards the Town Centre from Mansell Street. Is it suggested that it should be changed to make it one way from Rother Street towards Birmingham Road?

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy TC18
038	Amanda Waters		Agree
048	David Bowie		The tramway bridge could be widened; it isn't an engineering impossibility to do this while preserving its character. A new footbridge would be unnecessary, a waste of money and highly controversial.
055	Dr Ian G Heggie		I think this should be more specific. What is really needed is both a short and long term plan of action. In the short term, keep left signs might help to increase capacity and -- during peak summer weekends -- flows need to be monitored via CCTV so that Town Hosts (or others) can intervene when problems arise. In the long term, a relief bridge must be provided. Where and what kind of bridge are key issues to be consulted on.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support. However it is important that this important feature and the surrounding area are not compromised to deal with levels of congestion that occur rarely and predictably, and could be

			handled by temporary controls on those occasions.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed but the Tramway bridge is only congested during peak summer weekends and when festivals are held on the Rec. For most of the time, there is no problem.
064	Richard Eden		A statistic says on 15% of traffic coming in to Town is through traffic. I don't believe this covers the traffic problem. During peak times, probably 80% of traffic is through traffic. Has this been studied? Understanding the incoming traffic is critical to finding solutions. Clearly this bridge needs an upgrade. Two decisions a) does the bridge need and upgrade Yes/No. After that decision has been made b) how is it to be funded? If it's needed, then funding solutions need to be identified.
086	Jenny Fradgley		A second bridge is becoming a real consideration as the town becomes more successful at attracting visitors and locals to its festivals
095	Eric Ward		Cyclists should use Clopton Bridge (hundreds do).
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Stopping people sitting on the bridge begging would help the flow, and people selling random things. important gateway to town, currently un tidy and a let-down with the faulty lights etc.
147	Cllr Tony Jackson		The obvious solution to congestion on the Tramway Bridge is to build another bridge crossing - see comments under INF4
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
205	Trevor Bruce		There needs to be a safe cycle crossing over the river. Currently we have two car bridges, two pedestrian bridges and zero cycle crossings. A new crossing needs to be built at the tramway end of the river, and the Seven Meadows bridge needs to be reduced to 30mph to allow the road to be narrower in order to make space for a segregated cycle path connecting the greenway to the old tramway by Waitrose.
210	Rachel Syson		Agree - see comments above re TC16. Crossing the river by bicycle is very difficult at present.
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement	We support this policy. Permanent keep left signage required.

		District Ltd	
255	Sylvia Morris		Tramway Bridge. Need better signage, bollards etc. to discourage cycling on the bridge.
278	Joan Graham		Use of this bridge by pedestrians might be helped by a new Lucy's Mill Bridge so that it would have easy access for prams, cycles, etc.

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Built Environment and Design Section?

Yes **45 (20%)**

No **183 (80%)**

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE1
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		All sounds like a great idea. Continuing to keep residents engaged would be appreciated.
022	Quentin Willson		We need to be much more architecturally sympathetic. Parts of Stratford already look like Milton Keynes. Every new building must respect the architectural tenor and be worth of inclusion in the town because its visually sympathetic.
024	Michaela Willson		Stratford has become ugly, with inappropriate buildings little greenery and too many buses. Shakespeare would be horrified
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
038	Amanda Waters		Fully agree with all the proposals in the BE section, particularly bringing empty buildings back into use.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support. Unfortunately the term 'high standards of design and layout' is subjective. Developers should be called upon to explain how they have addressed this requirement and what alternatives they have considered.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Yes but the wording is difficult. We do need a variety of design (all of good quality) to avoid the Town growing simply as a Medieval copy.
063	Tony Goddard		There does not seem to be any comment on the maximum housing density of any new developments. This is important in order to maintain the character of the area. Densities seem to be getting higher and higher and this often seems to conflict with the density of housing in the surrounding area.
064	Richard Eden		All large scale developers should be involved in the wider traffic management solutions. They should not build developments to attract more traffic without offering solutions to the increased traffic load.
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree

109	Richard Thomas		A complicated area but attention to this whole matter is so desperately needed, the proposals are too complicated for me to comment on though. I do generally support the whole section.
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We applaud the desire to ensure that all large scale developments demonstrate a high standard of design and layout. This is something we have always endeavoured to provide in our capital programmes and we know our audiences also value the heritage of the town.
139	Renny Wodynska		To me as Jo public and not a civil servant or local government person this is full of meaningless words! We want limited development in this country and certainly in Stratford which has been ruined already. The numerous housing developers must be laughing at this section - some of the developments are shocking. Compare them to somewhere like Bourneville in Birmingham where thought was given properly to green space, gardens and so on.
140	Alan George		Much more control required on all development, Stratford is being ruined beyond recognition.
174	Sarah Eglin		agreed - but this is such a subjective judgement - the visitor centre at Shakespeare's birthplace is horrendous for example, as our many of the new hotels on the Birmingham road and some of the buildings around the canal between town and the Maybird centre are ugly too
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
226	Debs Campton		Built Environment & Design Section - very thorough and well thought out.
228	John Campton		Yes
278	Joan Graham		All very good principles and should help the town keep its unique market character.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE2
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support

057	Trevor Honychurch		Not really sure what Local Character is? Quality materials, green planting and walkways are crucial.
092	Suzanne Helen Bower		This is a very important policy for this town. It would be very easy to spoil the character & identity of Stratford and the town's economy depends heavily on visitors who are attracted by its uniqueness.
095	Eric Ward		Agree
139	Renny Wodynska		As above! What has gone wrong so far to allow so many hideous developments?
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
221	Lindsey Quinn		Much more effort should be put into the appearance and quality of building in the district. Far too many buildings are poorly designed eye sores that do not fit the character of the town.
228	John Campton		Yes
278	Joan Graham		All very good principles and should help the town keep its unique market character.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE3
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
028	Gordon Harrington		This should stress the need to consider more seriously the implications of large new housing developments on local services, particularly educational and medical. It is not responsible for the RDC to say, in response to recent objections to the 800 house Shottery development proposals because of insufficient secondary education facilities, that this is a matter for Warwickshire County Council (when space and funding are not available).
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support. Master plans should explain how features designed to ameliorate adverse impacts (e.g. traffic congestion, noise, flooding risks) address not just present circumstances but also expected future changes (traffic growth, climate change etc.)

057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed
059	Maureen Dartnall	N/a	Will consideration be given to some sort of Public Transport to both Birmingham & London (Heathrow) Airports? It's ludicrous that no easy link is available for tourist to visit the town. GP services are stretched to breaking pointsomething needs to be done NOW ...not be " thought about"
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support, design codes to include orientation to take advantage of solar gain, design for safety, and to highest environmental standards. Master plans should include community centres, space for teenage exercise as well as playgrounds for toddlers
095	Eric Ward		Agree
139	Renny Wodynska		As above - what about the impact on wildlife and nature which gives so many of us our health and well-being. This needs to be dominant for me.
140	Alan George		Impact on wildlife and nature should be primary. This is so important to support and help people with their health and well-being - refer to Bourneville as an example.
212	David Tucker		A Master Plan is vital to avoid the historic ad-hoc development, which has taken place in the Town in recent years. This has particularly affected the Birmingham Road as successful development Appeals thwart Planning Policy and especially create and compound traffic bottle necks.
228	John Campton		Yes
253	Daniel O'Donnell		Requiring a design code and master plan for all developments over 10 dwellings is excessive and unjustified given the scale of these proposals.
278	Joan Graham		All very good principles and should help the town keep its unique market character.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE4
025	Jane Dodge		I agree

056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support, subject to the local Design Review Panel including residents who specifically do not have a professional background in planning and development but are interested in preserving the quality and character of the built environment.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed
095	Eric Ward		Good idea
139	Renny Wodynska		Who is going to be on this panel? What about some normal people like me who are a bit more critical than politicians?
140	Alan George		The panel needs to represent local people like me not just politicians and housing developers.
174	Sarah Eglin		agreed as long as not expensive for tax payers
228	John Campton		Yes
253	Daniel O'Donnell		Requiring a design code and master plan for all developments over 10 dwellings is excessive and unjustified given the scale of these proposals.
278	Joan Graham		All very good principles and should help the town keep its unique market character.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE5
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		I would say at present Stratford is a safe place to live. It would be great to hear more how the police in the area hope to maintain this feel
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed but beware of the Police taking a simplistic view.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly agree

095	Eric Ward		Devoutly to be wished
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
228	John Campton		Yes
278	Joan Graham		All very good principles and should help the town keep its unique market character.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		I would suggest that the elimination of drugs-related or alcohol-related crime is the most important factor - not necessarily design. Therefore, people should be encouraged to identify drug users to police, who then ensure that this behaviour is acted upon / eliminated. Viz. recent events on Birmingham Road / Arden Road where someone was murdered in broad daylight on a busy road in the middle of the afternoon - how safe was that? (Not an isolated incident either in S-on-A).

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE6
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. There is no reason why we should not expect all new builds to be at a high standard (Level 5) and for all new homes to incorporate solar panels, the highest insulation and water saving devices from the outset. Let's make Green the normal and expected standard for the Town.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly agree
095	Eric Ward		Agree
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree

228	John Campton		Yes
253	Daniel O'Donnell		The government has discontinued the Code for Sustainable Homes and as such the policies are out of date.
256	Valerie Ansfield		An extended area of the Birmingham Road should be designated for Improvement in Design Standards. The Avenue / Bishopton Spa houses should be retained as an area of historical significance & receive some protection / enhancement as having a large number of Victorian Trees & is a Green Corridor.
278	Joan Graham		All very good principles and should help the town keep its unique market character.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE7
003	William Bruce Horton		Replace "All development proposals must incorporate suitable and sustainable means of drainage where site conditions are favourable" with "All development proposals must incorporate suitable and sustainable means of drainage". SuDS are sufficiently comprehensive and flexible to cover all conditions. Further they can be integrated with urban design to deliver a wide range of benefits, not just flood risk reduction but also water quality, amenity, health, recreation, biodiversity. SuDS should be integrated with green transport corridors and env improvement areas, not considered separately. This would also reduce costs significantly.
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support. Where additional drainage is necessary its capacity should take into account the likelihood of a reduction in the permeable land within the development over its life due to the construction of extensions, conservatories, garden sheds, widened driveways etc. that do not form part of the initial design.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
086	Jenny Fradgley		Ensure Warwickshire Market town character maintained - lower density, only 2.5 story, green buffer

			zones on the edge of town, maintain the view of the undeveloped rim of the town form the centre
095	Eric Ward		Agree
139	Renny Wodynska		This is critical - many of the fields around us were covered in standing water for months 2 years ago when it rained continually for 2 years. Insufficient attention has been paid to this. The impact of rampant building is that more of us will be potentially flooded.
140	Alan George		Many fields around us were covered in standing water for months 2 years ago when it rained continually for 2 years. If they were developed we would have significant flooding problems in future. More consideration needs to be given to this .
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
228	John Campton		Yes
278	Joan Graham		Is VITAL - drains in the town cannot cope in heavy rain especially near Shottery and on Birmingham Road.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE8
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree
095	Eric Ward		d) Too weak; . . . no use of productive agricultural land. See my comment on H4
139	Renny Wodynska		Green belt land and agricultural land , woods, forests etc. should NEVER ever be developed on - we have sufficiently damaged what is around us already. Many of us want harmony and quiet .

140	Alan George		Green belt land, agricultural land, woods, forests etc. should NEVER be developed on.
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		All very sensible. I particularly like the idea of controlling the density of housing so the town emerges from the countryside.
182	David White		Vital if development is not to get out of control. I sympathise with those trying to work within the imposition of ever changing increases in demands for more housing by a Government hell bent on building more houses to meet their misguided doomsday scenario and unelected bureaucrats slavishly putting that policy into effect.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
228	John Campton		Support
253	Daniel O'Donnell		Land around Stratford upon Avon, Tiddington and Alveston is generally best and most versatile agricultural land.
296	Kate Rolfe		Developments at the edges of our town - we should encourage a feathering approach to design of houses i.e. no 3 storey developments on the outside edge.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE9
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support. There should also be a strong presumption against signs using moving pictures (whether created by phased lighting effects or video)
057	Trevor Honychurch		Bit weak. Why not ban all external signage within the Town- by merely saying Strictly Controlled this relies on someone (District Council already down to bare minimum of staff) making a decision and then enforcing compliance.
070	Matt Sharpe		I would prefer advertising (aside from shop frontage) to be prohibited entirely

095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We support the broad principles here and assume the policy in relation to illuminated signs applies to all new advertisements, not retrospectively applied.
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		I think Stratford's pretty good with respect to advertising and signage but it's a relatively small thing which can have a huge impact, so I wholly support this proposal.
170	Peter Emmerson		I agree with the references to controlling untidy signage. However, there is no reference to working with businesses to remove and prevent temporary, poorly designed signage, which evades planning control because of its moveable nature. This should be written into this policy.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
228	John Campton		Support
282	Anne Marian Kiely		"A" - Boards proliferate all footpaths throughout the town which, combined with "outside dining" chairs and tables, litter bins, wooden blocks on e.g. High Street, all make walking along the footpaths in a crowded area a nightmare, especially if you are pressed for time. Holiday-makers obviously are not, but even they must find this clutter of obstacles irritating and unnecessary?
296	Kate Rolfe		Signage in our towns - agree we remove unnecessary signage including any repetitive signs.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE10
025	Jane Dodge		The Alveston Village Design Statement is about to be updated to a 2015 issue.
039	Katherine Burnett	Canal & River Trust	The Explanation for Policy BE10 – Use of Supplementary Planning Guidance identifies “One of the functions of the Local Design Guide would be to provide a development brief on particular proposals within this Neighbourhood Development Plan such as the Canal Regeneration Zone...” We would

			welcome involvement in the production of a design guide for the canal regeneration zone. We recommend a number of guiding principles for waterside developments which could contribute to the creation of the masterplan. Individual waterways and water spaces need to be viewed as an integral part of a wider network, and not in isolation. Water should not be treated as just a setting or backdrop for development but as a space and leisure and commercial resource in its own right. The 'added value' of the water space needs to be fully explored. Waterways themselves should be the starting point for consideration of the development and use of the water and waterside land – look from the water outwards, as well as from the land to the water. A waterway's towing path and its environs should form an integral part of the public realm in terms of both design and management. It is important that the siting, configuration and orientation of buildings optimise views of the water, generate natural surveillance of water space, and encourage and improve access to, along and from the water. New waterside development needs to be considered holistically with the opportunities for water-based development, use and enhancement. Improve the appearance of the site from the towing path and from the water at boat level, and enhance the environmental quality of the waterway corridor. It should be recognised that appropriate boundary treatment and access issues are often different for the towing path side and the offside.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support, subject to the NDP taking priority in any situation where policies may be contradictory.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree; not a moment too soon!
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		Strongly support.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
210	Rachel Syson		Is there not something that can be referred to for Tiddington?
228	John Campton		Support

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE11
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We object to this policy as currently worded as it does not reflect the guidance set down in the NPPF. Specifically we propose that the third sentence be amended to read as follows: 'To be acceptable proposals must seek to sustain and enhance the important physical fabric and settings of listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments.'
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support, subject to 'be resisted' being replaced by 'not be permitted'.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We support the recommendations to protect the special fabric and interest of listed buildings and to enable the appropriate and sensitive restoration of listed buildings. This has particular relevance to our current historic restoration of our Swan Wing, the oldest part of the theatre, and our future plans to revamp and redevelop our Costume Workshop on Waterside to provide a 21st century working environment.
131	Clive Alan Griffiths		I live at 117 Tiddington Road and my land is identified as being within the defined scheduled monument, but in contrast, the houses adjacent to me, 119 and Reading Court are not, clearly this is an error. Furthermore the houses across the road should also be designated as they are within the scheduled monument as well.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Strongly agree
228	John Campton		Support
253	Daniel O'Donnell		These policies are not in accordance with the cost / benefit approach of the NPPF and are not in accordance with statute.

278	Joan Graham		Have my support as long as they really improve conditions for everyone.
-----	-------------	--	---

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE12
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We object to this policy as currently worded as it does not reflect the guidance set down in the NPPF. We propose that the policy should read as follows: 'To be acceptable proposals for development within and adjacent to the Stratford-on-Avon and Alveston Conservation Areas should clearly demonstrate that they will sustain and enhance the Conservation Area, its setting and setting of any heritage assets within the Conservation Area. All proposals should be accompanied by a Heritage Statement which assesses the impact of the proposals on the Conservation Area and heritage assets. Proposals which will lead to substantial harm or total loss of designated heritage assets will not normally be granted planning permission. Where a proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm, the harm will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.' In summary the NDP policies in so far as they relate to Alveston represent a NIMBY agenda with no regard to the real housing needs of the community.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed
095	Eric Ward		Reword: substitute "refused" for "resisted".
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Strongly agree
228	John Campton		Support
253	Daniel O'Donnell		These policies are not in accordance with the cost / benefit approach of the NPPF and are not in

			accordance with statute.
278	Joan Graham		Have my support as long as they really improve conditions for everyone.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE13
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed. Can we not add the Welcome Hills and Rowley Fields as specific areas for control.
095	Eric Ward		Agree
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Strongly agree
228	John Campton		Support
278	Joan Graham		Have my support as long as they really improve conditions for everyone.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE14
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor		Does this allow sufficiently for developing new styles of building which may not be to everyone's

	Honychurch		taste?
095	Eric Ward		Agree
170	Peter Emmerson		The statement that "this policy will apply only to lawful dwellings, not to caravans and mobile homes" is ambiguous. Caravans and mobile homes may be "lawful dwellings". Does this imply that these structures are exempt and therefore beyond control? This should be clarified.
228	John Campton		Support
253	Daniel O'Donnell		The government has discontinued the Code for Sustainable Homes and as such the policies are out of date.
278	Joan Graham		Have my support as long as they really improve conditions for everyone.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE15
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed
095	Eric Ward		Delete the 2nd sentence
125	Mandy Last		There are so many offices that have either never been let or have been empty for a long time, could these not be converted into apartments. So reducing the need for new developments. Most have extensive parking and utilities are already connected.
174	Sarah Eglin		agree if building is historic
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree

228	John Campton		Support
278	Joan Graham		Have my support as long as they really improve conditions for everyone.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE16
018	Stephen Wreford		Tiddington MUST be able to use the unused spaces within the BUAB i.e. the Garages and Gravel Pit. They should be release for the village to decide on the type and quantity of housing required.
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly support bringing back living space above shops (and the Town Square development)
095	Eric Ward		Very strongly agree
125	Mandy Last		As above
139	Renny Wodynska		This must seriously be prioritised. For examples I'm aware of empty houses on Birmingham road for at least the last 12 years. That's ridiculous!
140	Alan George		This should be overall priority due to no of empty properties e.g. those on Birmingham road... empty for several years.
174	Sarah Eglin		good idea
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Support
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		Such spaces should form part of a Council administered register of potential brownfield sites for redevelopment. Until all such sites have been exhausted, there should be no approval for new greenfield developments.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE16
210	Rachel Syson		In practise, housing above shops and offices is a tricky one. Noise nuisance, either way, can cause trouble.
228	John Campton		Support
278	Joan Graham		Have my support as long as they really improve conditions for everyone.

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Natural Environment Section?

Yes 34 (15%) No 189 (85%)

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy NE1
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		All sounds great
022	Quentin Willson		Every effort should be made to protect green spaces within Stratford. Developers are closing in like sharks and threatening the quality of life of residents.
024	Michaela Willson		I approve of a green ring around Stratford for community enjoyment. Developers must not be allowed to build on the remaining green spaces
026	Sandra Oram		Why are there no local nature reserves identified for Tiddington? There are various areas that would surely be suitable
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	The Trust support the proposals to designate new LNRs, assuming that the sites identified meet the requirements.
038	Amanda Waters		Agree with all.
040	Mark Dickin		The navigation of the river should be opened up so that craft can move between Warwick/Leamington from Stratford's Basin
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly support
060	Richard Price		Fully endorse
095	Eric Ward		Welcome initiatives
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24	Great, important and will enhance Stratford

		Sheep Street.	
111	Mrs Jose Deer		I am concerned about the future of Rowley Fields (CLW4. Section 11) the Town Trust had assured us that there would be no development on this precious green space. It is used by so many people for so many different reasons at all times of the day and evening. Now I learn that the Trust is reconsidering the situation.
121	Helen Rowena Warrillow		I strongly support this policy and the protection given to the sites by designating them Local Nature Reserves
139	Renny Wodynska		I believe we should have at least 20 areas designated around the district - more work needs to be done on this e.g. with Warwickshire Wildlife Trust.
140	Alan George		20 more areas should be designated around the district. Work with local groups such as Warwickshire Wildlife Trust
174	Sarah Eglin		rubbish and dog mess in all the green spaces in an issue, I'd like to see stricter enforcement of penalties for anti-social behaviour which are detrimental to the green spaces
182	David White		Excellent idea, but must get total protection from encroaching development.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Support
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		I propose adding the land at Bishopton (between A46 & Bishopton Lane). This is a potentially significant area which could be converted from low level agricultural land to a meadow or woodland.
226	Debs Campton		Excellent plan
228	John Campton		Support strongly
278	Joan Graham		We need to preserve and protect as much green space and biodiversity as possible - it benefits everyone.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented	Policy NE2
--------------------	------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------

		(where applicable)	
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	The Trust support the identification and protection of the River Avon corridor as an important habitat network. This policy could be strengthened by identifying specific opportunities to enhance the biodiversity corridor. This may be best included within NE4.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly support
060	Richard Price		Fully endorse
095	Eric Ward		Agree
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	agreed
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We welcome recommendations to protect the River Avon Biodiversity Corridor.
121	Helen Rowena Warrillow		I strongly support any protection of the capability of the flood plain
174	Sarah Eglin		rubbish and dog mess in all the green spaces in an issue, I'd like to see stricter enforcement of penalties for anti-social behaviour which are detrimental to the green spaces
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Support but not at the expense of a much needed marina downstream of Seven Meadows Road
226	Debs Campton		Good priority
228	John Campton		Support
255	Sylvia Morris		Statement about development by river and areas adjoining to be stronger. Development should not

			be allowed.
278	Joan Graham		We need to preserve and protect as much green space and biodiversity as possible - it benefits everyone.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy NE3
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	The Trust support the protection of mature trees and hedgerows, however they already receive some protection in national and local policy. This neighbourhood level policy could perhaps be enhanced by the identification of specific trees or hedges that are particularly important to the community (for biodiversity of cultural reasons) and/or further details of specific species that are native to the area and would be considered appropriate for new planting schemes.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly support- all new developments should plant 2 year old stock not "whipps"
086	Jenny Fradgley		Ensure replacement of dead and dying trees on roads already rich in trees and establish new tree lined roads where residents agree e.g. Evesham Road close to town
092	Suzanne Helen Bower		There is a clear link between community wellbeing & nature, it's great to see this reflected in the plan.
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Agreed
139	Renny Wodynska		No development should be allowed unless they are similar to housing in Bourneville - refer to Bourneville Village Trust. Current wording is for NE3 is much much too weak.
140	Alan George		Wording is much too weak. Much more emphasis needs to be given to natural environment.

169	Anthony Reheusser	N/A	CLW4 :there is not much natural "green space" in Stratford. What there is should be protected. I personally use the Welcombe Hills and Rowley Fields for walking in and jogging in.
174	Sarah Eglin		rubbish and dog mess in all the green spaces in an issue, I'd like to see stricter enforcement of penalties for anti-social behaviour which are detrimental to the green spaces
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Support
226	Debs Campton		Important to safeguard trees and hedges
227	Maggie Greaves		Tiddington does not currently have a large enough playing field suitable for kicking a ball, playing rounder's/cricket for children and families. The fields are used for exercise/dog walking and general enjoyment which development will have an impact.
228	John Campton		Support
278	Joan Graham		We need to preserve and protect as much green space and biodiversity as possible - it benefits everyone.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy NE4
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	The Trust support the development of a neighbourhood area biodiversity action plan. This could include specific measures that new developments can take to best protect particular species or habitats that are important to the local area. It could identify where the opportunities for enhancing the local natural environment are - therefore making it easy to find compensation schemes should a development result in a site level loss to biodiversity. It could also look at the connectivity of habitats within the area and how this may be improved.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor		Strongly agree- a part of all S106 or CIL should be designated for Biodiversity work to include

	Honychurch		volunteers
060	Richard Price		Fully endorse
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support
095	Eric Ward		Good idea
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Agreed
138	Alison Tor		I am concerned that I cannot find any available NABP. Without an action plan for Stratford and the surrounding villages, I believe no further planning permission should be given and no designation of greenfield sites in the Neighbourhood Development Plan should be allowed. I comment on this further in the site specific section.
139	Renny Wodynska		Get on with it! This should already be there. Work with local organisations like Warwickshire Wildlife Trust, local Friends of earth.
140	Alan George		As above.
174	Sarah Eglin		rubbish and dog mess in all the green spaces in an issue, I'd like to see stricter enforcement of penalties for anti-social behaviour which are detrimental to the green spaces
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Support
226	Debs Campton		Sound to prioritise a Local Biodiversity Plan
228	John Campton		Support
256	Valerie Ansfield		Developments already approved on green fields on the Birmingham Road do not have "easy access to public transport & the highways network". This statement should be strengthened. Flooding of the Race Course Brook must be solved by the Environment Agency works BEFORE any more houses are built.
278	Joan Graham		We need to preserve and protect as much green space and biodiversity as possible - it benefits

			everyone.
--	--	--	-----------

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Infrastructure Section?

Yes 85 (38%) No 140 (62%)

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy INF1
003	William Bruce Horton		No additional car parking spaces should be provided, since this conflicts with other policies to reduce journeys by car.
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		This is really important! The traffic lights not just on Birmingham road but on the ring road it's, e.g. cause an enormous amount of traffic and I often feel we not safe. (For example the pedestrian traffic lights between the information centre and the Shakespeare play monument). Considering where traffic flows and where they park is important. I do also believe that adapting the junctions for Tesco and the may bird centre is also worth looking at.
017	Yvon Ashfield		Road systems need improving. Close all car parks in the town centre and make everyone use the park and ride, this would then pay for itself and would assist with traffic, also stop coaches entering the town and Shottery, too big for the roads. Not sure which policy but generally the road systems need sorting, less traffic lights.
018	Stephen Wreford		A full ring road is required for Stratford to take the overbearing weight of traffic from having to go right through the centre of town causing gridlock. This is the single biggest issue our town faces, and must face, if it is to continue to attract tourism, investment, jobs and people wishing to live and work here. It needs fixing NOW so please SDC get your act together before this wonderful town is crushed under the weight of all the traffic
022	Quentin Willson		Build a relief road, build a new bridge over the river, remove traffic lights on Birmingham road with mini roundabouts to increase traffic flow. Sort out the merging by the Leisure Centre.
024	Michaela Willson		We need a proper strategy on how to bring Stratford's infrastructure into the 21st century. Without improvements it will die.
025	Jane Dodge		I agree that there needs to be some joined up thinking about traffic but making the Birmingham Road narrower does not seem sensible.

026	Sandra Oram		Traffic flow through the town needs to dramatically improved. At least co-ordinate the excessive number of traffic lights - like they do in New York City. Better still, get rid of some of them to allow natural traffic flow, and build a relief road. All roads in to the town experience congestion, but to see traffic queued back to the golf course on the Tiddington Road at 9.15 on a Wednesday morning is dreadful. With all the extra housing proposed Tiddington residents will become 'trapped' at normal busy times, never mind Bank Holidays and sunny weekends. Unless the traffic issue is sorted out, residents and tourists will shop/visit elsewhere. We already try and avoid Stratford unless we absolutely have to go in. A sad reflection on the spoiling of an old market town.
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Where practical, green infrastructure should be incorporated within the built environment. For example; roadside verges can be mini windflower meadows helping to protect pollinators. Bridges can be designed 'green' to connect up habitats. Cycle routes can link up green spaces which also makes them more attractive to use. Street trees can make roads more attractive - often people will choose to add a few minutes to their journey to drive via a more scenic route.
038	Amanda Waters		Support
039	Katherine Burnett	Canal & River Trust	Policy INF1 – Initiatives to Reduce Peak Time Travel and Policy INF3 – Dedicated Pedestrian and Cycle Routes refer to the provision of new canal bridges/crossings. We would require further information before we would be able to agree to the principle of new bridge crossings. It would need to be demonstrated that sightlines for navigation will not be affected nor operational activities e.g. dredging. A bridge crossing shall also need to comply with the following principles: It should be ensured that the bridge clears the towpath sufficiently to maintain the current width of the towpath so that it will not restrict the Trust and other users use of the towpath; The minimum headroom for the bridge we can allow would be based upon the lowest bridge headroom along this stretch canal; All works should comply with the “Code of Practice for Works Affecting Canal & River Trust” a copy of which is available on our website. To ensure a good design standard, the following aspects should be fully considered; parapets; safety and drip details; positioning and design of supporting structures; abutment position and design, and side wall design; soffits, often overlooked but a key element; quality standards for exposed finishes (concrete, steel etc.); embankments finish; towing paths and other surfacing underneath the bridge; lighting (if appropriate); drainage; services integration (cabling , ducts etc.); associated fencing details; no ledges for pest roosts etc. We can confirm that we shall not take ownership nor maintenance responsibility for the bridge. In regard to the bridge crossing the ‘developer’ will be required to enter into agreement with us for the bridge crossing to obtain the right

			to over sail the canal as well as obtain consent from the Secretary of State.
048	David Bowie		Relief or ring roads are a 1960s solution for nondescript towns lying on major routes. They will not help Stratford because it is a destination for traffic, and any transport (not 'transportation' please!) strategy must focus on getting more people here without their cars - park & ride and public transport. Without reducing traffic volume there will be no solution to congestion, whatever tinkering is done with junctions etc.
051	Maureen Walker		No. 5 I would comment that there are plans to build on a plot of land adjacent to Birmingham road, with the entrance/exit opposite the St. Peter's way junction. Removal of the traffic lights would create huge access difficulties for all vehicles making manoeuvres across busy traffic. Suggest a mini roundabout might work better.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support. Any traffic survey which examines the possible need for a relief road or ring road with a new bridge or bridges must include the impact not just upon present and predicted levels of traffic, but also include the additional traffic movements generated by the new housing that would be required to fund such a scheme.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree. We should also protect the Park n Ride facility south of the river at Waitrose from being lost. It is important to ensure all road signs coming into town are coordinated and ensure that visitors are sent down Warwick Rd and Alcester Rd to avoid delays on Birmingham Rd
061	G Smith		In general the infrastructure is not sufficient to sustain present and future growth
062	Anthony William Dennis		This initiative takes a very narrow view of possible solutions, focused entirely on the car and roads. A more holistic approach is required. Improved rail links, particularly in the light of anticipated housing at Long Marston will provide alternative means of getting into the town, and reduce peak time travel on the roads.
063	Tony Goddard		To find effective ways of reducing congestion is central to achieving much in the Neighbourhood Plan. There is an urgent need to review the junction system more widely and understand how they work together at peak times. For instance it's planned to put traffic lights on Clopton Bridge to improve flows. But the traffic may get over the bridge faster but it will still hit all the congestion backed up from the Birmingham Road onto Guild Street.
064	Richard Eden		1.1 A full traffic survey will be very welcome! 1.2 New relief roads or ring roads are eventually essential! 1.3 Essential. 1.4 Essential. 2.1 Sound good. 2.2 Very good. 2.3 Sounds good. Revisit the

			middle bridge idea but get a better design in place. 2.4 Very good. 3 - All good. 4 - Good. 5 - Excellent and essential. I don't believe it's only 15% through traffic.
066	Brenda Stewart		I am very distressed by the frequent terrible traffic congestion in the Birmingham Road, particularly in view of continuing house building in this area. The congestion causes unacceptable levels of pollution from almost stationary vehicles as well as ridiculously long journey times to and from my home. It should be a priority to reduce the congestion.
070	Matt Sharpe		I am glad to see the 20mph speed limits.
076	Mr Hugo Happel		Must include detailed Heavy Goods vehicle movement's census, to quantify the HGV problem. HGV crossing the Clopton Bridge is unacceptable. Infrastructure should be redesigned to remove that error state.
078	Melanie Jane Forse		Traffic flow on the Birmingham Road is very slow already so I fail to see why traffic calming measures are needed. Speeding up the flow of traffic and diverting traffic around the town is needed to reduce the number of cars and lorries moving through the town
081	Nicholas Oliver		Additional car parking within the town will not alleviate the problem of congestion. Congestion will be relieved by the provision of out-of-town parking coupled with a reduction of car parking within the town. This will also have the effect of making journeys into town by bicycle a more practicable proposition.
086	Jenny Fradgley		The town needs a master plan for parking in the town to ensure support for the Park and Ride North. Partnership working the only way forward.
092	Suzanne Helen Bower		This is a high priority area for the town, the Birmingham Road traffic is awful. I am pleased to see that there are some strong strategies to tackle this included in the plan.
095	Eric Ward		Generally to be welcomed
097	Barbara Anne Baro		I can't see how removing the Birmingham Road/Western Road traffic signals will help reduce peak time Travel unless they are replaced with a roundabout.
104	Robin Edward Child		Proposed traffic lights at the junction of Clopton Bridge and Tiddington Road I understand the proposals to build 770 homes south of the river are now approved on appeal, with more in the pipeline, much to the dismay of a great proportion of the existing local residents. There are houses proposed in Tiddington and I also note some 134 homes are proposed in Ettington with their route into Stratford along the Banbury Road. I realise there has to be more housing, and that it is your job

			<p>to encourage it where possible, even though inevitably this will increase traffic in an already problem area. However the traffic lights at Clopton Bridge have yet to be started and may perhaps yet be cancelled, if reason prevails. My issue is that the traffic lights are being presented as a solution to the traffic problem thus making everything seem okay, as if everything that can be done is being done, and not even having to be paid for by the residents, but by the developers. However they do nothing to reduce the amount of traffic going north-west over the Clopton Bridge, only to prioritise who goes next. If there is a hold up with queuing down these three roads (Banbury Road, Shipston Road and Tiddington Road) then it is because there is slow/static traffic on the bridge itself. Furthermore these lights introduce a problem in themselves. There will be a constant delay to traffic, and pedestrians, waiting at the lights at slack times when otherwise there would be absolutely no delay. We know there are delays at peak times, but this scheme will introduce delays at all times. For pedestrians at the moment there is no delay at the zebra crossing at the Shell garage as all traffic is most considerate and we never have to wait, in either direction, to get across. As for the proposals being subject to public consultation prior to being considered, public meetings have resulted in the biggest objections there have ever been, with meetings overflowing with objectors at the venues provided on several occasions. Allow the houses to be built if you must, but do not pretend they will not have an impact on traffic or pedestrians, or that the proposed traffic lights will solve that problem. Please stop these proposed traffic lights.</p>
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Great ideas, HGV's cause huge congestion on the Clopton bridge, they should have times restricted maybe for crossing it.
116	Thelma Bates		A full relief road is long overdue, this would particularly help traffic on Clopton bridge if there was a road to connect Banbury Road and Warwick Road.
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We welcome policies to reduce peak time travel, but acknowledge that WCC has advised the majority of traffic entering the town centre is going to Stratford not elsewhere. There will always be requirements for day time traffic in between business locations within the town - for instance, lorry traffic between our workshops and the theatre.
121	Helen Rowena Warrillow		I am concerned with the comment in Objective A that a relief or ring road may not be an immediate single solution. It may not be a single solution but it is certainly urgently required. Even a casual observer cannot fail to notice the enormous congestion caused in both directions at the Clopton Bridge and its knock-on effect in the town and approach roads. Whether this is due to through traffic

			<p>or local traffic is immaterial. The volume and weight of traffic needing to cross the river must be given an alternative to this ancient narrow bridge before a similar incident happens to that in Bidford and I welcome a comprehensive review of the situation. With regard to the Birmingham Road, I do not believe it requires 'calming' - this is already achieved by the inefficient movement of traffic and the multiple traffic lights. It needs a thorough review to improve the flow and to prevent situations such as congestion ahead when the lights are green and a clear road ahead when they are red. Maybe consider creating a green wave, using zebra crossings rather than pelican crossings and sensor-activated lights from side roads.</p>
125	Mandy Last		<p>NO MORE TRAFFIC LIGHTS. A filter on the traffic lights on the junction of Birmingham Rd, Arden St and Clopton Rd for cars turning right from Birmingham Rd (Brewery St side) into Clopton Road. Reduce the size of the pavements on Clopton Road and so make the road a bit wider making a pull in for parked cars, making traffic flow better particularly at school times</p>
126	Clarissa and David Roberts		<p>Any development south of the river is going to result in additional volume of traffic over the bridge whether it be park and ride, push bikes, cars because there is only one Town crossing. Any influx of new housing or schools will inevitably lead to more congestion within the Town and the use of park and ride as a possible solution to the traffic problem will inevitably end up like the park and ride north of the river. The infrastructure of schools and health will be dictated by the requirement of additional housing needs both inside and outside the Town limits.</p>
135	Kate Bates		<p>Simply looking at the needs of the small area covered by the Town plan is burying ones head in the sand. The vast numbers of housing going up at Quinton and Long Marston alone make a ring road and new bridge essential. The new lights at the Cattle market are going to turn Alcester Rd into as much of a mess as the Birmingham Road</p>
138	Alison Tor		<p>What is written in the plan is quite accurate, but I am concerned that there is no mention of the problems at the Clopton Bridge and Clopton Bridge roundabout junction. This is of immense importance to residents living south of the river.</p>
143	Chris Strangwood		<p>Before any of the previous plans are considered a robust traffic management plan needs to be in place. The current roads are stifling the town and will ultimately reduce it to nothing more than a stage set for tourists. Current daily views on the traffic web site show that the north of the town, Birmingham road and Alcester road have problems with traffic most of the day and nearly all day. Any further developments either industrial or dwellings is going to make this worse. This should be the council's priority.</p>

153	Janick McOwan		Nothing seems to be mentioned about the gyratory. Improvements need to be made as this system is not really working.
171	Emma Scott		The inclusion of traffic lights at Clopton Bridge is a ridiculous intervention. This needs to be re thought. Consideration should be given to a second roundabout at the top of Tiddington road - removing part of the central reservation to enable traffic to turn right without going to the roundabout at the shell garage. This would improve the flow of traffic.
173	Neil Williams		Current developments on the Birmingham Road appear to have been built with absolutely no thought as to the effect on the Birmingham Road and this seems to be continuing with the developments beyond the Avenue. All they do is add another set of traffic lights. These traffic lights are then not timed correctly, so it creates chaos. Even on the older sections of the road this is the case, with the Western Rd traffic lights being a particular joke. With further developments planned on areas such as Bishopton, this will get even worse and will start affecting the Alcester Rd. The canal district sounds excellent, but it will be ruined unless the traffic problem is resolved.
174	Sarah Eglin		A relief road is definitely needed - the obvious solution requires traffic to be taken away before the queues build up on the Warwick and Birmingham roads.
182	David White		Important to remove these traffic lights, particularly Western Avenue, which leads to almost continuous gridlock around the Arden Street junction at peak (and more regularly) off peak times.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		The arterial roads into Stratford from the west are totally choked. There should be no further large scale housing developments on the western side of the town as the infrastructure cannot cope.
210	Rachel Syson		Seems like a sensible approach given the findings of the recent survey.
211	Alex Quinn		Proposed development sites should not be considered on an individual basis where traffic is concerned, but in context of all other proposals.
212	David Tucker		Whilst strongly supporting the initiatives contained in INF1, it should be ensured that new housing developments to the west of the Town, in particular Shottery, contribute to providing a Western bypass link to the proposed Long Marston new bridge and Western Relief Road.

215	Portia Hazel Conn		Please plan for more 21c living with continued growth in working from home and more cycling as a means of transport. This means a plan for radically faster broadband and cycle only pathways .
221	Lindsey Quinn		The impact on traffic of all developments should be considered when deciding whether to approve individual sites. Assessing sites on their individual impact when so much development is taking place is misleading and short sighted.
226	Debs Campton		Proper surveys need to be conducted at various times - some surveys commissioned on Birmingham Road in past were conducted at times which suited a desired policy - hence current bedlam. Consideration for relief /ring roads must be properly explored. Inf1.5 - Birmingham Road proposals inappropriate - narrowing, slowing, cosmetic improvements. Solve real problems.
228	John Campton		Inf1.5 Sort the traffic problems don't use cosmetic tinkering which will not address real issues
255	Sylvia Morris		Support Lucy's Mill Bridge and cycling, and increase in pedestrian activity. Southern park and ride - improve management of traffic island at end 7 Meadows Road by Waitrose. Assist those parking at Waitrose to cross to Tramway in order to walk to town. This is a very dangerous crossing point. Include Lucy's Mill Bridge as river crossing - it is very heavily used and a strategic point.
259	Mr & Mrs Cyril Willoughby		(Section 10, Objective A, Paragraph 2). We live facing the Shipston Rd we are amazed at the comments. Are the Car Transporters; HGVs; Hay and animal lorries really travelling INTO the town? Clopton bridge MUST be by passed by these through vehicles (No access to bridge between 8-18hrs?)
260	Malcolm John Eborall	Bishopton Matters	Reducing Congestion In The Town. Modifications to Birmingham Road. If the proposed development of up to 500 houses between the A46 and Bishopton Lane gets the go ahead as well as other proposed developments in the area, then no amount of modifications to Birmingham Road could cope with the large increase in traffic volumes.
276	S. J. Everett		I agree with the policy objective, but I disagree with any measures that reduce capacity of the roads even more - 20 mph and narrow roads. Many of the current problems are arising because WCC has, without any strategy, cut road capacity by unnecessary traffic lights. Without a clear and comprehensive traffic strategy, which WCC appears incapable of devising, the problems with just got worse.
281	Michael Craig Scott		Initiative to reduce peak time travel. On this subject the plan seems to have completely missed the point. The Town of Stratford-upon-Avon is loved by the residents and visitors alike because of the size and style of this pretty little market town. All the measures made to try to combat the current

		<p>congestion will make little or no difference while the town continues to grow through the planned developments which this plan sees fit to support. We all love the bridges which we have, and have had, for many years and do not wish them to change but they cannot cope with the level of traffic now and this will be increased dramatically with the developments which this plan supports. The plan mentions "peak time travel" I wonder if anyone who has seen the queue of cars on Tiddington Road on a Saturday afternoon would consider it to be a peak time? The traffic congestion is another example that once again the quality of life of the residents of Stratford suffers because developers see it as a golden goose because of house prices and the Council allows it to happen.</p>
282	Anne Marian Kiely	<p>Having been to a couple of Public Information Displays recently (re: Bishopton Lane / 500 units and Orbit Development Plan for ex Redrow site at the former cattle market); we are assured that "a computer - model has been undertaken" - but similar "computer model" has left us already with fiasco known as Birmingham Road. We have to live with THE REALITY of increased traffic, not the wild aspirations of any computer-model!! 1. This cannot be a "computer model" (see above). Also, remember pedestrians and cyclists when planning and road junction improvements and prams/pushchairs and mobility scooters. 2. Remember pedestrians and cyclists! At all junctions. 3. I'm convinced a certain amount (0-3 hours) of free parking will help remedy current traffic situation. 4. Park & Ride: now limited to Mon-Sat (7.30am-7.30pm?) nothing on Sundays or Bank Holidays!! 5. Remember to ensure that pedestrians (with wheelie luggage) and cyclist, pram/pushchair and mobility scooters all have a right to cross busy road/junctions safely. Explanation + comments on para 4 & 5, page 89. In order to get from Trevelyan Crescent to either town basin/waterside, or to St Gregory's Road/Welcombe road/Warwick road junction, it is easier and quicker for me to walk along the canal than to take my car (no public transport on a Sunday) - all due to congestion on Alcester Road from traffic trying to get to Maybird Centre. On one occasion, I did drive into Maybird centre on a Sunday lunchtime and spent one hour queuing to get out of the car park - never again. In the winter, the canal footpath is only acceptable from Timothy's Bridge Road to Birmingham Road - in bad weather it is quite dangerous/slippery/muddy/ no handrails under bridges etc. which does nothing to encourage anyone to use the canal route. This needs to be changed. Para 5 is a bit ambiguous - needs to be punctuated correctly (or at least a little) to make meaning clearer. As this para 5 is probably the most important traffic measurement in the document so far, it is important that any reader can understand what is being said! So that he/she can comment on it.</p>
295	Cllr Charles Bates	<p>First line; have the words "should be" missed out after "A comprehensive report". It's suggested that additional spaces should be provided in Church Street Car Park. How? Is the answer to build a multi-</p>

			story car park? It's Western Road not Western Avenue.
297	Ian McLean		<p>1. Road Congestion</p> <p>1.1 Clopton Bridge</p> <p>The single most pressing infrastructure issue for many residents living South of the river is the frequent and persistent road traffic congestion.</p> <p>The most obvious point at which congestion is troublesome for residents is the river crossing at Clopton Bridge. This medieval structure is still expected to carry a combination of heavy goods traffic, buses, light vehicles and even bicycles across a narrow thoroughfare.</p> <p>The roundabout at the junction of Shipston and Banbury Roads is heavily congested at peak morning and evening times during the week, as well as at weekends. The normal protocol of giving way to traffic from the Right becomes impossible to observe in the morning and weekend rushes so that an informal code of allowing vehicles to push their way on to the roundabout from these two roads becomes the norm. It is only a matter of time before this leads to an accident or a severe case of road rage on the part of anyone unversed in this local peculiarity.</p> <p>Traffic, queuing for long periods before finally exiting the recreation ground out of Swans Nest Lane, adds to the problem at weekends. It is a wonder that any visitor who has tried parking there would ever visit the town again!</p> <p>1.2 Birmingham Road</p> <p>The issues of Birmingham Road and its spillage into neighbouring roads have been well documented in the report and there is no need to elaborate upon these here. It will come as no surprise to readers of this report that residents South of the river will take whatever evasive action they can to avoid the problems highlighted above. However, such action merely transfers traffic problems elsewhere.</p> <p>1.3 Shipston Road</p> <p>The writer hears frequent complaints from Shipston Road residents about the speed at which vehicles travel down it's 30 mph limit. The writer recommends the installation of simple traffic calming measures along this stretch.</p> <p>1.4 A Radical Proposal</p> <p>The author proposes a solution which will enhance traffic flow around the town centre and also leave the built environment intact.</p> <p>The core of the proposal is to create a clockwise ONE WAY Inner Ring Road (IRR). Starting at the Evesham Road roundabout (although users can start anywhere) the route travels along Evesham Place, Grove Road, Arden Street, turns right into Birmingham Road, Guild Street, Bridgefoot (the</p>

		<p>current Bridgeway gyratory system is abandoned in this proposal), Clopton Bridge, Shipston Road, Seven Meadows Road and thus back to Evesham Road roundabout.</p> <p>Under this scheme, all vehicular traffic inside the IRR would be banned apart from the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 🚗 Blue badge holders 🚚 Residents and businesses with permits 🚲 Cycles 🚶 Pedestrians 🚚 Delivery vehicles outside of the hours 05.00 - 08.00 and 18.00 - 22.00 <p>Good urban design should be used to separate these categories so far as is possible.</p> <p>An alternative to this exclusion zone approach could be to introduce congestion charging within the IRR area.</p> <p>Modifications to existing neighbouring routes would be required. For example, the current flow of traffic in Bridgeway would be reversed, Warwick Place would become two-way traffic, and a set of traffic lights placed at the junction between Warwick Place and Bridgeway to allow access and egress to the Leisure Centre, Bridgeway Car Park and the businesses situated on Bridgeway.</p> <p>Hand in hand with this would go the compulsory purchase of land to the South of the Recreation Ground, known as “The Onion Field”. Part of this site would be converted to a new Park and Ride South. This would also answer Policy INF1 shown on Page 87, Para 2, 3rd bullet. The existing car parking on the recreation ground would be closed down and a shuttle transport service provided to the town centre. This may require the establishment of a new river crossing.</p> <p>The balance of unused land from the ex-“Onion Field” could then incorporate an extension to the recreation ground, or better still the creation of pleasure gardens, enhancing the visitor experience.</p>
--	--	---

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy INF2
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		I think Stratford is missing out massively from the slightly lacking park and ride, even though we have 2 it's often empty and achieving its aim. I wonder whether the Waitrose p&r is really the best place for it. Having one along the ridding ton road would defies telly help congestion. Have you thought

			about how the P&R is promoted and how to improve the service? I moved from Cambridge, who have similar car issues and multiple park and rides (they've made an error is recent years walking the price up to nearly £5 a prison but before that it's great) maybe looking at other towns that manage their traffic through park and rides could be helpful?
025	Jane Dodge		How about using the A46 Park and Ride in conjunction with the train from Stratford Parkway rather than get people on buses that go slowly down the Birmingham Road.
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Where practical, green infrastructure should be incorporated within the built environment. For example; roadside verges can be mini windflower meadows helping to protect pollinators. Bridges can be designed 'green' to connect up habitats. Cycle routes can link up green spaces which also makes them more attractive to use. Street trees can make roads more attractive - often people will choose to add a few minutes to their journey to drive via a more scenic route.
036	Kathleen Margaret Dews		Having lived in York, where a number of Park-and-Ride locations work extremely well, I feel strongly that we must develop a viable southern P&R site. P&R plays a vital part in town centre traffic reduction.
038	Amanda Waters		support
048	David Bowie		Park & ride (see above) is too important to be left to an advisory body. The plan must do more than 'support and encourage' - it should set out a clear statement of intent.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Yes but we have a Southern Park n Ride already at Waitrose?
076	Mr Hugo Happel		Current P&R schemes are ineffective. Other towns and cities do it better - e.g. Bath. Dedicated bus route is vital. Location must be a good distance away from the town centre. A good location would be the land where Warwick Road meets the A46. Must carry out a cost benefit analysis of some scenarios such as widening the road into town for a dedicated P&R bus lane, or reserving Warwick Road into Stratford for buses only (cars to use the Alcester Rd entry into town).
081	Nicholas Oliver		Also needed: clear signposting from Park and Rides to town centre using dedicated pedestrian routes (e.g. along canal). More recognition that out-of-town parking is compatible not just with a bus ride into town, but also with walking and cycling into town.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Southern Park and Ride already lost.

095	Eric Ward		The nature of, and the charging schemes for P&R need wide publication.
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Great ideas, Could make so much difference. Most people would not drive into oxford as P&R so good, make Stratford like that
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We support park and ride, but it is not an appropriate solution for late night visitors and employees.
126	Clarissa and David Roberts		ditto as above
135	Kate Bates		The Park and Ride should be free but even this is probably not enough to make anyone want to use it. Why pay and sit on a bus in near stationary traffic? There needs to be a bus lane.
138	Alison Tor		There is mention of creating a Park & Ride south of the river. However, this is very unlikely to solve the traffic problem as most of the traffic, apart from on Bank Holidays, is local. People working or shopping in the town, or taking children to school, are very unlikely to make use of a Park & Ride. Any increase in housing south of the river is only going to increase the problem. There should be no further building south of the river until a realistic solution to traffic congestion is found.
143	Chris Strangwood		I agree as previously stated
170	Peter Emmerson		I consider that existing signage to the Park and Ride on the A46 is clear (at least when approaching from the east).
173	Neil Williams		The P&R is a lost cause unless access to the town from it improves. Nobody wants to sit on a bus in masses of traffic, when they could just drive themselves. The car park also needs to be free. There is no incentive whatsoever to use it. If only they could make use of the railway to transport people into town. That would make it a lot more convenient. Currently it is yet another example of an ill-thought out idea.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
205	Trevor Bruce		If the parking wasn't so easy in the town centre then more people would use the park and ride. In

			other historic places like Canterbury and Cambridge, car drivers are forced to use the park and rides, which in the end saves time and money compared to parking in the centre.
210	Rachel Syson		As a resident, it is further to drive to a park and ride than to drive into town, so this is not relevant for many residents.
226	Debs Campton		Park and Ride - needs to be a really attractive proposition and adequately subsidised as a way to ease congestion
228	John Campton		Vital to whole traffic congestion issue
256	Valerie Ansfield		Signage alone is insufficient to require use of Park & Ride: a dedicated Bus Route, even if it means building a new link road and one way traffic and other such solutions must be considered before more house building takes place.
280	Paul Tomlinson	Scouts	Southern Park & Ride (INF2) There is insufficient publicity for this facility and there is a danger that motorists approaching the town from the south are not aware of the congestion which awaits them if they proceed into the town to seek parking. There needs to be a concerted effort to promote the park and ride facility just as there is a town like Oxford where every effort is made to accommodate visitor's cars outside the town centre.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		The P&R off A46 exists - need to reduce fare on bus for multiple occupants of one car. One car and driver at £2 per day makes economic sense to use facility. One car and fares for several adults/children/seniors possibly does not? A P&R at Waitrose already exists - why do we need to create a new one? Comments on fares as above. Clear signage exists for P&R off A46 - but why close on Sunday/bank holidays? Cannot comment on P&R at Waitrose Site. There is some local use of from Timothy's Bridge 222/221 buses on route to/from town by non-car drivers. I think £1.10 is acceptable for this one way journey and do use on occasion (when wet/or it take when walking/carrying heavy bags - especially on a Sunday, when no local service operates). Agree that a one off charge per car would be preferable (more likely to encourage visitors/tourists to the service) with a season ticket arrangement for commuter users, perhaps?
296	Kate Rolfe		Northern park and ride - in order for this to succeed we need to look at ways of providing a bus lane on the Birmingham Road to facilitate the bus getting in and out of town much faster. Southern park and rider - sadly this facility is going to disappear. We need to emphasise how essential it will be to have a southern park and ride particularly in view of all proposed development in the outlying areas to the south of Stratford-upon-Avon.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy INF3
003	William Bruce Horton		Cycling into and within town centre is currently unpleasant and dangerous, especially for children. This policy should be significantly strengthened by extending to more areas and incorporating an integrated network of pedestrian/cycle paths that encourage non-car use and enable non-car users to move more freely and safely, and give priority to pedestrians/cyclists at crossings and junctions. The piecemeal approach proposed will not achieve this.
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Cycle routes across the river are important, as a car driver it's often scary driving with other motorists when I cyclist is also travelling along the bridges,
018	Stephen Wreford		I fully support this policy to improve the use of cycle lane in to and around town.
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Where practical, green infrastructure should be incorporated within the built environment. For example; roadside verges can be mini windflower meadows helping to protect pollinators. Bridges can be designed 'green' to connect up habitats. Cycle routes can link up green spaces which also makes them more attractive to use. Street trees can make roads more attractive - often people will choose to add a few minutes to their journey to drive via a more scenic route.
038	Amanda Waters		support
039	Katherine Burnett	Canal & River Trust	Policy INF1 – Initiatives to Reduce Peak Time Travel and Policy INF3 – Dedicated Pedestrian and Cycle Routes refer to the provision of new canal bridges/crossings. We would require further information before we would be able to agree to the principle of new bridge crossings. It would need to be demonstrated that sightlines for navigation will not be affected nor operational activities e.g. dredging. A bridge crossing shall also need to comply with the following principles: It should be ensured that the bridge clears the towpath sufficiently to maintain the current width of the towpath so that it will not restrict the Trust and other users use of the towpath; The minimum headroom for the bridge we can allow would be based upon the lowest bridge headroom along this stretch canal; All works should comply with the “Code of Practice for Works Affecting Canal & River Trust” a copy of which is available on our website. To ensure a good design standard, the following aspects should be

			fully considered; parapets; safety and drip details; positioning and design of supporting structures; abutment position and design, and side wall design; soffits, often overlooked but a key element; quality standards for exposed finishes (concrete, steel etc.); embankments finish; towing paths and other surfacing underneath the bridge; lighting (if appropriate); drainage; services integration (cabling , ducts etc.); associated fencing details; no ledges for pest roosts etc. We can confirm that we shall not take ownership nor maintenance responsibility for the bridge. In regard to the bridge crossing the 'developer' will be required to enter into agreement with us for the bridge crossing to obtain the right to over sail the canal as well as obtain consent from the Secretary of State.
049	Gillian M. Hayward		See comment on TC16
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support. There should be adequate provision of secure areas around the town centre where bikes can be left without creating an eyesore.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. Money should be made available from CIL and administered within the Town
063	Tony Goddard		Much can be done to enhance cycling as a mode of transport. It is currently dangerous to attempt to cross Clopton Bridge or to try and use the gyratory system. This significantly reduces the willingness of people to use a bike to make a trip.
064	Richard Eden		Excellent.
076	Mr Hugo Happel		Cycling not being taken seriously. We need dedicated cycle paths, physically separated from the road, like they do in the Netherlands. This creates a genuinely better work - life environment. Encourage cycling, discourage use of car into town. I use my bike all the time to get into town, but I find the journey seriously hazardous: pinch points are Clopton bridge and Bridge St down the hill towards the gyratory system. B'ham road is very hazardous as well.
081	Nicholas Oliver		In agreement. However, "all development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how pedestrian and cycle links have been incorporated throughout the development and how the development connects to the existing infrastructure" will need to be seriously applied - current proposal for housing development between Bishopton Lane and A46 has disingenuous and perfunctory statements only in relation to walking and cycling.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support

091	Chris Houghton		Cycle paths should be clearly separated from footpaths.
095	Eric Ward		Cyclists use Clopton Bridge safely. The use of footways for unauthorised cycling should be subject to the law. Cycling is not currently permitted on the Tramway Bridge.
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We strongly welcome improved pedestrian routes from Bridgefoot car park to the town centre and hope this can explicitly reference the theatre too, as this is the main parking option we promote to our visitors. And we applaud more welcoming access to the town and theatre from the railway station.
126	Clarissa and David Roberts		ditto as above
139	Renny Wodynska		Cycle routes are very poor, we have nearly been knocked off our bikes on several occasions , especially near our home on Wellesbourne road. Cycle paths need to be improved but also more action to ensure speeding is stopped. Speeding is frequent, persistent and serious - many car drivers and bikers are regularly doing over 80mph on Wellesbourne road, certainly not sticking to 50.
140	Alan George		Cycle routes are very poor and insufficient. We have nearly been knocked off our bikes on several occasions, especially near our home on Wellesbourne Road. Improve paths but ensure that speeding motorists and cyclists are spotted and then prosecuted before there is a death.
154	Wendy Appleby		Totally agree with this section
174	Sarah Eglin		strongly agree - cycling provision is poor and yet could be a major tourism part of the town as a gateway to the Cotswolds
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Support cycle routes
204	Mr and Mrs Pritchard		The proposed new secondary school south of the river should have a designated cycle route that is safe for children to use. (well lit and away from traffic)
205	Trevor Bruce		All cycle paths need to be segregated from motorised traffic. Safe enough for a four year old child as well as a 90 year old senior. There needs to be less focus on traffic management investment and more on public transport, getting people to cycle and walk into town instead of driving. The congestion issues would then be resolved. Stratford Upon Avon should become an exemplary cycling town,

			focusing on eliminating cars from the town centre and creating an enjoyable experience for visitors and residents to stroll around safely.
210	Rachel Syson		Agree
211	Alex Quinn		Greater consideration should be given to the number and location of pedestrian crossings in the town and the impact they have on traffic. Multiple crossings in quick succession are present at a number of places on main traffic routes and these should be reviewed.
214	Anthony Mclsaac		I strongly support a policy to improve cycling connectivity. Stratford is largely flat and should be well suited to cycling, but neither residents nor visitors use bicycles to move around town or explore the area nearly as much as they could. My own children would walk rather than cycle into town, but if the routes had been easier and safer I would have encouraged them to cycle more. I'm not sure that just requiring new developments to demonstrate how they will link to existing cycle routes will be enough. Someone will have to have a master plan, and resources will have to be devoted to improving certain junctions etc., possibly funded as a priority by CIL.
226	Debs Campton		Cycle routes should be further developed. To constantly cater for pedestrians in the Town Centre with an ever increasing number of visitors is making it a no go area for residents and many visitors .Pedestrianisation is not feasible with existing roads and traffic flow. It is not feasible to constantly expand the tourist industry at the expense of local residents whose Council Tax is high and quality of life is suffering.
227	Maggie Greaves		Current facilities are already over stretched and not had the effect yet of the extra 32 homes already agreed on the Home Guard Club.
276	S. J. Everett		I agree with dedicated pedestrian and cycle routes but this MUST be done properly. The current arrangements are worse than useless, because all they do is encourage irresponsible cycling (ignoring red lights; wrong way on one way streets; cycling on footways).
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Do not understand final comment on TC17 and first comment of this policy. All cycle routes should bear signage to remind cyclists of need to use bell when approaching pedestrians from behind. Pedestrians need to be educated in use of traffic lights - visitors (esp. overseas visitors, but often UK ones too) do not know that they need to press the red button to get the traffic lights to change in their favour! Perhaps a large diagram at strategic arrival points could be used for this important message? Also confused by fact that some lights "bleep" and others don't when it is time for pedestrians to cross. As stated previously, junction at Grove Road/Alcester Road/Greenhill St/Arden

			<p>St, are an absolute nightmare - especially now as standard of driving seems to have deteriorated immeasurably over last few years, pedestrians are regarded as skittles. If Clopton Bridge were purely pedestrian/for cyclists, could "through traffic" be routed via another bridge going towards Warwick Road? I.e. traffic would use Seven Meadows Bridge or New Bridge (off Tiddington Road onto gyratory) and leave Tramway Bridge/Clopton Bridge for peds/cyclists? NB: - Obviously, I'm not qualified to see how this would/would not work, but has this idea ever been considered? It would save the iconic and internationally famous view towards HTC from TB? Do not understand this location. Having lived in Bishopton area for over 34 years: local people have never had the luxury of a Sunday local bus service, or even after 6.30pm. Therefore, without a car or the use of expensive taxi services, you are marooned. Cannot comment on para 2 in timescale left for completion of this document, does this simply opening up of train line from Stratford to Moreton-in-Marsh impact the Greenway?</p>
296	Kate Rolfe		<p>We should strive to make our town properly cycle friendly - all new developments should be encouraged to provide proper cycle lanes leading to main roads - developers should then be encouraged to put in place proper cycle lanes on the main roads leading into.</p>
297	Ian McLean		<p>Cycling The author and his wife are regular cyclists. Cycling could be described as our preferred method of transport around the town. However, it is a potentially dangerous pastime where, for example, Clopton Bridge is shared with all the vehicular traffic listed in Section 1 of this document. In response to the Plan, I would make the following points: Painted lines on the main carriageway of main arterial roads, most of which are faded beyond recognition, DO NOT constitute existing "extensive networks of cycle... routes", as asserted on Page 91 of the Plan. For example, in Banbury Road, the very wide verge could incorporate a separate cycle lane which would keep pedestrians, cycles and motor vehicles separate. Informal feedback via social media suggests that, if cycling in the town were made safer, far more people would take it up as a regular mode of transport for local journeys, thus taking more cars off the road. Pedestrian Traffic One rather bizarre product of (presumably) "planning gain" to the South of Kipling Road is a cinder path which leads down to under the bridge which carries Trinity Way over the Rush Brook, and then stops dead. What was the purpose of stopping this path at this point? Why not extend this path up to the Seven Meadows/Shipston Road roundabout, and lay it with asphalt, which will encourage pedestrian and cycle traffic to use Waitrose and the Rosebird Centre, once again reducing car journeys.</p>

Code	Full Name	Organisation	Policy INF4
------	-----------	--------------	-------------

Number		represented (where applicable)	
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Good idea, it's import at to think about the aesthetics of a new bridge
018	Stephen Wreford		I fully support the need for a new walking/cycling bridge at Lucy's Mill
025	Jane Dodge		Don't agree that there should be a new bridge at Lucy's Mill - what chaos would that cause!!!
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Where practical, green infrastructure should be incorporated within the built environment. For example; roadside verges can be mini windflower meadows helping to protect pollinators. Bridges can be designed 'green' to connect up habitats. Cycle routes can link up green spaces which also makes them more attractive to use. Street trees can make roads more attractive - often people will choose to add a few minutes to their journey to drive via a more scenic route.
038	Amanda Waters		support
055	Dr Ian G Heggie		Lucy's Mill Bridge. The adapted -- or new -- bridge must be accommodated within the footprint of land currently owned by the local authorities. Compulsory purchase of private land will not succeed.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
064	Richard Eden		Excellent. I fully support this Policy.
080	Roger Francis Harris	Friends of Lucy's Mill Bridge	I support the replacement of Lucy's Mill Bridge as at present it is not suitable for disabled access, pushchairs, prams or cyclists. This severely restricts the access across the river at this point.
095	Eric Ward		No further delay, please!
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	brilliant
125	Mandy Last		Why not make the bypass road into a pedestrian bridge as well as a road bridge. With ramps either side for easy access for wheel chairs, prams, bikes etc. so stopping the need for a completely new

			bridge at the Lucy's mill site. Saving money too.
147	Cllr Tony Jackson		It is very difficult to oppose a replacement bridge at Lucy's Mill but the current phrasing will do nothing to bring this scenario about. If we want to see this happen then the phrasing needs to be much more proactive
154	Wendy Appleby		Totally in agreement with this section as a new bridge at Lucy's mill is desperately needed.
173	Neil Williams		The Lucy's Mill bridge is ugly, inaccessible to wheelchair users, difficult for others with pushchairs or bikes and dangerous in the winter. I was really surprised to hear people protesting against changing it. It must be changed, no argument.
174	Sarah Eglin		agree - this should be wheelchair and pushchair friendly and cycle friendly
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree no bridge
226	Debs Campton		Bridge is problematic for cycle users and needs to be redesigned.
255	Sylvia Morris		Need to protect Greenway. Hugely valuable recreational space for all abilities including wheelchair users and baby buggies. Re-opening rail route would be disastrous for this use. Look instead at Park & Ride, improving bus services and new river crossing further downstream for vehicles.
278	Joan Graham		Much needed by families with pushchairs, cycles, or in wheelchairs.
295	Cllr Charles Bates		I strongly support the need to make Lucy's Mill Bridge user friendly.
297	Ian McLean		Lucy's Mill Bridge The writer supports the requirement of INF4 for a replacement bridge at Lucy's Mill. Since this will take a long time to realise, the author recommends the installation of a steel girder channel on the sides of the steps leading up and down this bridge, into which bicycle wheels can be channelled, making the use of the bridge easier for cyclists at least. If anyone believes that this cannot be done, the writer recommends they visit the city of York and examine the pedestrian bridges crossing the River Ouse.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented	Policy INF5
--------------------	------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------

		(where applicable)	
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		The current state of the Stratford train station is upsetting and a let-down. It's time (and long awaiting) for the job to be finished!! It's an eyesore for those who visit the town for the first time, and disappointing the area around it isn't being used for something. It's something that needs addressing asap
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Where practical, green infrastructure should be incorporated within the built environment. For example; roadside verges can be mini windflower meadows helping to protect pollinators. Bridges can be designed 'green' to connect up habitats. Cycle routes can link up green spaces which also makes them more attractive to use. Street trees can make roads more attractive - often people will choose to add a few minutes to their journey to drive via a more scenic route.
036	Kathleen Margaret Dews		I should like to commend serious consideration of the high speed tram system (known as the busway)which operates between Cambridge and St Ives. This runs on the old railway track, looks like a bus (works like a bus when it reaches the end of the line and has to run for a while on ordinary roads) and behaves just like a train. There is room alongside for pedestrians, cyclists and horses. It's very fast, frequent and very quiet. It would be the perfect way of using the Greenway to link Stratford and the Cotswolds. It would satisfy all parties in the heated debate about reinstalling the railway line - without having to do any major works at the Evesham Road roundabout. I can't understand why nobody has suggested this. Is everyone unaware of it? See www.thebusway.info . It's brilliant! Go to Cambridge, Huntingdon or St Ives and try it!
038	Amanda Waters		support
048	David Bowie		This policy is too weak and vague. I would like to see positive support for reopening the rail line to Honeybourne, not just for protecting the route. This line could be a huge benefit in reducing car use and providing better journey opportunities for visitors and locals alike. Including a fast public transport option for the inevitable expansion of housing around Long Marston. Such projects take time and we ought to be demonstrating a bolder vision.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree. However the rail link south of the Town along the "Greenway" should not be reintroduced except perhaps for a limited tram service from a new Long Marston development to stop at the Seven Meadows carpark.

062	Anthony William Dennis		This policy appears to be weak in regard to its aspirations. Realistic alternative transport opportunities will have a major impact in ameliorating road congestion issues. The case for progressing a reinstated railway from Stratford to Honeybourne is already strong, as made clear by the Ove Arup report. The Neighbourhood Plan should actively seek reinstatement of the railway as a matter of priority.
064	Richard Eden		Good
070	Matt Sharpe		I am glad to see this here. The railway station is very important. I agree that services need to be improved and expanded upon. Services need to run later - it's currently not practical go for an evening out in Leamington or Birmingham for example and get the train home.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support, already lost the Chiltern argument
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
097	Barbara Anne Baro		I think it's very important to preserve and enhance existing Rail Links and Services.
100	Mr Morgan	Stratford Rail Transport Group	Policy INF5 – Preserving and Enhancing Rail Links and Services SRTG support the reference in the Justification to safeguarding the Stratford-Honeybourne railway line including reference to the proposed residential developments at Long Marston, but reinstatement should be specifically included in the Policy wording. Restoration of the 6 mile missing link south of Stratford to Long Marston, would create an alternative self-contained route between Birmingham and Oxford as well as allowing Stratford on Avon, an international tourist destination, to be served by through trains. This route is therefore of strategic as well as local importance. The GRIP 3 Study, was commissioned by Stratford District Council, jointly funded by 10 organisations including First Great Western, London Midland, Network Rail, Oxfordshire County Council, Worcestershire CC, Gloucestershire CC, St. Modwen Developments and rail promotion groups and carried out by ARUP. The consultations have come up with a trench/grade separated option avoiding a level crossing and noise impact on residents in the short urban section of Stratford. Hourly service options of Stratford-Oxford and Stratford-Worcester are proposed. Table 6.16 shows that revenues will exceed operating costs giving a Benefit Cost Ratio of 2.03. i.e. that the service can make a profit from day one, generating income for the Government for a capital investment of £60m, if a section of double track south of Long Marston can be reduced in length. Otherwise the baseline cost is £76m. The Tourism section, 5.5.4/p35, confirms that rail accounts for just 6% of visits to Stratford, compared to an average for the UK of 13%, i.e. there is scope to increase this by 100% if Stratford were on a through route. Overall, the results of the

			<p>economic appraisal indicate that "the Line is a promising candidate for reinstatement." (9.7 p75/Conclusion). Additionally, there would be important economic benefits arising from additional tourist spend and improved rail network resilience which have not been quantified at this stage in the process. Tourism is an important contributor to the economy of Stratford and the Cotswolds. It will contribute to economic growth (regional Gross Value Added) through additional indirect jobs. The Arup report was commissioned by SDC and not the County Council as stated.</p>
101	Paul Boness		<p>Warwickshire County Council has plans to develop the Nuneaton - Coventry - Kenilworth - Leamington rail corridor, and this Neighbourhood Development Plan supports moves to extend those services to Stratford-upon-Avon, offering the future possibility of a rail link to Birmingham Airport. The plan also requires the protection of the former railway route to Honeybourne from any development which would compromise its possible reopening. Extensive housing development in and around Long Marston is already taking place. The preferred direction of travel to work and for education will certainly be towards Stratford. With a station at Long Marston, this line could provide an alternative to car travel. The alternative is more cars crossing the Avon at Stratford. In parallel, a reopened line to Honeybourne would improve access to Stratford for visitors from the south and west. Stratford District Council commissioned Ove Arup to examine this development and recommended serious consideration, subject to, amongst other things, the business economics being confirmed.</p>
106	Steve Price.		<p>Am generally in favour of the policy but consider reopening of the Stratford to Honeybourne railway line is vital to reduce congestion and improve connectivity to the town and district. Also vital is the bus /rail interchange at the town railway station. Must also point out Stratford District Council to the lead in the Arup report on Stratford to Honeybourne, NOT the county council who I consider at best exceedingly unhelpful.</p>
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	<p>We strongly support this policy to encourage the expansion of rail links, in particular improvements to the current services to Birmingham and to London via the Chiltern Line. Given the recent contraction of services to Stratford, we would like this policy also to talk about protecting existing services. The public transport offer to Stratford, particularly for London and late night visitors, is derisory.</p>
143	Chris Strangwood		<p>Bus and Coach station by the town railway station</p>
148	MRS NICHOLE SOUTH		<p>Tiddington Fields Main street traffic will have to use Oak road and New street which cannot cope and is experiencing a problem already with narrow roads and parking issues. It will have a negative impact on local infrastructure including schools, hospitals and transport.</p>

173	Neil Williams		A multi-million pound new railway and the same awful services. What a waste, when there was such an opportunity to improve. Services to Birmingham are a joke - painfully slow, with the final train way too early. It puts people off using it both to travel to Birmingham and to come to Stratford. Services to Leamington and Warwick are equally sub-standard and there aren't even direct services to the likes of Coventry and Oxford are non-existent. There is no-point in using the Stratford to London train as it is so much easier and quicker to travel to Warwick Parkway to get the train. A better service would bring people into the town.
174	Sarah Eglin		this area should include green landscaped places and be much more welcoming to pedestrian visitors arriving in the town
194	Kerry Gulley		It is of paramount importance that Stratford has an adequate bus station to end road and pavement congestion in the town centre. Bus stops and queues not only inconvenience other road and pavement users but detract from the aesthetic of the Town Centre and create areas of street litter, both unacceptable, particularly in a town with such a heavy economic reliance on tourism. However, when location of a bus station and car parking is considered the movement of the resultant pedestrians needs careful consideration as the overuse of a plethora of pedestrian crossings, particularly on the gyratory and at the bottom of town, is adding to traffic congestion over Clopton Bridge. Separation of pedestrians and traffic by means of bridges or underpasses should be considered.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree station
228	John Campton		Yes - support
278	Joan Graham		Improving direct rail service from London and some provision for buses would help preserve this station. Presently it is not very welcoming for visitors to the town.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		Explanation Para 2. Having quickly visited public info display for cattle market site (Orbit) - there is no provision for central transport hub!! Cannot comment on remaining paras of this explanation within timescale provided to return this document.
297	Ian McLean		Train There is reference in the second paragraph on Page 94 to the rail corridor and the "future possibility of a rail link to Birmingham Airport once HS2 creates more capacity". The writer finds it

			hard to believe that there is any seriousness attached to this proposal if we have to wait for HS2 to be completed. Such a rail link to Birmingham Airport is feasible NOW if the political will is there. There has also been much talk and no small amount of consulting engineers' fees devoted to exploring the rail link to Honeybourne. Can anyone seriously imagine that such a move would not have a detrimental impact on the much-loved and much-used Greenway? Some explanation of what is intended to Greenway pedestrian and cycle traffic needs to be included here
--	--	--	---

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy INF6
002	Susanna Sutton		When deciding on acceptable routes for coaches, PLEASE seek the opinion of fully qualified Blue Badge Guides. I was born and still live in Stratford, and to qualify for a Blue Badge we had to pay a lot of money and study very hard to pass our exams! These were set by the Heart of England Tourist Board. I am very willing to be asked for my input!
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Good idea, lack of real bus area is difficult and leads to the main drag of the town becoming a bus station, which doesn't help with pedestrian flow or aesthetics of the town.
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Where practical, green infrastructure should be incorporated within the built environment. For example; roadside verges can be mini windflower meadows helping to protect pollinators. Bridges can be designed 'green' to connect up habitats. Cycle routes can link up green spaces which also makes them more attractive to use. Street trees can make roads more attractive - often people will choose to add a few minutes to their journey to drive via a more scenic route.
036	Kathleen Margaret Dews		The provision of a railway/bus interchange is absolutely essential on the cattle market site. With a drop-off bus ferrying visitors to various spots in the town. Support these recommendations very strongly.
038	Amanda Waters		Transport Hub should be created at the rail station accessible from Alcester Rd and Birmingham road to reduce congestion in town centre.
048	David Bowie		Since I favour pedestrianised streets, I would prefer a bolder policy of locating a bus terminal close by - e.g. where Windsor St car park now is. The policy as presented is an unsatisfactory set of

			compromises which does no credit to a long term plan.
049	Gillian M. Hayward		Can't we have the bus station back, it has been left derelict for a while since the toy store shut up shop. Be so much better than all the congestion in the street or trying to mix it up with the Station, there isn't much room there even with its new layout, and the Birmingham Road will be a traffic disaster for a while yet I fear!.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree but we shall need to insist on routes for coaches and buses
064	Richard Eden		Good
076	Mr Hugo Happel		Encouraging hybrid buses is nowhere near ambitious enough - we should aim to have zero emissions public transport (smaller coaches) all over town by 2018. Cost-benefit analysis of an electric tram linking north and south side of town should be carried out.
078	Melanie Jane Forse		A bus station by the railway station is vital. It makes sense to co-ordinate public transport and provides a hub for people to find information re local buses and trains. Also, the town centre should be free of idling buses
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support, the Gateway Development is key to a bus layover/ bus station which stands. Chance of being used by bus companies. Lobby SDC to take back powers to regulate bus routes.
095	Eric Ward		3) e.g. Rother Triangle
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	great ideas
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	Any improvements to bus services would also be welcomed - in particular to Coventry which is almost inaccessible by public transport from Stratford and could be a potential source of employees and visitors. Late night audiences and employees face particular challenges without access to a car. We hope the policy will explicitly acknowledge the requirements of the theatre for audiences to be dropped off and collected near to the building, within appropriate bays or drop off points.
125	Mandy Last		Build a bus station on the outskirts of town then provide a free shuttle bus so reducing congestion in Bridge St and Wood St. Only having local estate buses, park and ride and shuttle buses in the town

			centre. Stop coaches going up Old town beyond the end of Southern Lane as there is no room for turning outside the Methodist Church.
170	Peter Emmerson		There should be a clear reference to the need for a bus station or bus/train hub in this policy.
171	Emma Scott		Better and more frequent bus links are needed between nearby villages and Stratford, Leamington & Coventry. A rail shuttle bus to Warwick Parkway or Stratford (parkway) should be considered that runs frequently at peak commute times.
174	Sarah Eglin		agree
210	Rachel Syson		agree
226	Debs Campton		Very important policy with sound priorities
255	Sylvia Morris		Need stronger statement about bus station. Currently no information & bus stops randomly around town, on pavements. If there was a proper bus station bus use would increase dramatically. Green space designation - should include all on the list, particularly Greenway (all of it) and River Avon corridor. Green Necklace - nice idea but concentrate on improving existing routes, and if to make it work, must ensure bikes and pedestrians can cross main roads safely (a large expense). Money could be better used enhancing those wonderful routes that already exist and joining them up.
276	S. J. Everett		Regrettably, I have zero confidence in WCC doing anything useful. Generally agree, but why are there no signs or information about the long distance buses at the Leisure Centre? Visitors have NO information - look at the (absence) of information on Bridge Street!
278	Joan Graham		Much needed to reduce traffic congestion in town a major problem Stratford upon Avon NEEDS a bus station.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		1. Orbit proposals do not include bi-rail interchange 2. Agreed 3. Agreed at leisure centre; not sure about alternative location 4.No comment 5.Agreed/absolutely imperative 6. Do not understand 7. Should not be allowed in town
295	Cllr Charles Bates		Policy INF6 may be just a dream if the bus companies won't co-operate. Since the Deregulation of Buses in 1987, by Margret Thatcher's Government, it's been difficult to make bus companies use facilities provided if it's not in their best interest. The County Council may soon have more power in this respect, and this option should be pursued in partnership with the County Council.
296	Kate Rolfe		I think we need to strongly promote the idea of a bus station in town. I refer to the feasibility study

			done a few years ago where Windsor Street was identified as being the best location for this to be. We need to make proper use of the bus layovers proposed at the station. We could work with the bus companies to avoid laying over at Wood Street and Bridge Street and encourage use of the station facility.
297	Ian McLean		Bus The sight greets visitors to the town on emerging from the Railway Station has been a disgrace for more than a decade. The semi-abandoned former Cattle Market site would look more appropriate in an impoverished Third World country rather than as an entrance to what is supposedly an important World Heritage Site in the sixth largest economy in the world. It seems obvious that the bus station should be sited directly adjacent to the railway station, allowing visitors and commuters alike to transfer for their onward journey. There should also be greater provision of cycle parking to enable commuters leaving Stratford in the morning to cycle to the station and leave their bikes there safely during the working day. What is required is the political will to cut through whatever impasse exists and to make this important development happen. Regarding improvements to Birmingham Road, and increasing the incentives to use Park and Ride North from Parkway Station, the writer believes that priority must be given to buses along Birmingham Road (as in Oxford) or people will simply not use Park and Ride.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy INF7
028	Gordon Harrington		There is an essential need to increase educational facilities, particularly for secondary education, where exiting facilities are close to capacity.
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Where practical, green infrastructure should be incorporated within the built environment. For example; roadside verges can be mini windflower meadows helping to protect pollinators. Bridges can be designed 'green' to connect up habitats. Cycle routes can link up green spaces which also makes them more attractive to use. Street trees can make roads more attractive - often people will choose to add a few minutes to their journey to drive via a more scenic route.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support

057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
062	Anthony William Dennis		Encouraging the growth of existing institutions needs to be considered in partnership with the means to get to those institutions. Students in particular rely on public transport. Stratford College is adjacent to the railway station and yet rail transport is not mentioned as a possible asset to the college. A reinstated rail link southwards would considerably extend the catchment area for Stratford's schools and colleges.
064	Richard Eden		Good.
081	Nicholas Oliver		An absolute commitment to not exceed maximum legal measures of air pollution would be a good start here...
116	Thelma Bates		A bus station adjoining the railway station would prevent buses clogging up Bridge Street, sometimes two abreast and three in a line. It's almost impossible to negotiate the bottom of Bridge Street when people are waiting for buses. Wood Street is not much better and often has 3 buses waiting. The X20 would not need to enter the town.
226	Debs Campton		High priority
278	Joan Graham		Ever increasing population will need new schools.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		The new Stratford High School (or Stratford School) was deemed to be too small within weeks/months of being opened! (mitigated by policy INF8)

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy INF8
030	Annie English	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Where practical, green infrastructure should be incorporated within the built environment. For example; roadside verges can be mini windflower meadows helping to protect pollinators. Bridges can be designed 'green' to connect up habitats. Cycle routes can link up green spaces which also makes them more attractive to use. Street trees can make roads more attractive - often people will choose to add a few minutes to their journey to drive via a more scenic route.

038	Amanda Waters		I believe Welcombe hills caters for pupils from a wide area. I do wonder whether the catchment area should be narrowed instead - are you proposing building a second school to cater for pupils from areas which should in fact be building their own special needs schools?
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
064	Richard Eden		Good. Plus additional schools where required please.
095	Eric Ward		Agree
143	Chris Strangwood		Consideration of new primary and secondary education facilities
154	Wendy Appleby		There is a need for another school ages 11-18 as Stratford high school is oversubscribed and too big to provide a quality comprehensive education
173	Neil Williams		With all the new development, the schooling has become totally inadequate. The re-building of the high school was done with no apparent thought towards the future and the primary schools have just had to tack on new bits to them to keep up with increase in pupils. Facilities are not improving quick enough to cope with demand.
210	Rachel Syson		agree
226	Debs Campton		High priority
278	Joan Graham		Ever increasing population will need new schools.
295	Cllr Charles Bates		I support the proposal in Policy INF8 that a new secondary education facility should be provided south of the river.
296	Kate Rolfe		Just a very small point - Stratford High School is now known as Stratford School.

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Community Leisure & Wellbeing Section?

Yes 96 (43%) No 129 (57%)

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW1
002	Susanna Sutton		I can't remember the no. of the policy, but in the redevelopment of Bell Court, instead of having a new multi-screen cinema, an ice rink or bowling alley would give night time entertainment for young people, and give life to this wasted space. We already have a cinema, there certainly is no need to have 2!
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		All this is great
020	Ross Anthony	The Theatres Trust	The Theatres Trust supports this Policy. The importance of planning for culture and cultural facilities is emphasised in the National Planning Policy Framework by being included as a core planning principle (item 17). This is supported by guidance in item 70 of the NPPF which states that to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services that the community needs, planning policies and decisions should plan for the use of shared space and guard against unnecessary loss of valued facilities. Also to ensure that established facilities and services are retained and able to develop for the benefit of the community. Recommendation: For clarity, and so that guidelines are clear and consistent, we recommend that the accompanying text and the Glossary contains an explanation for the term 'community facilities'. We recommend this succinct all-inclusive description which would obviate the need to provide examples: community facilities provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.
022	Quentin Willson		Rowley Fields must be designated green space and protected. This is a vital amenity for the town residents to use. The STT must understand that they can't build on this land and must allow its preservation as a recreational amenity.
038	Amanda Waters		Agree with all these policies. In particular, all developers of new housing MUST be requested to provide as much funding as possible for the infrastructure required to meet the demands of the

			resulting increase in population in the area.
040	Mark Dickin		The riverside walk - footpath should be extended all the way into Warwick
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
064	Richard Eden		Good
080	Roger Francis Harris	Friends of Lucy's Mill Bridge	I have 3 children who grew up in Stratford. None of them had the opportunity to attend a local youth club. For the last 3 years my youngest child has had to travel to Lillington [Leamington Spa] to attend a WAYC youth club. We could not find a suitable one in Stratford. He did get involved with a club at the Buzz Café which shut down, and the Escape Arts Workshop, but he did not meet many people his age there. Therefore we need some provision for youngsters to meet and do activities that are not sports orientated.
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
122	C J Pepper		The Greenway should be a parking free zone.
125	Mandy Last		With new housing there must be new school facilities. It seems silly that as a tourist town we don't have a police station that is open 24hrs a day also if local police have to take those that they have arrested to Leamington that takes them out of the area and so means longer to wait in emergencies. We have a large police station with cells and facilities surely rather than letting these go unused surely it would be better to reopen it.
134	Roger Holbeche		It has recently been suggested by the owners of Rowley Fields, the Stratford Town Trust, that the area to the rear of No. 7 Benson Road is a fenced off area of land which is not in use. This is not only untrue but part of a deliberate strategy on the Trust's part to engineer the current position. Prior to the field being fenced off several years ago, it was not only used on a regular basis by all those who enjoyed the public access to the remainder of Rowley Fields from the Benson Road direction but by local people in general for very many years for many forms of activities including dog walking, football, jogging, walking etc. Moreover local residents have, since the 1980s enjoyed and used legally acquired rights of way across the field to access RF and Welcome Hills. Several years ago the Trust wrongly erected a fence along the boundary alongside the public walkway to prevent access to the field by the residents and public. Many residents objected but the Trust refused to remove it or

			unlock the gate, telling people not to worry - it was just to enclose cattle. The Trust have also, recently implied that they would be objecting to the inclusion of this field on the grounds that it is not really part of RF. This is totally untrue. Their own application to the Land Registry clearly shows this parcel as being part of Rowley Fields, as does its widely publicised public consultation document. For the Trust to now suggest otherwise to suit its own ends is a blatant attempt to distort history and the truth purely for financial purposes.
181	Carl CONN		The District Council has failed the town in its provision of cheap, easily accessible sports facilities. Their belief that 40GBP per month for an adult to access the leisure centre gym/pool is acceptable is evidently mistaken. The usage of such a centre should be considerably greater and made more accessible. The DC have committed to the present contractor (pricing) for over 20 years. Therefore, the Town Council should look to welcome into the town and provide, more realistically priced facilities that are accessible in tune with a service sector community that is one that works beyond the 9x 5 norm. These new facilities, often called "easy Gyms" are low priced, (usually starting at 10gbp per month) and accessible 24 x 7: such gyms are booming in membership and opening throughout the country with recent openings in Coventry - we need one in the town !
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		Any new housing developments should carry an obligation to provide appropriate community facilities & medical facilities. These should be at a defined level of financial contribution according to the value of the development
215	Portia Hazel Conn		The district council's management of the leisure centre contract means we are burdened with an overpriced gym for the next 20 plus years. I and the majority of young people in the town cannot afford the £40 a month fees and the TC should please encourage the new 24x7 low cost gyms to set up in town so we can have a £10-£20 a month gym that fits in with late night service sector workers.
228	John Campton		Vital priority

Code	Full Name	Organisation	Policy CLW2
-------------	------------------	---------------------	--------------------

Number		represented (where applicable)	
020	Ross Anthony	The Theatres Trust	The Theatres Trust supports this Policy. The importance of planning for culture and cultural facilities is emphasised in the National Planning Policy Framework by being included as a core planning principle (item 17). This is supported by guidance in item 70 of the NPPF which states that to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services that the community needs, planning policies and decisions should plan for the use of shared space and guard against unnecessary loss of valued facilities. Also to ensure that established facilities and services are retained and able to develop for the benefit of the community. Recommendation: For clarity, and so that guidelines are clear and consistent, we recommend that the accompanying text and the Glossary contains an explanation for the term 'community facilities'. We recommend this succinct all-inclusive description which would obviate the need to provide examples: community facilities provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.
028	Gordon Harrington		It is essential to enhance the existing leisure centre and to promote more strongly play and sports provision and community facilities. Particularly for young people. Dual use of community facilities should be encouraged.
049	Gillian M. Hayward		We do really need something similar to Youth Club facility to replace and improve on what Tyler Street used to do. Why can't this be at Stratford College. Not much of the College is in use in the evenings these days because not a lot of evening courses run now, well the level of fees had become prohibitive for many.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree. All privately operated facilities must offer realistic fees. The question of Late Night entertainment is delicate. Balance between peace & quiet for residents and entertainment. Taxis and cars using the main roads out of town can be very noisy.
064	Richard Eden		Good
080	Roger Francis Harris	Friends of Lucy's Mill Bridge	see above
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree

119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We welcome the support for new leisure, entertainment and community facilities especially for younger and older generations and for families. We have a particular audience development priorities to encourage more 16-44 year old visitors and families. We hope the policy will also recognise the opportunities for these groups presented by cultural organisations and attractions. We welcome lower charges or free parking in the evenings, and some increased pedestrianisation, though we would like the policy to acknowledge the safety aspect of mixed use space in the evenings, to enhance personal safety for audiences and staff.
121	Helen Rowena Warrillow		It is often overlooked that churches play a major role in promoting a sense of community. When considering the accessibility of community facilities and reviewing the associated parking costs, please give consideration to the need for families and the elderly to park close to churches at Service times and particularly on Sunday mornings. Apart from the additional cost, some have been known to stop attending because the time restrictions on meters do not enable them to find suitable parking within a reasonable walking distance for their abilities. You do not have to be a blue-badge holder to find distances difficult. (Please see comment under TC14)
134	Roger Holbeche		The inclusion of the whole of Rowley Fields, including the parcel of land to the rear of Benson Road is correct and helps fulfil the aim of promoting leisure facilities for families and the elderly.
173	Neil Williams		Stratford used to have a vibrant nightlife. Now what we have is a town slowly dying a death in the evening. Friday nights may as well be Tuesday night. Even Henley is busier than Stratford these days and it is something that must change. Too many late night bars have closed (perhaps 6 recently), leaving nowhere to go. The trouble they caused is vastly over-exaggerated and the town has pandered to a minority of moaners who probably behaved in exactly the same way in their youth. Stratford needs better nightlife for people of all ages. Not just one bar where everyone has to squeeze in. If they want to attract younger people, then this is something that must improve.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
214	Anthony Mclsaac		I support this policy. In particular - municipal tennis courts that are affordable for young people and easy to access - informal football pitches in areas that are kept separate from dog walking areas
228	John Campton		Vital priority

257	Bennet Carr, Headmaster	King Edward VI School	Promoting Leisure, Entertainment and new Community Facilities. New leisure, entertainment and new community facilities specifically for the younger generation.
-----	----------------------------	--------------------------	---

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW3
018	Stephen Wreford		I support this policy as it will start to re-integrate older people into the rest of the community and stop them being isolated in pockets of care homes/retirement homes far from the rest of the "life" of the town/village.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
064	Richard Eden		Good
095	Eric Ward		Do not restrict this to Elderly People
121	Helen Rowena Warrillow		As well as children's play spaces, some form of community centre should also be included in such schemes.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
226	Debs Campton		Very important to prevent social isolation of the expanding elderly population. Important to promote and increase public green spaces where there are opportunities for contact with the natural environment and exercise . It is proven that an active population experiences better levels of health and wellbeing .
227	Maggie Greaves		Tiddington does not currently have a large enough playing field suitable for kicking a ball, playing rounder's/cricket for children and families. The fields are used for exercise/dog walking and general enjoyment which development will have an impact. Current open space is privately owned and not

			available for the general public.
228	John Campton		Vital priority

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW4
004	Timothy Bailey		I very much support the policy statement aimed at protecting and enhancing our existing open spaces
005	Lisa Bailey		I am delighted that the NP will provide greater protection for existing open spaces
006	Edward Bailey		Great - right thing to do
007	Brian Bailey		This is the right thing to do for future residents of Stratford
008	Pauline Bailey		This is the right thing to do for future residents of Stratford
009	Thomas Bailey		As a young adult living in Stratford this is really important to me
014	Dudley Harker		The protection of Rowley Fields should include both the large area and also the smaller area to the rear of Benson road which is accessed via a footpath from Benson / Welcome road. It should not have been separated from the larger Field to make planning permission easier.
018	Stephen Wreford		Any public open spaces proposed within larger developments in/around Tiddington should be designated as Local Green Spaces to retain the public amenity value and enshrine valuable strategic gaps ensuring coalescence does not occur.
023	Richard Howdle	n/a	It is vital that Rowley Fields are kept for future generations and are designated local green space and are NEVER allowed to be built on. They provide an area for recreation for so many people, both young and mature.
024	Michaela Willson		Rowley Fields must be made protected green space. To build on the land would be a huge loss to the town and its residents. It's the only natural place left and you can park for free
029	Mrs Linda Roberts		Having perused the SNDP I would like to add my support for the area of Rowley Fields being designated an area of 'local green space' thereby securing its status as open space for the well-being and good of present and future generations. Throughout my 45 years as a resident this area has

			always been accessible and during these times of increased housing demands its loss would be a great tragedy for the community.
031	Keith Stephen Roberts	Member of Friends of Rowley Fields and also a member of Stratford Town Trust	I wholeheartedly agree that the area called Rowley Fields should be designated an area of "local green space" thereby securing its status as open space for the well-being and good of present and future generations.
035	Ian Duncan Andrew		I fully support the policy to apply Local Green Space designation to give further protection from inappropriate development for the following: Rowley Fields.
037	Janet Bosu		Protecting our existing open spaces such as Rowley Fields is extremely important for the wellbeing of the community of all ages, it is an area where one can walk side by side with nature, to watch the changing seasons is very special, we have no other open space quite like Rowley Fields, its benefits are numerous and very special.
039	Katherine Burnett	Canal & River Trust	Policy CLW4 – Protecting and Enhancing Existing Open Spaces states “...development which adversely affects these important spaces will be resisted.” “The Canal Corridor running through the Neighbourhood Area (development associated with the Regeneration Zone should incorporate the Canal Corridor as a key feature of the scheme).” The canal corridor, as part of its multifunctional role, provides an area of open space. However, the protection and enhancement of the canal as an open space should not prevent the canal’s potential for being fully unlocked or discourage the use of the waterway network.
042	Ms Jacqueline Burgess		I am pleased to find Rowley Fields recommended for inclusion in local green space. This vital lung used by so many is vulnerable to development by the Town Trust who ignore its importance for the young to let off steam and learn about nature, for the elderly as an important place to make social contact and keep fit and healthy by walking, and all the other users who daily walk jog or run through it. People throughout Stratford visit it regularly and use its open space. It is far closer to a great deal of Stratford than the Recreation Ground and should be preserved at all costs. Shakespeare himself is recorded walking through these fields on the way to Clopton. The local population joined together to oppose development of these fields whose original gift intention was to be used for the health and well-being of ALL the residents of Stratford without charge. People without the means to buy theatre

			tickets, attend sports clubs, etc. could exercise and enjoy this space without charge. Local schools frequently walk the fields, as do sports clubs exercising. Please protect this space, and its access from Welcombe Road.
042	Ms Jacqueline Burgess		Rowley fields is an important green lung for all generations, from children running freely to escorted walks with their local school, to the older pensioners who have an unofficial meeting place and always a joke and a smile for all passers-by. It is the only flat place to safely jog, walk, fly a kite etc. It is also FREE! No expensive admission fees no parking charges just wonderful nature and clean air. What more a study has shown that green space is 'equigenic' because it appears that it may help in creating health equality between richer and poorer people. The research showed that access to green / recreational space was the only neighbourhood characteristic tested which had this link to narrower inequalities in wellbeing, The study concludes that green space could have an important part to play in reducing socioeconomic health inequalities. Access to green space could show up to 40% improvement in these inequalities. That is what Rowley Fields represents, a strong local community space fiercely loved and protected by its daily users. I am a member of the Town Trust and in no way does its opposition to Rowley Fields being green space represent my view. Any statement by the Town Trust purporting to represent its members in its opposition to the land becoming green space is completely untrue.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. All current open space must be retained for free public access.
058	Dudley Harker, Geraldine Harker		Please keep Rowley fields, including the land behind 7 Benson road as designated green space, no development allowed.
060	Richard Price		To whom it may concern Having read of the proposal in the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan to include the nomination of pockets of existing green space as designated 'local green space', could we register our wholehearted support for this scheme. It is clear, given the undoubted need for housing on a national basis, that it is imperative that certain areas of localised green space are completely protected and not thoughtlessly sacrificed in pursuit of housing need. Indeed, the requirement for housing should run hand-in-hand with the need for green space to counterbalance said development. We feel it is imperative that the areas of green space quoted in the plan (Rowley Fields, Shottery Fields and the Recreation Ground) should be protected in their entirety for both present and future generations and that, as a perpetual legacy of your administration, their sanctity

			should be upheld by unassailable law. We trust that you will ensure that this is the case.
064	Richard Eden		Good
066	Brenda Stewart		I very much support giving Local Green Space designation to all these, especially Rowley Fields, to protect them from further housing development.
072	Sylvie Laforest		Very happy to see that all of Rowley Fields has been included as valuable greenspace. I have heard that the Trust may object to the small 1.48 acres being included on the grounds that it is not Rowley fields. I have copies of the consultation event that was held last February by Stratford Town Trust which clearly indicates that Rowley Fields is 22 acres of land. Please let me know if you would like a copy of this document. Thank you for taking the necessary steps to ensure that the few remaining green spaces in Stratford are kept intact.
073	Michel Toutant		Thank you for including ALL of Rowley Fields in the neighbourhood plan. There is so little green space left in Stratford that every little bit counts!
079	Michael Warrillow		I welcome the proposal that a number of areas (and Rowley Fields in particular) are proposed as Local Green space. I believe the negative public reaction in the face of the recent Town Trust proposal to build on Rowley Fields show the overwhelming desire of the town to maintain this important space as recreational land and we should do all we can to preserve this for the future.
082	Anthony James White and Christina Elizabeth White		Please remove our garden at Manor Cottage, 34 Shottery Village from the list and map of "local green spaces" on page 104. This is private land and not a public space.
090	Steven Mark Bower		Our green spaces are under threat e.g. Rowley Fields and we strongly agree with the need for statutory protection for the benefit of the local community. We support the proposal of the Neighbourhood Development Plan to designate all of Rowley Fields as Local Green Space even if that is against the wishes of the Town Trust Trustees.
092	Suzanne Helen Bower		Our green spaces are under threat e.g. Rowley Fields and I agree with the need for statutory protection for the benefit of the local community. I support the proposal of the Neighbourhood Development Plan to designate all of Rowley Fields as Local Green Space even if that is against the wishes of the Town Trust Trustees.
093	Stephen Parker		I fully support the inclusion of Rowley fields as a designated green space which is of great importance

			to the town
094	Emma and Colm Murphy	N/A	We thoroughly support the addition of Rowley Fields as a Local Green Space, which means it will be protected from inappropriate development. We understand that Stratford Town Trust oppose the allocation, citing 'charity' (money) reasons. However, as you have decreed that it meets the criteria, we expect you to uphold this position and also listen to the local community who are clearly very passionate about preserving such a beautiful area. In addition to this, we would expect further reassurance that the Welcombe Hills Nature Reserve is also protected from development of any kind, including access roads.
095	Eric Ward		Very welcome
097	Barbara Anne Baro		I would like to register my support for this policy. Existing open spaces within Stratford-upon-Avon MUST be protected and enhanced.
107	Katherine Stuart		I go running on Rowley Fields 4 or 5 times a week. There are very few natural green spaces in Stratford. Rowley Fields is one of them. It must be retained as such
111	Mrs Jose Deer		Rowley Fields are used throughout the day and evening by all sectors of the community and for a variety of purposes. I am most concerned that the Town Trust seem bent on ignoring this unique asset to the town and its value to Stratfordians. They appear to be viewing it in monetary terms only.
112	Kathleen Day		I wish to confirm my agreement that Rowley Fields be designated as Green Space. As a member of the Town Trust, I am appalled that they should object to Rowley Fields being thus designated. I attended their AGM last Wed to find they take no notice of Trust Members as the whole meeting was against them on this issue but no vote taken. The meeting was a farce and members think they still intend to build houses if they can. Please protect this wonderful place.
116	Thelma Bates		There are not enough open spaces and green spaces. Functions on the recreation ground are well supported, perhaps more could be organised.
117	Alexander Wilson		I strongly support the inclusion of the Rowley Fields and Welcombe Hills being designated as protected green spaces. As a member of the Town Trust I strongly disagree with their opposition to this proposal.
121	Helen Rowena Warrillow		I strongly support this policy and in particular the inclusion of Rowley Fields as a Local Green Space. I make this comment in the knowledge that the Stratford Town Trust have advised they will be opposing this policy on the grounds of Rowley Fields. This is even more reason why I hope the

			Neighbourhood Development Plan will include it. The designation of Rowley Fields as Local Green Space will put it beyond the whims of developers and individuals who choose to put money above wellbeing. Even without going into the argument of protecting wildlife and habitat, it is clearly a public space much loved by a wide cross section of the town and it deserves to be protected for future generations. According to Fig 11, the Welcome Hills and Clopton Park Local Nature Reserve are already designated greenbelt within this policy and I hope Rowley Fields will be included as an essential part of this area.
130	Claire Elizabeth Russell	None	I am pleased to see that both Rowley Fields and Welcome Hills and Clopton Park Local Nature Reserve have been identified as areas where adverse development should be resisted. Even better, that Rowley Fields should be designated as Local Green Space. I fully support these proposals.
131	Clive Alan Griffiths		I live at 117 Tiddington Road SOA and the area behind my property has a colour definition on a number of the maps shown as light green, or even lighter green, designating it as either an amenity green space or as an area of restraint, it is not clear. Furthermore the boundary line cuts right across my garden on some arbitrary line (the same with my neighbour at 119) unlike everywhere else along the Tiddington road where it clearly follows the edges of the property boundaries. This cannot be right. Please adjust the maps to show this amenity green space and area of restraint outside of my full boundary.
134	Roger Holbeche		Please see comments CLW1 and 2 above. The inclusion of Rowley Fields, including the Field to the rear of no 7 Benson Road will continue to fulfil the aim of protection of existing green spaces. This area is one of the very few left which gives the wider population of all ages of Stratford the opportunity to enjoy healthy outdoor pursuits. For the Town Trust to fence off the Benson Road parcel, which is the subject of a legal action to suppress resident's rights, is illegal and would be wholly improper.
135	Kate Bates		I would support areas A to F being designated Local Green Spaces, in Particular Rowley Fields
136	Adrian Bates		I support the designation of Rowley Fields as a local green space
139	Renny Wodynska		Insufficient areas have been identified - people need far more designated and permanent green spaces.
151	STEPHEN JOHN TURNER		THE PLAN OFFERS NO DEFINITE PROTECTION TO THE OLD SHOTTERY HALL ESTATE, BORDERING ALCESTER ROAD AND CHURCH LANE. TOGETHER WITH THE ADJACENT SHOTTERY FIELDS, THIS PROVIDES A GREEN CORRIDOR ON THE WEST OF THE TOWN. IT IS A LUCKY SURVIVAL, BEING A

			PRIVATE ESTATE - MUCH AS THE ROYAL PARKS SURVIVED AND NOW PROVIDE A GREEN LUNG IN CENTRAL LONDON. IF FURTHER DEVELOPMENT IS EVER ALLOWED (THE EDGES HAVE BEEN ALLOWED TO BE ENCROACHED UPON ALREADY) IT WILL BE AN IRREVOCABLE LOSS. IT SHOULD RECEIVE AT LEAST THE SAME PROTECTION AS ROWLEY FIELDS, WHICH ARE ADJACENT TO THE WELCOMBE HILLS. FUTURE GENERATIONS WILL NOT THANK US IF THIS AREA IS SACRIFICED TO DEVELOPMENT. IT CURRENTLY FORMS PART OF THE 'HOLE IN THE MINT' OF MASSIVE DEVELOPMENT IN THE SHOTTERY AREA. DONT LET THAT HOLE BE FILLED IN. IDEALLY, THE AREA SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO PUBLIC OWNERSHIP.
174	Sarah Eglin		Agree - these are valuable recreational green spaces for the whole community to enjoy. I would like to see better pathways for disabled users to exercise their dogs on Rowley fields and perhaps some swings and slides in the small field for families. Shottery fields can feel unsafe - I'd like to see greater patrolling of the areas and stricter enforcement of fines for litter & dog mess. I like the outdoor gym facilities at the recreational ground and would like to see these at Rowley fields and Shottery too
179	helen conn		I applaud the Town Councils plan re recreational space. At a time when lack of exercise, obesity and loneliness are serious social and welfare concerns for society - to not have public recreational space included in a plan would be a huge glaring omission. There is a proven direct correlation between mental illness, depression, social isolation and not having access to opportunities for exercise, recreation and social interaction. I am delighted that the Local Plan looks to serve the town's community by providing free local recreational space- this is real short supply especially in the north of the town. As a female often out walking, I am looking for something not hilly and safe, being frequented by other walkers, and also that is free to use and access. The recreational ground is good but I need to drive and pay to park before I can use. The Greenway is very good. It is also, impractical to use on certain busy periods as it can take a 30 minute car journey from north of the town to the car park. For most of us, use of the Greenway necessitates use of a car which is not very convenient but relatively cheap as long as car parking stays free of charge. However, that determination is, as I understand it outside of the Town Council remit. However, the one space that "ticks all the boxes" for me is all of Rowley Fields (RF). It is not hilly or isolated like Welcombe Hills. Neither does it have cattle on, which I find intimidating, especially if I am walking alone with my dog. Like many in the town, I have been appalled by the Trusts actions in trying to sell off ANY of Rowley Fields. To stress, Rowley Fields is 22 acres of land stretching from Benson Road/Welcombe Road public footpath, behind Benson Road and up to the top of gateway by Clopton Tower House/Wheelhouse. That is three separate though conjoined parcels of land, 12 acres on the top slope (presently designated as Green

		<p>Space, I think). The 7.8 acres in front of Maidenhead Road and very importantly the 1.48 acres behind Benson Road. It is very important to stress that I and many others feel that the Stratford Town Trust (STT) are being disingenuous when they say by virtue of their putting a fence alongside this in 2008 that it is no longer part of Rowley Fields or, rather desperately, when they refer to 17c usage when, more relevant, in their own public consultation on the possible development of RF, it was, properly referred to as one 22 acre plot of land. It is to the STT's shame, that they ignored "the overwhelming view of the town" when they greedily choose to continue to try to sell the 1.48 acres of Rowley Fields behind Benson Road. This green space, still used daily by people in the town and alongside the other 2 parcels must be kept as one whole for recreational use. I strongly support the Town Council in determining all of Rowley Fields as local recreational land and not to be developed on.</p>
180	Evelyn CONN	<p>As someone who enjoys walking, jogging and a non-driving University student, the town is rather desperate for places for recreational areas - there are very few. The Rec is really very limited to use in summer as it is so busy, plus I have to bike there to use. Ditto the Greenway but I do not feel so safe jogging along here on my own, especially in winter when not so many people are on it. Therefore, for a single, female jogging or walking, reading outdoors the Rowley Fields is the ONLY place I can go. I am delighted you have choose to secure ALL of it as recreational space - I and the vast majority of people in the town support you here: well done for being in tune ! Wish the same could be said for our dreadful, Town Trust and their rapacious developer friends. All 22 acres of Rowley Fields (RF) needs to be preserved forever for the Town as recreational space. I and many others still use the 1.48 parcel behind Benson Road and shame on the Trust for fencing it off years ago - pleased it still used as a public recreational space: please ensure this is the case for the next 20 years ++. BTW when the Trust fenced it off years ago they told people different things why: it was because the wanted to turn it into livestock pasture and then others allotments (der without any water ?). The Trust here is, as my mates would say "well dodgy or sketchy". Please do not let them desperately cling to 18C folklore to why they, this month, do not consider the 1.48 acre parcel behind Benson Road part of Rowley Fields - it is. Their own public consultation clearly said it was Rowley Fields is 22 acres of local green space, all 22 acres is and should be formally designated as such. This is the only way the growing local population can have easily accessible recreational space to use for generations to come. Please continue to protect all of this valuable green space for our recreational use.</p>
181	Carl CONN	<p>I strongly support the Town Council in the protection of all of these facilities. They are key aspects which help improve and enhance the quality of life in the town. I would like to comment on several aspects: a) Warwick Road - this site is being circled by greedy developers and more should be made of</p>

			<p>its wildlife bio diversity with more bat boxes, bird nesting boxes and raptor sites. All of this can be done whilst improving the educational and attraction to visitors. It is also a useful flood plain and should be further developed and protected as such. c) Rowley Fields. Much has been written in the Herald and, I am sure from other residents. I strongly support your plan to designate ALL 22 ACRES of Rowley Fields as Local Green Space. Please do not be misled by the Town Trusts latest change of argument by now asserting that the 1.48 acres is NOT part of RF. It is as evidenced by their own: a) Public Consultation on RF. b) Press release from June on Public Consultation. And all earlier assertions. RF clearly falls into a Local Green Space designation and the positive change of tack by the Trust to not go against your plan on one portion of RF is partly useful. Such selective support of the plan, which I guess they were party to drawing up, is wrong. All 22 acres of RF needs full Local Green Space protection for the benefit of all of the residents in the town.</p>
183	Sharon Taylor	Tiddington Village Residents' Association	<p>5. P122 3rd bullet point, second sentence needs to acknowledge this NP policy and Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities Policy CS.24 states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the "Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people". There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space. So the wording for the third bullet point, or elsewhere in the extract regarding any future potential development in Tiddington, needs to acknowledge this by stating that a significant and clearly defined (based on population) part of this or another bit of land, SHOULD be green space/parks/community woodland. Currently, this Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the requirements of the Core Strategy policy for Healthy Communities. We would like a designated area of Tiddington to be included in the list for "special protection" which should "rule out new development" and suggest site 2b as such. This would compensate for the lack of communal space in existence and prepare for the increase in population due to new housing.</p>
183	Sharon Taylor		<p>Tiddington should have a designated area of green open space. Currently we have a tiny amount. With the extra housing SDC will be contravening its own policies (CS.24)</p>
199	Mrs Janet spencer		<p>I am very much in support of the plan to make Rowley Fields a Designated Green Space. It is extremely important to protect this piece of land which was gifted to the Townspeople of Stratford for leisure and recreational use and vitally important that generations to come continue to be able to enjoy this precious community amenity. It should be protected as a designated green space to prevent the town trust from selling it off to developers.</p>

201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Support better open spaces especially for the canal corridor changes
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		I propose adding the large plot of land at Bishopton to the list of sites. This area has huge potential to form part of the "green necklace" or to be sympathetically developed as sports fields or as woodland etc.
204	Mr and Mrs Pritchard		Protecting open spaces is very important. Is the Greenway included as part of the list mentioned? Also re. The Tiddington Fields development mentioned in the plan. The fields are currently a local amenity for villagers of Tiddington for exercise and relaxation ... should these not be protected and not built on? Tiddington has a lack of open space and this should be protected. Tiddington must have a protected space too.
214	Anthony McIsaac		I support this policy as a priority
215	Portia Hazel Conn		I would like to thank the TC for planning for greater recreational space. I specifically support: 1) greenway access - the should be tarmacked and allowed for greater use by bikes as well as joggers - ideally separately t marked parts of the path. 2) Recreational ground - please continue to get the council to stop car access onto this. It ruins it for a long time also this is too heavily used for locals in summer so we have to rely on Rowley Fields. Lastly better use of parcor and calenthestic equipment around the whole rec should be encouraged for tourist and local use alike. The present equipment is cited in damp shady area and of very poor design as to be a joke. 3) Rowley Fields - as a single female who likes to jog and walk I love the RF - it is safe, level (welcome Hills is too hilly and muddy with lots of cow pats plus I am scared of the cattle on the hills) and I met friends and others jogging around the area. I use the benches for reading and chatting to other users of the Fields. It is a 365 refuge from work stresses and indoor life. In winter it is still useable and often the only way I get some outdoor light in the shorter days. I strongly disagree with the Trust in that all 22 acres of RF must be covered by local green space and that the land behind Benson Road must, rightly, be included in this protection. This part of RF has been fenced but it is still used by many locals. And shame on the Trust for putting a fence up ! It is part of RF of course and the desperate inconsistencies of the Trust should be seen for what they are: greedy, arrogant and ill advised to make a quick deal at the expense of their own beneficiaries that is the townsfolk of SOA.
216	Kathy Starkey		I think it is important that Rowley fields should be designated as local green space and that the issue

			of selling the fields for housing does not arise again. They should be left as they are for future generations to enjoy.
218	Kevin Gold		Rowley Fields should be designated as a green space, for the good of the community and kept as a natural place of leisure and recreation for everybody to use. There are not many left so keep it as it is.
226	Debs Campton		The plan is right to wish to and enhance protect existing green spaces which give the Town its valued and special character. Local people prize their green spaces as the recent struggle of the townsfolk with the Town Trust over Rowley Fields testifies. The constant pressure for housing on the periphery of the town must be resisted..
228	John Campton		Vital priority
276	S. J. Everett		I strongly support more green space, particularly the designation of Local Green Space for areas a to f on p.103

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW5
022	Quentin Willson		Rowley Fields is an essential green space that must be protected for the residents of the town. Any attempts to build must be strenuously resisted. This is an enormously special parcel of land that's a vital community resource.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. All new developments must provide open space & play areas together with mature tree planting. The Council must take on long term maintenance to avoid poor quality support.
064	Richard Eden		Good
086	Jenny Fradgley		Ensure space for teenage use as well as toddler play areas.
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
148	MRS NICHOLE SOUTH		Tiddington Fields There will not be enough public open space for the ratio of residents UNRESTRICTED NATURAL ACCESSIBLE GREEN SPACE FOR LOCAL SERVICE VILLAGE IS 0.75 HECTARES PER 1,000

			PEOPLE.
174	Sarah Eglin		agree
183	Sharon Taylor		As above
183	Sharon Taylor	Tiddington Village Residents' Association	As above. The minimum ratio is not enough for Tiddington as we are so poorly lacking currently. We would expect the maximum ratio.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
228	John Campton		Support

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW6
026	Sandra Oram		Why are there no proposed local green spaces for Tiddington? We already have them, but they all seem to be wanted for housing. Surely the existing flora and fauna should be acknowledged and efforts made to preserve them. Once gone, they are gone forever
039	Katherine Burnett	Canal & River Trust	Policy CLW6 – Promoting New Strategic Green Open Spaces and Policy CLW8 – Protecting and Enhancing Existing Public Routes identify the canal and towpaths as public routes. We wish to highlight that the towpath is not a public right of way and as such access is invited and it is we as the land owner who would give permission for access to and across our land.
042	Ms Jacqueline Burgess		How fantastic to be able to link the Warwick Road wetlands, with the Rowley Fields, and Welcombe and Clopton Hills. With paths for walkers, families, joggers and cyclists. To be more cycle aware and to enable more disabled access.
048	David Bowie		This is an attractive idea which I strongly support. It is ambitious, quite rightly, and will need some

			determination to see through.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. With all of the new house building the concept of a green necklace is essential.
064	Richard Eden		Good. Lucy's Mill Bridge forms part of this "necklace" so steps should be actively taken to deal with that as soon as possible. Elderly residents are unable to get over the other side at present. Waitrose should be involved too to improve the pathway to their store.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support
095	Eric Ward		Imaginative and welcome proposals
129	Penny Matthews		I believe that Rowley Fields should be a designated green space and should NEVER be built on and that all other green spaces suggested should be designated. We need free recreation areas where people of all ages can walk and play. We are losing our environment to concrete and it MUST be regulated and we MUST NOT give in to over development.
139	Renny Wodynska		I would like to see as much of the district being handed over to Woodlands Trust as possible so that areas are protected and woodlands are replenished where they have already been lost.
143	Chris Strangwood		Consideration of maintaining the field next to Bishopton Lane, Ridgeway and the canal and A46 as a piece of fresh air for the local residents, especially if you are considering industrial units on the other side of the A46
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		Interesting and appealing idea - but no diagram to help the reader see where the necklace could be.
173	Neil Williams		Excellent idea.
174	Sarah Eglin		agree
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree re woodlands
214	Anthony Mclsaac		I support this policy

226	Debs Campton		Visionary policy to promote New Strategic Green Open Spaces
228	John Campton		Vital policy for townsfolk and generations to come.
276	S. J. Everett		I strongly support more green space, particularly the designation of Local Green Space for areas a to f on p.103

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW7
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree
064	Richard Eden		E.g. Lucy's Mill Bridge
081	Nicholas Oliver		In agreement. However, the statement: "Proposals which either adversely affect existing walking and cycling routes or fail to encourage appropriate new walking and cycling opportunities will be resisted" does need to be properly applied whenever such proposals are being considered, and needs to be a grounds for successful appeals against approval of such developments.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support
091	Chris Houghton		Walking opportunities should be treated as distinct from cycling opportunities and afforded separate provision.
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree
116	Thelma Bates		Cycling takes place on many pavements, in the town centre and particularly on Tiddington Road. Even when there is little or no traffic, they do not cycle on the roads. Hence cycle tracks would be a waste of money.
139	Renny Wodynska		See previous comments on cycling - add more cycle paths. Prosecute / monitor motorists and bikers who make cycling on road so dangerous.
174	Sarah Eglin		strongly agree

201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
214	Anthony Mclsaac		I support this policy, in particular in connection with cycling. Together with INF3, it will enable Stratford's potential for cycling use to be much more fully realized.
228	John Campton		Yes

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW8
039	Katherine Burnett	Canal & River Trust	Policy CLW6 – Promoting New Strategic Green Open Spaces and Policy CLW8 – Protecting and Enhancing Existing Public Routes identify the canal and towpaths as public routes. We wish to highlight that the towpath is not a public right of way and as such access is invited and it is we as the land owner who would give permission for access to and across our land.
041	Michael Bird	The Ramblers' Association, Warwickshire Area	Under Policy CLW8, Protecting and Enhancing Existing Public Routes, it should be noted that while there are a number of footpaths and bridleways within the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan area which enjoy the legal protection of being recorded on the Warwickshire Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way, in the case of public footpath SB7 which runs into Stratford from the Welcombe Hills, the final 220 metres of this footpath (which logically terminates at an existing kissing gate giving access onto Welcombe Road) does not enjoy the protection of being recorded on the Definitive Map. This omission came about because under the original provisions of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949, public rights of way within urban areas were not required to be recorded on the Definitive Map. This exemption however was subsequently revoked by the Wildlife and Countryside Act of 1981, which extended the Definitive Map to all formerly excluded areas. On the 10th May 2009, Warwickshire Ramblers put in a claim to Warwickshire County Council for a Modification Order to add this length of footpath to the Definitive Map. This application was accepted and appears on the County's register of claims as MZ895. A chronic shortage of staff and an abundance of other claims have, to date, prevented the County

			Council from adjudicating on this claim. However, given the fact that this footpath forms the eastern boundary of the 1.48 acres site known as the 'Benson Road Parcel' which we understand Stratford Town Trust may still sell-off for housing development, an early resolution of this claim for the legal recognition of this well used footpath would seem to be highly desirable, and possibly a matter of concern for the Neighbourhood Development Plan too.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support. The requirement that "No new development should reduce the amenity currently enjoyed by the public route users..." currently in the Explanation should be incorporated into the Policy.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree
081	Nicholas Oliver		In agreement. Unfortunately, existing pedestrian routes are still being closed down without good reason. An example would be the short cut pedestrian route behind the Stratford upon Avon Visitor Centre on the one-way system.
095	Eric Ward		Of course
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We hope this policy will explicitly reference the Historic Spine and its opportunities and benefits for locals and visitors alike.
183	Sharon Taylor	Tiddington Village Residents' Association	TVRA would like it to be acknowledged that there are public footpaths around and going through sites 2a, 2b and 2c
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
226	Debs Campton		Policy sound to protect and enhance public routes - we prize our diverse range of routes and walkways which give the district its special character.
228	John Campton		Yes

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW9
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		We love the leisure centre, continuing its use and making it even better is encouraged
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree, The leisure centre needs to stay in the town centre
095	Eric Ward		It was the Leisure and Visitor Centre, but has never matched this title. Re-emphasise "Visitor" - much can be done, and should be.
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We welcome the aspiration to encourage local generation of renewable energy, and would like the policy to acknowledge that proposals should be looked at on their individual merits, as significant benefits may well outweigh any specific localised impacts.
170	Peter Emmerson		I support the reference to the "need to create a separate high quality tourist arrivals facility worthy of an international destination". However the Plan needs to commit itself to where this should be located and what form it should take. Also, this statement seems to contradict the statement in Objective B of Section 7 that there is no need for a large scale development of visitor facilities. This discrepancy/ambiguity needs tidying up.
226	Debs Campton		Leisure Centre very important for all ages to promote health, fitness and wellbeing
228	John Campton		Yes
278	Joan Graham		It is very important that this facility is maintained within the town where it is accessible for local residents.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW10
--------------------	------------------	--	---------------------

056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. All new developments especially of flats, should provide land for allotments within the site.
082	Anthony James White and Christina Elizabeth White		We are concerned to see that our garden, at Manor Cottage, 34 Shottery Village is included within a list of local allotments, even pictured in your policy leaflet. We have chosen to allow the use of our land to friends and neighbours in order to assist with the task of maintaining such a site. This is private land - it is not a public allotment - nor a local green space. We cannot allow your policy programme to discriminate against our garden whilst ignoring all of the other gardens in the town. The possibility of planning restrictions on our land would cause us to discontinue others using our garden. Your proposed restrictions of any future use of allotment land would also ensure that no future allotments would be created as no one would then put their land to this use. Could you please ensure that our garden is removed from your list of allotments as detailed on Page 110 of your document and could you also ensure that our land is not included as a "local green space" on your map on page 104.
095	Eric Ward		Agree
139	Renny Wodynska		Increase allotments as much as possible - encourage landowners to use land for this rather than for housing development.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree allotments
226	Debs Campton		Provision for more allotments and growing space should be a high priority promoting exercise, good use of leisure time and healthier life styles.
228	John Campton		Yes
289	James and Christina White		CLW10 Allotments and Growing Space. With reference to our email response to the Development Plan we have not as yet received confirmation that our garden has been removed from the allotment list for Stratford upon Avon Town Council. The extract from your plan is summarised below: Page 111 There is a growing interest..... The Neighbourhood Area has approximately 180 allotments plots of various sizes on 5 different allotment sites (Shottery, Tiddington and Alveston, Bordon Place, Manor

			<p>Cottage and Park Road). As we indicated in our response the ground adjacent to our house is our own private garden and we currently choose to allow friends and neighbours to help with the management of the site. We do not believe therefore that it is the responsibility of Stratford upon Avon Town Council to include this in either a list of local allotments nor to issue restraining orders on its future use; nor do we believe that it is our responsibility to provide allotments for the residents of Stratford. We also object to it being included within the definition of "local green space". We note that no other private garden in Stratford is included under this heading. Our garden is within the local building line and recently there have been significant developments of a large school sports hall built to the southeast of our land, and there is currently housing under construction to the north west. Neither of these sites, which were previously open spaces, were listed as local green space. We await your confirmation that your plan has been amended.</p>
--	--	--	---

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW11
028	Gordon Harrington		Protecting and enhancing health care provision is very important, particularly with the older age profile of Stratford residents.
049	Gillian M. Hayward		There seems to be a lack of properly medically supervised accommodation for people in need of it who are struggling in the community with severe mental health issues, only today outside Trinity Court Surgery I encountered a poor fellow who I think had had an appointment with a health care professional and been sent on his way and clearly he just couldn't cope and he was outside lying on the floor, and later when I left he was still there but bent over against the wall. Patients mentioned the poor chap was there and the staff just laughed it off and said he is just attention seeking but clearly he needed some help and a safe place to go.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
095	Eric Ward		A huge and complex area, needing frank examination.

170	Peter Emmerson		I support the importance of preserving allotments, but I think the Plan should be more ambitious in seeking to increase the number, at least in line with the planned increase in housing. A reference to community orchards should also be added. I would also like to see the Plan committing itself to increasing the public open spaces in the town, If planned imaginatively, these could become a visitor attraction in themselves. For instance, the creation of a Physic Garden would have clear educational benefit and could double as, for example, a secure space for the display of open air sculpture. The car park opposite the District Council offices (behind the Windmill pub) would make an excellent location.
226	Debs Campton		Important to safeguard and improve existing healthcare facilities - the scandal of selling off Stratford Hospital in the past for a hotel should not be forgotten.
228	John Campton		Yes

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW12
028	Gordon Harrington		Promoting new health care provision is critically important with the older age profile and planned population growth.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	New health care facilities will be needed, but this policy is vague and could potentially support large and inappropriate structures in or near the town centre, particularly in view of the trend towards larger GP practices. Specific site(s) should be identified.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
095	Eric Ward		Conflate with CLW11 ?
125	Mandy Last		There shouldn't be any more houses until there is at least another Drs surgery as the ones we have now are struggling to cope also as a tourist and growing town we should have a proper A & E dept.
153	Janick McOwan		I agree additional provisions for GP surgeries, dentists, opticians... should be made available south of the river and in other areas wherever needed.
202	Mr Mark		Any new housing developments should carry an obligation to provide appropriate community

	Rowlands		facilities & medical facilities. These should be at a defined level of financial contribution according to the value of the development
226	Debs Campton		New healthcare provision vital to keep pace with the expanding population
228	John Campton		Yes

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW13
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree
092	Suzanne Helen Bower		I would be very interested to see a measurement of the air pollution in Stratford given the weight of traffic going through the town.
139	Renny Wodynska		All these housing developments add everywhere to our stress and pollution. Fight and stop all extra developments. Protect the local population from further pollution.
143	Chris Strangwood		As CWL6.
174	Sarah Eglin		strongly agree
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		To prevent noise nuisance to residents and walkers on the canal, there should be a ban on intrusive motorsports events such as those at Borden Hill and Copham Hills Farm.
226	Debs Campton		Good
228	John Campton		Yes

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW14
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree
062	Anthony William Dennis		Bullet point 1) is a very subjective statement, the definition of “adverse impact on landscape and character of the area” will mean many things to many people. Visual amenity is an important principle to maintain, but should not be a block to change. I suggest that bullet point 1) be deleted and become part of the principle statement of policy. Maybe rephrase as “Proposals for renewable energy facilities should be sensitive to the landscape and character of the area, and will be supported providing: 1) There are satisfactory arrangements for parking and servicing; and 2) There would be no adverse impacts on neighbouring uses.” Explanation, paragraph 2, page 114. Solar power should be included in the list.
066	Brenda Stewart		I strongly support increasing usage of renewable energy resources.
070	Matt Sharpe		I am very glad to see this here.
092	Suzanne Helen Bower		I would be very pleased to see Stratford leading the way in terms of meeting its energy needs through local renewable.
095	Eric Ward		Lucy's Mill should be generating electricity.
174	Sarah Eglin		agree
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree
226	Debs Campton		Good
228	John Campton		Yes
253	Daniel O'Donnell		There is no justification for including standards that are higher than the Building Regulations.

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Site Specific Briefs Section?

Yes 66 (31%) No 46 (69%)

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy SSB1
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
038	Amanda Waters		For this (and all other developments) there is no reason why all new units should not be required to be built with a percentage of solar panels covering their roofs.
039	Katherine Burnett	Canal & River Trust	Policy SSB1 – Stratford-upon-Avon Housing Allocation - Canal Regeneration Zone The Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone incorporates our land at Western Road and the canal between Timothy Road (bridge 64) and Clopton Road (bridge 66). While we welcome the creation of a regeneration zone focussing on the Stratford Canal, the allocation of land only for housing and suitable mixed uses, does raise issues for us. We made representations to the Stratford-upon-Avon Core Strategy consultation commenting that this allocation did not appear to have recognised the presence of our land holding at Western Road and the operations at this site which include: a hire fleet; long term moorings; and a maintenance wet dock. The site also includes toilet waste facilities and water which are available to all users and this is the only such facility in this section of a busy and popular canal, well used by hire craft bringing tourists to the area. We would welcome further discussions in regard to our land and operations within the Canal Quarter to ensure the future of these facilities are not affected by the regeneration proposals or an alternative site should be offered to enable the operations to be relocated. As previously mentioned, we would welcome involvement in the production of a design guide for the canal regeneration zone. We recommend a number of guiding principles for waterside developments which could contribute to the creation of the masterplan. Figure 12 identifies the location of proposed pedestrian bridges and a new road crossing. As previously mentioned we would require further information before we would be able to agree to the principle of new bridge crossings. It would need to be demonstrated that sightlines for navigation will not be affected nor our operational activities, such as dredging. A bridge crossing shall also need to comply with a number of design principles. The ‘developer’ will be required to enter into agreement with us for the bridge

			crossing to obtain the right to over sail the canal, as well as obtain consent from the Secretary of State.
048	David Bowie		This is a bold and imaginative proposal which I fully support both for satisfying a major housing need and creating a pleasant leisure canal side environment. No doubt there will be difficulties but they must be overcome.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. The nature of the canal needs to be protected but this should be achieved by a good walkway/cycle path. This location is ideal and business can be relocated to the north of the town which offers better road and rail links. The price of land must not be allowed to derail this proposal. Compulsory Purchase as necessary.
081	Nicholas Oliver		Sections A and B: in agreement Section C: would like to see this continuous corridor on both sides of the canal within the town boundaries.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support. Bring partners together to agree ways forward
097	Barbara Anne Baro		I'm very pleased to see the proposal to enhance the canal corridor
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Great idea, could make the canal an actual desirable place to visit
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		It would be wonderful to see the canal regenerated. I love the idea of using it, but only walk it at busy times or in company as it doesn't feel safe. So the idea of taking an area which is currently a bit seedy and making it into the sort of desirable area canals can be makes this policy feel like a priority. Maybe this would also improve the experience for holiday makers on the canal? It can't be very impressive at the moment having a noisy motocross alongside the flight of locks down from Wilmcote then going along the backs of the businesses at Timothy's Bridge Road.
173	Neil Williams		Excellent. This part of Stratford has such potential, yet it's been neglected for ever. Great if it wasn't just for housing too.
182	David White		Greater use of brownfield land, use above shops, putting back empty houses into use and changing designation of industrial units left empty for more than six months to housing use.

201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Strongly support. Would like to see wider green corridors
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		In support of this vision, cancel the planning approval given for a McDonalds drive-through take-away on the junction of Western Road and Birmingham Road. Note - I think the map legend has the pedestrian bridges & canal bridges the wrong way round
212	David Tucker		Whilst strongly supportive of the Canal Regeneration Zone, particularly the Eastern side adjacent to the Hospital and Station, it is difficult to envisage how this will be delivered in a reasonable timeframe and it is essential to provide new commercial space to the North of the Town with appropriate infrastructure at an early stage to enable businesses to relocate.
226	Debs Campton		Yes support proposal
261	Paul Reginald Gilmore		LAND TIDDINGTON RD / LOXLEY RD Parcels of land above, have been put together to provide an ideal 1.5 acre (approx.) site for retirement houses and bungalows for sale. A strategic housing land availability has been made, together with a pre-application for planning advice. The report indicates a good possibility. Following completion of land options, a planning permission will be made under N E C Homes Ltd.
295	Cllr Charles Bates		There's a realistic chance that industrial sites in Masons Road, and maybe part of Timothy's Bridge Road could be used for housing development in the short term, starting with the former Football Ground (owned by the District Council), and the redundant Peak Engineering site. Timothy's Bridge Road would possibly be suitable for housing at the Masons Road end, but as there are a significant number of quite new commercial building at the Bishopton Lane end of the road, therefore it could prove to be impractical to designate the whole length of Timothy's Bridge Road for housing. As Western Road will soon become a through road, linking the Alcester Road with the Birmingham Road, surely it would be unsuitable as a residential area as no doubt it will become very busy with traffic, and therefore should not be considered for this purpose. - Policy SSB1. Is the suggestion that there should be a 5m wide corridor in addition to the towpath? - The map is incorrect. The Fire and Ambulance Station isn't where depicted, nor are the Government Offices.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy SSB2
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
048	David Bowie		While I understand that this follows from SSB1 I don't agree that it is the only, or a preferred, solution. I object to greenfield land being taken up, when other brownfield sites exist. Atherstone is not far away, and there is Long Marston (with a rail link please!)
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support, subject to linkage to improvements to improve the safety of the A46 and make it suitable for the additional traffic it would need to carry.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree
064	Richard Eden		Taking a strategic overview, a west side ring road between Alcester Road and Evesham road is essential. Decisions in Town should be based on this happening. An east side ring road is ultimately essential and plans should be drawn up and made available for consideration. Between these two major new bypass roads, traffic in to Town will reduce significantly. A traffic planning consultation will show the costs and benefits of each road.
080	Roger Francis Harris	Friends of Lucy's Mill Bridge	This development of greenbelt area should not be considered until all existing commercial properties are in full usage [Masons Road, Timothy's Bridge Road]. There are many empty units at present.
095	Eric Ward		What is Town Square Land? I am very uncomfortable about any proposed use of greenfield land.
124	John Brennan		It seems to me that there is insufficient land allocated for industrial and commercial activities to match the growth of population envisaged for Stratford. Allocated industrial land should be increased and minimum employment densities jobs per ha. should be specified, to discourage low density employment like warehousing. Tourism is declining so no more Hotels to be allowed in this area. It might be a good idea to correct the spelling mistake in this policy.
143	Chris Strangwood		This proposal will increase traffic on this side of the town again. Move it near to Waitrose.
182	David White		No to this for reasons previously explained.
198	Mr Laurence		I think the present trees from Birmingham Road to Timothy's Bridge line the canal effectively for the

	Moran		most part and hide the industrial premises, giving the feel of a rural canal-side walk, despite being within a built-up area. While I would be happy if new buildings replaced the industrial premises, I would want them to be hidden by the trees from the canal and towpath. I would definitely require that they were no higher than 2 storeys where they were nearest to the canal, and could only be higher further back from the canal (i.e. set back like the floors of the Bridgefoot car park.) Thus they wouldn't cast shadows on the canal. I would also prefer there to be gaps between new buildings that were at least as wide as the canal frontages of the buildings. I presume that the Premier Inn was only allowed its height because it replaced a similarly high warehouse, so I would hate to see the height of the hotel being used as a precedent for 4-storey buildings equally close to the canal.
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		There should be statements relating to noise abatement to prevent disruption to nearby residents
212	David Tucker		See SSB1 above
226	Debs Campton		Yes support proposal

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy SSB3
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
026	Sandra Oram		The suggestion that the gravel pit be built on seems rather odd, as there is only a very narrow access, not big enough to allow builders traffic, quite apart from the safety to adjoining houses of accessing it from Knights Lane. The suggestion that it be used as a wildlife area is a sensible one as it is already rich in local wildlife
057	Trevor Honychurch		Please reinsert the proposal for commercial development north of Birmingham Road irrespective of Green Belt considerations.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Not certain this is the correct route to follow

227	Maggie Greaves		Access/exit not suitable from Oak Road on to Knight Lane. Surrounding field's danger of development. Tiddington being swamped by housing and over development. Traffic problems escalating.
-----	----------------	--	---

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy SSB4
018	Stephen Wreford		The provision of access to any proposed development over Tiddington Fields via the Land at The Home Guard Club. This will simply allow mass development over all of the currently "white land" to the East of the land referred to as SS85. WHERE IS THE SPACE TO COMMENT ON POLICY SSB5!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Policy SSB5 - This policy is not supported at all. This land is outside the BUAB as defined and so should not be supported. It will lead to massive traffic safety issues in New Street and Oak Road. There is no agreed access via The Home Guard I understand so this policy MUST NOT BE ADOPTED.
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree
138	Alison Tor		Too late - planning permission already given - see comment to Policy SSB5
155	Barry Martin Kigsbeer		Development of Tiddington Fields will be highly detrimental to village life, bringing traffic misery especially in Oak Road and New Street and will be a precursor for further unneeded development along the rear of Hamilton and Townsend Roads. A far saner answer is proposed on land to the east of Knights lane where traffic access is straightforward and does not disrupt existing residents in the same way.
171	Emma Scott	Save 'Tiddington Fields' Oppose Planning (STOP) - action group STOP is an action group set	Since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing.

		up to campaign against any development proposed for Tiddington Fields. A number of residents have submitted the same/similar evidence in support for STOP.	
171	Emma Scott		<p>Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields should not be the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land. It provides a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and via which residents from all over the village enjoy excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only possible option is for their planning application to be resubmitted (and risk rejection) and access to be provided over the area they've determined as green space. Based on information provided by planning officers at the town planning committee this would not likely be permitted. There is also a suggestion in the SNDP that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However this would be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Additionally, permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. The residents of Margaret Court have purchased their homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and</p>

			<p>these residents would be put at risk from any access there. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Church who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to a question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. At no point was it made clear that these two questions would be considered together or that any question had a higher weighting. The view was taken that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets.</p>
178	Andrea Fleet		As previous comment
183	Sharon Taylor		Cala already has planning permission to build on this site. NP needs updating to reflect this.
183	Sharon Taylor	Tiddington Village Residents' Association	<p>P122 -123 Home Guard Club Site As it now looks more than likely that Cala Homes will develop on it and build 32 new homes due to planning permission being granted for such, the policy SSB4 and explanation needs to reflect the situation at the time of adoption. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. The TVRA would like there to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. Currently, in July 2015, there is potential for this to happen and TVRA would like a clear statement in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. We would like a definitive statement on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where.</p>
210	Rachel Syson		<p>The Cala Homes planning application has been approved, so I think this should be noted in the document. Consideration needs to be given to access to any development on Tiddington Fields via Main Street through this plot. The white areas in Fig 14 should be part of Strategic Gap. At the moment they are</p>

219	Steve Duddy		I support this development but would want to see the provision made for floodlights in the identified football pitches so they can be utilised all year round at all times of the day.
259	Mr & Mrs Cyril Willoughby		Tiddington Development. Access into Stratford will become even more difficult at peak times if not addressed properly.
281	Michael Craig Scott		Tiddington Housing Association - Home Guard Club. I agree that this application should be supported. While it should not be reason to grant the further development of Tiddington Fields site. I am concerned that this site will be used by developers as leverage to persuade the planners to allow the development of the Tiddington Fields site as it offers a more agreeable access route. If I was cynical it would suggest that the only reason that developers have considered this site is to use it as a gateway to the Tiddington Fields site with the first phase being the 60 houses closely followed by a further 60 further punishing the current residents for a profit. The 32 houses planned for this site will more than satisfy the demand for housing in the Village of Tiddington.
295	Cllr Charles Bates		Saint Margaret's Court, which is in Tiddington, isn't in figure 12.

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy SSB5
025	Jane Dodge		I agree
026	Sandra Oram		How ridiculous to propose a development that uses a narrow residential road as the access. New Street is an old Victorian street meant for horses and carts, not cars and lorries. It is already nigh on impossible to get down in a car due to residents, naturally, parking outside their homes. There have been occasions when an ambulance has tried to get to get up New St and been unable to do so. So it will prove even more tricky for builders lorries. Oak Road is a little wider, but not much so access is again unacceptable. As to there being an access from the main road, I have understood that this will only occur if Cala Homes are in an agreement with Roscoe. If this is not the case, then expecting Oak Road to become a retrain for lorries is appalling.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree

064	Richard Eden		Summary note on the Neighbourhood Development Plan - How do you get the Public to engage in this? I'm sure lots of work and ideas have been done. I would suggest some competitions open to all SOA residents with ideas on how to expand the number of people involved. Thanks you. Richard Eden
087	Perry Yates		Development if this site would result in many existing dwellings being adversely affected in terms of traffic in dense populated area with narrow roads and impact on a small community. Increased congestion would result onto knight's lane and then produce a knock on effect along the Tiddington road and Loxley rd. There is already issues around peak times at the Clopton bridge with any development would exacerbate. The very essence of living in the village would be affected through increased traffic within local streets. Alternative sites have been suggested within Tiddington that may be preferential as these can be accessed from the Tiddington road or Knights lane which may be generally more acceptable to the village population as a whole. The impact therefore on the village could be more easily managed. Building on Tiddington fields would put the local area at risk of overcrowding and congestion which is not in keeping with current values.
137	Andrew Cartwright		I responded to the Tiddington Village Residents Association questionnaire, although the limited response shows that it is of limited value. The draft plan does not represent my view. I think that the questionnaire was flawed and skewed towards maintaining a separation of Tiddington from Stratford, at the cost of other options. This has led to a cascade of decisions, leading to a poor outcome. If this was opened up again with a simple option list, then I think that a more representative result would be found. I think that traffic congestion was never considered and that a better solution is for land off Knights Lane is developed rather than the area called Tiddington Fields. I cannot see how the plan can provide and rely on safe access to Tiddington Fields through a site at the Home Guard Club, that has yet to be built, with detailed planning and no provision for through access. I feel that this is not a representative neighbourhood plan and should be changed to areas that can be accessed from the better road infrastructure of Knights Lane.
138	Alison Tor		Neighbourhood Plan The Stratford Neighbourhood Development Plan does not reflect my wishes for the following reasons: Tiddington resident's survey and the neighbourhood plan As stated in the plan, the respondents to the survey strongly supported leaving the area to the south of the village as a strategic gap to maintain the identity and integrity of Tiddington. However, respondents were also strongly against building on Tiddington Fields. Nowhere in the survey were residents told that the maintenance of a large strategic gap would take priority over the residents' wishes for the Tiddington Fields to remain undeveloped. Given a choice, I, and I am sure many other residents, would prefer to

		<p>have a smaller strategic gap by building off Knights Lane than destroying the Tiddington Fields. Although both are equally important as greenfield sites, the Tiddington Fields development would affect many more residents by allowing traffic from the new development to pass through the quiet residential roads of Tiddington. In addition, those living on New Street, behind which the houses would be built, would be overlooked. In contrast, a development off Knights Lane would mean that traffic would be unlikely to pass along any road other than Knights Lane, leaving the remainder of the village undisturbed. The development would not overlook anyone's garden and would therefore be less offensive to the majority of residents. Furthermore, the best way to maintain a strategic gap between Stratford and Tiddington is to refuse any housing development towards the end of Knights Lane and on Arden Heath Farm. This is a huge site, which must support a substantial amount of wildlife (see the above section) and poses the biggest threat to the coalescence of Stratford with Tiddington. I suggest that another survey of Tiddington residents is made to enquire whether, if any building had to take place on greenfield sites, residents would prefer Tiddington Fields or land off Knights Lane to be developed. Biological Diversity and Ecological Impact How can greenfield sites be designated for development without a current Neighbourhood Biodiversity Action Plan? The neighbourhood plan states: Policy NE4 – Neighbourhood Area Biodiversity Action Plan A Biodiversity Action Plan shall be prepared for the Neighbourhood Area in consultation with key stakeholders and the public. All proposals should take account of the Local Biodiversity Action Plan and show what effect, if any, they will have on local biodiversity. Where development involves a loss of biodiversity or habitat, appropriate habitat should be created in mitigation. I have been unable to find any BAP for the Stratford area. By designating greenfield sites within Tiddington and the outskirts of Stratford for building, the council is not only failing to protect wildlife but is acting contrary to the above policy within the same document. Without an action plan for Stratford and the surrounding villages I believe no further planning permission should be given and no designation should be allowed. With particular reference to the proposed developments at Arden Heath Farm, Knights Lane and Tiddington Fields, there is a danger that by considering the environmental and ecological impact of each proposal separately, the overall impact on biodiversity within the neighbourhood of Stratford is being overlooked. Each separate ecological impact report is worthless without consideration of adjacent or nearby developments. I am particularly concerned about the impact of these three proposed developments on the habitat of skylarks, a species that is fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act of 1981. There are many skylarks living and/or feeding on these sites and the crops on these areas are usually sown in the spring, allowing the larks to have 2 – 3 broods each year</p>
--	--	--

			<p>before the crop becomes too tall and dense for nesting. This has helped to maintain a healthy population of larks in the neighbourhood – with the added benefit of the pleasure of hearing larks from our back gardens! One example of the danger of considering ecological reports separately for each proposal is an ecological report for a developer about Tiddington Fields, which stated that although building would affect skylarks they would be able to move to the surrounding fields. This statement implies that there are no other proposed developments, and yet, Cala Homes has already been given planning permission for the neighbouring Home guard Field and the Arden Heath Farm site is also likely to soon receive planning permission. Thus, the available habitat for skylarks around Stratford is being considerably diminished. I intend to contact the RSPB and Nature England about this issue to determine the legal status of disturbing skylark-nesting sites. Every development that the council allows on a greenfield site leads to an encroachment of the countryside and the loss of agricultural land. Not only is this land important to the agricultural industry of the UK, but, as stated by the RSPB, much of the UK's wildlife depends on farmland. In addition it affects the living environment of the communities on the edge of Stratford and its villages. .</p>
141	Carol Crabb		<p>I would like to object to the way the NP has not been clear about the development on Tiddington Fields at Tiddington. p125. The residents' survey split Tiddington Fields (TF) into 2 sites, 2a and 2b. It needs to be made clear that the recommendation is only for housing on site 2a. Land at 2b needs to be protected as green, open space (Tiddington does not have enough of this to meet the core strategy requirements for healthy communities). This is not at all clear in the NP document. We would like a reassurance that Tiddington should not take extra houses. Also, a submitted objection to the core strategy saying Tiddington should not be identified as a Local Service Village has not been responded to. Finally, the housing site decisions are determined by the residents' questionnaire, as only 20% of residents responded to the questionnaire and it was over a year ago, should this be what important decisions are based on? The number of proposed houses in Tiddington should be reduced as there are developments in very close proximity (Arden Heath - less than one mile away) which might be approved, which will affect traffic/schooling to a massive degree. Developers should be made to wait, instead of the speculative applications that are being submitted. Stratford is a beautiful tourist town, which is being spoilt by too many houses and too much traffic.</p>
142	David Wolstencroft		<p>Tiddington Fields should not be included for consideration for housing development because I believe Tiddington Fields will impact more on the community, than Knight's Lane development. Currently many, many people use the open space as a community resource, including myself. The fields in Knight's Ln are not available as community spaces. Secondly, I frequently struggle with reversing my</p>

		<p>car down New St meeting traffic coming the opposing way. Increasing traffic flow will exacerbate this. I do not want New St to be one way as it is inconvenient and adds considerably to issues in Oak Rd. There are more families with young children living in New St, and with parked cars and increased traffic flow, this is an accident waiting to happen. Traffic from Knight's Lane development can at least access main roads, although traffic and local services will struggle with either development.</p>
144	Dr Derek Whatling	<p>As a resident of Tiddington now for some 30 years I have seen the changes over the years and accept that change is inevitable and not always a bad thing. However the recent proposals for housing on 'Tiddington fields' (Reference Policy SS-B5) will for the first time alter the character of the village to a point where it no longer fulfils the reasons why we moved here. Extra housing in the locations proposed will destroy the connectivity with open fields, recreation areas, country walks and the feeling of well-being this brings. Further, the 'strategic gap' between Tiddington and Alveston will be reduced undermining the diverse characters of the two settlements. As a biologist specialising in biodiversity I recognise the proposed development sites of Tiddington Fields are of little value taken in isolation. The land is arable, cultivated mono crops dominant and the soil heavily managed. Many hedgerows have over the years and more recently been taken away which has the advantage of making it easier for planners. Taken in its wider landscape context however, the resulting 'habitat nibbling' at the edges of the village reduce undisturbed available foraging and nesting opportunities for birds and diminish their invertebrate and mammal food source. This is a consideration which has to be taken seriously if Tiddington is to remain a meaningful margin between rural and natural areas. On the upside of down, recent farming inactivity is increasing biodiversity as the land reverts towards a more natural flora mosaic. The traffic has been steadily increasing in the village, as one would expect, but the addition of some 60 extra houses would result in further adverse pressure on the link roads of Oak Road and Knights Lane. In addition, New Street cannot take any more traffic as it is already impassable at times for emergency vehicles. These roads are barely adequate now for residential, NFU, School, Football club traffic. Parking for residents is at present extremely difficult in New Street and on Tiddington Road. In terms of infrastructure the village school, for example, is at capacity and any more children will have to travel elsewhere, further exacerbating the effectiveness of road networks.</p>
145	Stephen Crabb	<p>I do not think that Tiddington Fields should be identified as a preferred site. It is too hard to access in the heart of the village and could lead to massive over development of the area, once Gallagher's have 'got a foothold' into the fields that are prime agricultural land. These fields should not be built upon. If we have to have extra houses in Tiddington - and I don't see why we should - the Knights</p>

			Lane development is better for traffic and can be contained better.
146	Daniel Crabb		I do not agree with the methodology used to choose Tiddington Fields as a preferred site. The fields on Knights Lane scored almost the same amount of points, but the question of coalescence was given a high priority, thus Tiddington Fields was recommended. I think this is not fair. The Knights Lane fields are more suitable. I do not think that Tiddington should have to accommodate 76-100 new houses - this is too many for a small village, which will not be able to support them.
149	Mark Morrall		I agree that Tiddington Fields (site 2b) is my preferred location for any development within the village. I firmly believe this offers the best protection for the village in terms of preventing coalescence with Stratford.
150	Anna Chambers		Reference Policy SS-B5: Tiddington Fields should not be included as a supported site for new housing development in Tiddington because: - the site does more harm to our village than other equally preferred sites such as Knights Lane - It provides little public open spaces for local residents - with no access to main street traffic will have to use Oak Road and New Street which cannot cope - negative impact on local infrastructure including schools, hospitals and transport - there is a greater danger or erosion of the strategic gap between Tiddington and Alveston - proposed site at Knights Lane should be included instead as it provides both a genuine strategic gap between Stratford and Tiddington and will mean less traffic along the smaller roads in the village such as New Street and Oak Road
153	Janick McOwan		The proposed new development on Tiddington fields (60 houses) should definitely have safe access from Main Street and not from Oak Road or New Street or Townsend Road which are narrow residential streets which would not be able to cope with the extra traffic (potentially an additional 120 cars) generated by the additional 60 dwellings. Tiddington Fields should also be split into two sites 2a and 2b, 2b being preferably kept as green open space or a woodlands area.
154	Wendy Appleby		I support the allocation of Tiddington Fields (site 2a in the tvra consultation) for housing, with particular emphasis on affordable housing for local people particularly young people and families. The access should be via Main Street not via oak road or New Street as these are not suitable. There should be an allocation of amenity land for local residents particularly open spaces for children to play.
155	Barry Martin Kigsbeer		An open invitation to Ms Gallagher to build more unneeded housing.
156	Chris French		Site access must be from Main Street and not Oak Road.

171	Emma Scott	<p>Save 'Tiddington Fields' Oppose Planning (STOP) - action group STOP is an action group set up to campaign against any development proposed for Tiddington Fields. A number of residents have submitted the same/similar evidence in support for STOP.</p>	<p>Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in</p>
-----	------------	--	---

			<p>keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development.</p>
178	Andrea Fleet		As precious comment
183	Sharon Taylor	Tiddington Village Residents' Association	<p>P121 Description of Tiddington Fields TVRA would like it to be acknowledged in this description that Tiddington Fields, site 2, is agricultural land, this information is omitted. This would then be an accurate description and in keeping with that of the description of site 3. This site also has public footpaths running around it and through it. P121 The information regarding site 2, Tiddington Fields The information regarding the SHLAA Review of 2012 is imprecise as only the northern part of Tiddington Fields was identified as suitable for development in this document. Hence, TVRA's reasoning behind splitting the site into 2a and 2b. We would like this differentiation to be acknowledged clearly. P122 3rd bullet point, second sentence needs to acknowledge Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the "Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people". There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space. So the wording for the third bullet point, or elsewhere in the extract regarding any future potential development in Tiddington, needs to acknowledge this by stating that a significant and clearly defined (based on population) part of this or another bit of land, SHOULD be green space/parks/community woodland. Currently, this Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the requirements of the Core Strategy policy for Healthy Communities.6. P125 Policy SSB5 Name of Buildings It's Margaret Court, not St Margaret's Court. P125 Policy SSB5: the importance of two separate sites for Site 2 and geographical accuracy The inaccuracy on the map highlights the need</p>

		<p>for Tiddington Fields to be identified as 2 separate areas as this policy erroneously links the sites together in its description of the “Land east of Townsend Road...”The TVRA site 2a is NOT the land “east of Townsend Road...”. It is land of east of Oak Road, slightly north of Townsend Road and just south of Margaret Court. TVRA wish the Tiddington Field sites to be clearly differentiated as in our survey (2a and 2b) with the area south of 2a as land which SHOULD be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland with dimensions as outlined above according to population (CS.24 Healthy Communities) (CLW4 and CLW 5) Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. The TVRA would like there to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. Currently, in July 2015, there is potential for this to happen and TVRA would like a clear statement in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. We would like a definitive statement on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. P121 Description of Tiddington Fields TVRA would like it to be acknowledged in this description that Tiddington Fields, site 2, is agricultural land, this information is omitted. This would then be an accurate description and in keeping with that of the description of site 3. This site also has public footpaths running around it and through it.</p>
183	Sharon Taylor	<p>There is nowhere in Tiddington suitable for housing. Although I believe this is the lesser of the two evils as Knights Lane would lead to coalescence, I believe that the access to this site without being able to use Main Street as this plan suggests (and as Cala have already gained planning permission and their plan does not include this, so therefore, it's unlikely to happen) makes it untenable. There are pathways across the fields, an abundance of wildlife, crops growing and it maintains the character of Tiddington as a village in close proximity to countryside. To take this away from the residents of New Street, Oak Road, Margaret Court, Townsend Road and Hamilton Road is a travesty. These residents chose to live in a village, near open fields. This NP will strip away what people have worked all their lives for: to own a house with space around it. The fields are "our lungs". Without the open space for communities as outlined in CS.24, these fields add greatly to a sense of health and well-being within the community. To take this amenity away without replacing open space could lead to physical and mental health problems. The policy wording would need to be changed so that the southern part of this site SHOULD include the amount of open space which the whole village needs, not just enough to sustain any new development.</p>
204	Mr and Mrs	<p>Big concern is that only 20% of Tiddington Residents completed the survey which informs this as a</p>

	Pritchard		'preferred site'. It's not a representative response rate and further consultation is needed with villagers about what their preferred site actually is. The survey happened in August 2014 when there were not any imminent planning applications ... perhaps villagers didn't understand the significance of the survey and chose not to fill it in. Also access to the development 'MUST' be via main street, not 'should' as stated in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is simply not safe to access this development via Oak Road (a narrow residential street where children play and there are lots of parked cars.) But how will access be made via Main Street? Through Margaret Court or the Cala Homes development on the Home Guard Club? ... Why would they want to allow extra traffic through their sites? This needs to be addressed. We feel that other sites in Tiddington would be much better for development. Access is biggest concern with Tiddington Fields, it's a safety issue, but also Tiddington Fields is a village amenity and we strongly feel that it should not be built on. It's a highly valued and used green space where villagers meet, make friends ... where we exercise and relax. It's the only place in the village where our children can run freely away from busy roads. We love Tiddington Fields and feel it should be protected farmland for villagers to enjoy, as they have done for generations.
207	Mrs Christine Susanne Eastwood		Tiddington Fields should not be included as a supported site for new housing development in Tiddington because of a number of reasons which include: It is detrimental to the village as a whole due to the generation of extra traffic using the already congested roads (namely New Street and Oak Road) with the threat of a further entrance/exit by Margaret Court. Main Street is often difficult for traffic to negotiate as it is a bus route and latterly a route for large lorries from the Wellesbourne Industrial Park. The plan provides little or no open spaces for local residents and deprives them of current exercise and dog-walking areas. The character of the village and its separation from Stratford and Alveston will be eroded as no doubt, Gallagher's will apply to build more houses after the initial 60 with all the consequent pressure on schools, roads etc.
209	Robert Bessell	Retirement Security Ltd, Leaseholder and Managing Agent of Margaret Court, Tiddington	We are very concerned at the proposal to build 60 dwellings adjacent to Margaret Court and although the Neighbourhood Plan specifies no more than 2 Storeys, the Plan circulated by Gallagher's provides for a building of 3 Storeys adjacent to Margaret Court, which duplicates the permission given to Cala for a 3 storey building also adjacent to Margaret Court. If erected these two buildings would drastically affect the quality of life of those residents in Margaret Court whose apartments would be totally dominated by an adjacent 3 storey building, which amongst other things would severely restrict daylight.
210	Rachel Syson		The massing together of sites 2a and 2b is not appropriate. Site 2a, which is East of Oak Road is one

			<p>which would be better developed. There are issues with access via New Street, which must be avoided if possible by providing access via Main Street and Oak Road. But site 2a is the preferable site for building on - and 2b should be designated as an open space/community parkland to maintain a Strategic Gap to Stratford, along with sites 3a,b and c. These sites are currently Agricultural land - green field sites. This has not been stated.</p>
211	Alex Quinn		<p>The number of houses proposed for Tiddington is out of kilter with its size, location and infrastructure - and more importantly with the views of local residents. The site of Tiddington fields in particular should not be included as a supported site. Approving building on the north end of the field opens up the opportunity for further development across the south of the field which would have disastrous effect on the village. Oak Road and New Street are not equipped to deal with the current volume of traffic so increasing it would have an extremely negative effect. Parking is also an issue and new developments are renowned for not providing enough spaces which will lead to further on-street parking which is already at dangerous levels on Oak Road and New Street. Emergency and service vehicles are often unable to get up New Street due to this. No provision has been made to improve local services to deal with the number of new residents. The school is already often at capacity and the approved development at Arden Heath will undoubtedly make this situation worse. Consideration should be given to the impact the Arden Heath development will have on Tiddington as new residents there will undoubtedly make heavy use of the village's facilities which means that development should count towards Tiddington's allocation. If development has to be made in Tiddington it should be on a much smaller scale and the site at Knight's Lane should be considered instead. This is already a major traffic route and so won't impact the smaller roads in the village.</p>
219	Steve Duddy		<p>I support this development as the most appropriate plan for fulfilling Tiddington's requirement of 75-100 new houses.</p>
221	Lindsey Quinn		<p>Tiddington Fields should not be a supported site for development. Allowing building to take place on one part of the field will encourage further development on the rest of the area which will have a devastating impact on the character of the village. Neither Oak Road or New Street are suitable for an increased level of traffic that would come as a consequence of developing on these fields. Suggesting that a link road to the Home Guard site would ease this is misleading. On-street parking is already a serious hazard to emergency vehicles and pedestrians on Oak Road and New Street, a hazard which would be significantly worse with increased traffic flow. New developments never provide enough parking so the overflow would undoubtedly affect surrounding streets. Neither Oak Road or New</p>

			Street are designed as major through routes, which they would become if this development were to go ahead. Green field sites should not be suggested as primary sites for development within the village. The number of houses assigned to the village is not in step with the views of local residents and is utterly arbitrary - there is no good reason for that level of housing to be associated with Tiddington.
222	Gareth Walton		If Tiddington does have to have extra housing then surely Knights Lane is the better option. The impact for the village would be far less as it does not involve opening up internal streets to a greater volume of traffic.
224	Gina Print		I disagree that the Tiddington Fields be indicated as a preferred site for development. The land on either side of Knights Lane (Site 3) should be more seriously considered or reconsidered. In this Plan, it appears to be quickly dismissed. Rosconn has submitted a revised application for a reduction to 60 homes (not 100-200 as originally presented to the residents) and has submitted a revised planning application which allocates open space and clearly provides a green buffer which allows a strategic gap between Tiddington and Stratford. I believe at the time the TVRA submitted the village's results, the application was for 100 homes and no strategic gap had been allowed for. Thus, at the time, making it an unfavourable site. However, it is now clearly a more attractive proposal and should be stated in the Neighbourhood Plan as a site to be seriously considered. The Tiddington Fields have a serious access issue which will greatly disrupt the interior, quiet, residential area of the village. New Street cannot seriously be considered as an option for access, as it already has major issues with parked cars on the road. It is a very narrow residential road, with very few driveways. There is absolutely no way that contractors/suppliers during the term of the build would get thru the road, thus forcing all access down Oak Road. Oak Road is a quiet, residential, also narrow road. This sort of activity, during the build would be hugely disruptive to the village and directly to the residents along Knights Lane and Oak Road. So, we have access during the build as an issue and access to and from 60 new homes, as an issue. Although the Neighbourhood Plan recommends that access "should be" provided, there is currently NO other confirmed access point on any submitted application. Therefore, it is a huge risk to include the Tiddington Fields site as the preferred site, when such issues have not yet been resolved or even addressed seriously in the planning application. Tiddington Fields should also be described as agricultural land in the general description on page 121.
225	Tim Print		Paragraph a): It is recommended that access should be provided through the Main Street side via the Home Guard Club site. As I understand it there is currently no provision for this in the Home Guard

		<p>Club development proposal and therefore Tiddington Fields should not be considered for development. Paragraph a): The phrase "...laid out, so as to reduce the increase in traffic along the existing narrow residential roads..." is unclear and misleading. I understand the intention but the word reduce is problematic. 60 extra houses would inevitably create a significantly larger volume of traffic on what are clearly identified as 'narrow residential roads'. Using the word reduce does not convey this at all. I disagree with Tiddington Fields being promoted for development over other possible sites in the village for the following reasons. I do not believe the recommendation of Tiddington Fields as the preferred choice by the Tiddington Village Residents Association (TVRA) is an accurate representation of the results of the survey that was conducted by them. At the time of the survey the proposals were as follows: site 2a (Tiddington Fields North) - 60 dwellings site 3a (Knights Lane) - 100 dwellings site 3b (Knights Lane) - 100 dwellings Each site received approximately 9% share of the votes (of a turnout of around 20% of the village residents). Based on these results and the wish by a majority of residents for a green buffer between Tiddington and Stratford, TVRA have chosen to recommend Tiddington Fields for development. However the proposed development for the two Knights Lane sites (3a & 3b), by Rosconn Group, has since been revised to a total of 60 dwellings from the potential 200 dwellings included in the survey question. The revised application also includes a covenanted green belt, to guarantee the long term protection against coalescence. This development of 60 dwellings would have significantly less impact on the village than the 200 dwellings which were in the original TVRA survey and which their recommendations are based on. I do not believe that with such a fundamental difference to the facts provided in the original question that the results can still be considered valid. I believe that the development of sites 3a and 3b would have less negative impact on the village than the development of 2a. Site 2a (Tiddington fields) has had a permissive footpath around it's perimeter for many years and is used by a large number of local residents including, dog walkers, families, playing children and residents of Margaret Court residential home. It provides a significant community open space that is valuable to the well-being of village residents.</p>
230	Mark Taylor	<p>I have closely followed the detailed work done by the Tiddington Village Residents' Association and the results from their village consultation questionnaire, and I am in full agreement with their representation of the needs of the whole village. I do wish to make clear that I oppose all development in Tiddington - the village school is full, the drainage problems are already manifest, the biodiversity in the surrounding countryside is hugely important both to the lives of the village residents and the cultural importance of our nearby town. The local infrastructure already cannot support the current level of development - day after day, it is becoming increasingly difficult to drive</p>

			into or through our local town. I oppose any building on Tiddington Fields - the traffic implications for all residents of the village are unmanageable, and Knights Lane as a whole is becoming far too busy. Even further I oppose any building on the proposed Knights Lane sites - the need to keep a full strategic gap between Stratford-upon-Avon and Tiddington is paramount. The views from the village towards Alveston Hill are part of the essence of living in the village. The children going to Alveston School over the next 20 years should be able to look into the distance, to see countryside, and not to have their Forest School bordering on a housing development.
253	Daniel O'Donnell		Tiddington. The TVRA survey undertaken does not fairly represent the different housing proposals options; such as the survey is fundamentally flawed.
259	Mr & Mrs Cyril Willoughby		Tiddington Development. Access into Stratford will become even more difficult at peak times if not addressed properly.
279	Gloria Douglas		SSB5 Tiddington Fields. I have reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan and have the following comments regarding new housing in Tiddington. I understand that the Tiddington Fields planning application by Gallagher's has now closed but knowing the length of planning applications, I am nevertheless putting forward my views on development in Tiddington and trust they will be given serious consideration. As housing has to be constructed in Tiddington, the best option would be Knights Lane. This would have less of a destructive aspect as it is a relatively contained area and would be the most favourable in respect to increased traffic. Tiddington Fields has always been an open area which I and my family and countless others have enjoyed for walking, bird watching and general recreation and should remain an open public space without having to take a car or transport. Its environmental value cannot be over-emphasised and it would be a tragedy to see it over-developed to housing. There is no over-turning of creation of a concrete jungle and, if this happened, future planners would realise that it was an enormous mistake. Please "close the door before the horse has bolted" and future generations would appreciate the foresight. Take into consideration also the physical and mental health enjoyed by users of this green space - an important issue in the 21st century. The traffic situation is also a huge problem, but as some housing has to be built, locating development in Knights Lane would be positive and might alleviate greater bottlenecks on Main Street. As is well known, traffic on Main Street is sometimes backed up to New Street with further dire congestion at the lower end. While selecting Knights Lane for development would result in a smaller strategic gap, I consider this to be of secondary importance. The construction of 70/100 houses in a small village should be sufficient to meet overall housing needs in the town and County and a fair and equitable distribution

			if applied to all villages - at least for some time in the future.
281	Michael Craig Scott		Tiddington Housing Allocation - Tiddington Fields. This application should not be supported. This site is a prime example of a site that should not be considered for development. The site is outside the built up area boundary on greenbelt land and no benefit to the neighbourhood has been demonstrated. The development will create greater traffic congestion both in Tiddington and Stratford. No increase in school places has been put in place to accommodate children of the families expected to suddenly appear in Tiddington with roots in Tiddington and demand to be housed. (I realise that the plan recommends that new and existing businesses are encouraged to grow in the Town but there is no evidence that this is happening and the situations vacant page of the Stratford Herald does not confirm the need for this level of residential development. The development will have a detrimental effect on the character of Tiddington significantly reduce the visual charm of the village. These houses are not required in Tiddington.
283	Mrs L E Barnes		Policy SSB5 - Tiddington Housing Allocation Tiddington Fields. I am writing to put forward some comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan for future housing developments in Tiddington. I note from published information that at the eastern end of the village seems to have been targeted, with an approved application for 32 new dwellings on The Home Guard Club site and a new application for 60 plus dwellings on Tiddington Fields. I appreciate that it is very desirable to maintain a gap between Stratford and Tiddington, but it seems to me to be unreasonable, not to say unfair, to expect the residents at this end of the village to have to accept nearly all of the present requirement (90-113 houses). I have no desire to see any other residents adversely affected, but some development in the other suggested locations around the village, seemingly equally suitable, would have less impact on everyone. As you will see from my address, I am very much an interested party as far as Tiddington Fields is concerned. The impact of such a development on the quality of life would be considerable for the residents of Margaret Court, as well as for those of the surrounding residential roads. The loss of this open space, which is amenity very well used by walkers of all generations, would be a matter of serious concern. The lack of infrastructure in the surrounding area - inadequate schooling, no medical facilities nearer that Wellesbourne on Stratford, increased traffic on already very busy B road - has often been discussed but it remains no less valid. I have also been told that a previous planning application was refused on the grounds of potential risk of flooding, although I have not seen written evidence of this. If this was the case, surely it must still apply! As a relatively recent resident of Tiddington, who came from crowded and noisy London, I am very concerned that these quiet country areas are threatened with being spoiled for so many people.

290	Reg Edwards		<p>Tiddington Housing Allocation - Tiddington Fields. Regarding the above subject I would like to make my own and no doubt many other people's objections to what we feel is definitely for safety and other reasons a ridiculous idea. 1. Sixty dwellings with all that entails, inadequate roads already overloaded 2. How will they cope with very heavy lorries conveying very heavy Machinery and supplies. 2. With approx. 100 more vehicles after construction 4. What about school places could be 100 more? 5. Totally inadequate approach roads Oak and New Street, there will surely be accidents, even perhaps a fatality 6. I cannot see how any thinking person can even consider such a dangerous plan. Finally I could continue writing genuine reasons why not because quite honestly this is the most irresponsible plan imaginable. To whom this concerns please think again. Yours Sincerely, Reg Edwards</p>
294	Mrs Angela Brook		<p>Although I understand that more housing is needed, I believe the allocation for Tiddington is far too many as we do not have the infrastructure to support them. I am, therefore, objecting to both preferred sites on the following grounds:</p> <p>Tiddington Fields Currently provides valuable open space to the whole village and has several permissive footpaths which provide residents with a place to exercise and would be lost through any development. Access: With no access from Main Street, traffic would have to use Oak Road and New Street both of which are already busy with local traffic and severely over-parked as most houses own more than one car.</p> <p>Open Space: Building on this land would mean the loss of the village's open fields where many of us exercise and walk our dogs and where our children play. The SNDP suggests that site 2b may be kept as open green space. However, without agreement to this by Clifford Chambers Trust, this area will become vulnerable to further development and we will lose all these open fields and our only green space. Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the 'Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people. I don't believe that Tiddington has this now so what we do have should be protected!!!</p> <p>Knights Lane Building on this land would not limit disruption to the village. It also provides open space for the community and wonderful views. Access: Although traffic would enter either from Loxley Road or Knights Lane, the increase in traffic would still</p>

		<p>cause problems for the village. These two roads are already busy with traffic for the Football Club and for the NFU and cause problems around the primary school when parents are dropping off and picking up.</p> <p>Open Space: Again, development on this area of land would mean the loss of our green open spaces. It also presents a risk of 'coalescence' with Stratford if the proposed Arden Heath development goes ahead. This could, potentially, mean even more homes could be forced upon the village as we become a suburb of Stratford. In order to remain a separate settlement, Tiddington needs to have a strategic gap around the village. There is, however, no guidance on how wide this gap should be.</p>
296	Kate Rolfe	<p>Tiddington - in policy SSB5 we are promoting 60 houses however in the drawing there are two hatched areas. We need to remove the hatching of the second area nearest to the Loxley Road backing onto Townsend and Hamilton. Only the hatched area backing onto Oak Road should remain. Tiddington has no or very little amenity space. Developers in Tiddington must be encouraged to provide more of this.</p>
298	Helen Campbell	<p>Neighbourhood Plan Page 124 and 125 With reference to the above plan, I have lived in this village for 56 years born in the house I live in and I am totally objecting to your idea that north of Tiddington Fields which is off Oak Road and Hamilton Road is the preferred site for these houses. If we have to have houses built then the preferred site for these houses should be in the field which is the top left of Knights Lane by Townsend Road and Knights Lane. Please read as follows: Tiddington Fields North and South Previous application of 188 houses were turned down by Planning who stated NEVER TO BE BUILT ON this was due to the cellars of old houses in New Street being flooded out and the unsuitable access to these fields. On occasions the farmer's tractors have been stuck in those fields just the other year this happened. So if you don't mind, I would like to remind the Committee on the Neighbourhood Plan from the dictionary what Never means "AT NO TIME IN THE PAST OR FUTURE, NOT EVER - NOT AT ALL". So why are these fields mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan Page 125. 2. To access these fields are roads which were built in 60's when there were very little cars i.e., not every house had a car not like today when every household could have one, two or three cars. Roads as follows a) Oak Road - Bottom of Oak Road is a very small entrance into the fields - (1) This is a nice quiet road with the occasional car travelling up the road. (2) Children play in this road (3) Cats cross the road also dog walkers. (4). If this is to be the main entrance to the housing then for months we will experience construction traffic i.e., diggers, cranes, delivery vans, workmen's cars etc. All coming down that road. I wonder if the road can take the pressure as under the tarmac history,</p>

		<p>the prisoner of the war built the road with squares of concrete and their names and dates were on each square. I might ask the question as to why we should put up with that amount of traffic and noise and extreme danger to children and animals (5) Cars will not only use Oak Road to access the housing they will also use New Street which this street has major problems with traffic and parking Ambulance and Fire Brigade have had major problems accessing this Street even coming down Oak Road. One gentleman which died the sat nav on the ambulance sent them into New Street to get to Oak Road the ambulance could not get through so had to back out then go down Knights Lane to Oak Road. (6) Various premises in Knight Lane will suffer from extra traffic I.e, Tiddington Court Retirement Home, School, NFU and Football Club plus more traffic on Main Road and Clopton Bridge. b) Hamilton Road off Townsend Road - Small entrance to field Similar to Oak Road queries where by all traffic would have to come through Townsend Road into Hamilton Road c) Margaret's Court 24 hour care Retirement Home Private Road - this is a small Road with cars parked whereby a small entrance via gate to field. This road is owned by Margaret's Court. d) Plimico Lane - This is a narrow Lane and is already used as a dirt track and is extremely dangerous to walk down especially as there is a 50 mph limit. To gain access to Tiddington Fields for housing then this road would need to be widened to accommodate the traffic and this would be difficult as you have a public footpath running along side the road plus two houses, Restaurant, a Garage and workshop are on the edge of that road. Neighbourhood Plan mentions main access from main road via Cala Homes Development depending where the access will be entering into Tiddington Fields. Ghalager's proposal looks as if access will come by Margaret's Court if that be the case then Margaret's Court will be piggy in the middle with Main Road on one side and another road albeit entrance of actual road on the other side of the Home. This is a 24 hour care home and as have residence with dementia and Alzheimer suffers, I hardly think gaining access from Main Street very suitable and could be quite dangerous for the Home. What do you think? 3. Tiddington Fields are the main countryside of Tiddington they run along side other fields known as three fields. These fields are used regularly by the Villagers, dog walkers and families going out for a walk. There are wildlife, protected birds ie, skylarks, yellow hammers. Most important these days people work many hours and long distances so they need that countryside to relax and feel free and it is very important for children to be brought up in parts of the countryside to learn all about various things like wildlife birds, and things growing like blackberries, crab apples, damsons, sloes, cherries they do not want to be brought up in over built up areas. 4. Tiddington Fields the farmer grows crops in them. So these fields are used for producing things they are not laid to rest. There are so many houses destroying farmed fields and countryside. ONCE THE COUNTRYSIDE HAS</p>
--	--	--

		<p>GONE YOU CAN NEVER GET IT BACK. The builders Gallagher's say they will put a bit of open space and woodland etc. well firstly we don't need this as we already have Countryside and secondly this open space etc will only last a few years before the builders will put another application in to build on that. Thirdly who will maintain this open space and woodland. I bet not the builders, it will probably be down to the Council which will be a further cost to their budget. Fields Top Left of Knights Lane /Townsend Road Obviously either site is not really suitable for housing but this field should be the preferred site as a) Only one field will be affected so not much destruction to the Countryside b) Can access this field straight from Knights Lane so does not have such a huge impact on roads like Townsend Road, Hamilton Road, Oak Road, New Street. c) However the cars from the new housing estate in this field would mainly use Muddy Lane (I think this has now been named Boundary Lane) this is a single track road and already overused with major amount of potholes and 50 mph, whilst travelling down that road within five mins passed 8 cars totally unsuitable and Loxley Road as their main access to Stratford the only time they will use Knight Lane would be going to the village. If coming from Wellesbourne they would more likely to use Plimico Lane which here again is not suitable as mentioned above will need widening. c) Would not affect Margaret's Court Retirement Home so the residence who suffer from dementia and alzheimers would be protected. d) One of the reasons you say this field would not being the preferred option due to the fact it might link up with Stratford a). This is ridiculous as the 270 houses planned in Loxley Road will almost certainly link Tiddington with Stratford and it will not stop at that number with the relaxed planning now made by the Government. b) By allowing Stratford Football Club being built in Knights Lane, yes it might be on the boundary of Stratford but it is still in Tiddington so yes you have linked Tiddington with Stratford via this Club. This Club should never have been built here huge error by the Council. As mentioned before keeping Countryside is more important then linking Stratford At the end of the day 270 houses Loxley Road, 60 top Left of Knights Lane, 60 North of Tiddington Fields, 30 Home Guard Club. ? Garages ? Waste Land Off Knights Lane, Oak Road, Lawson Avenue, 50 Alveston plus the likelihood of more houses that the roads around Tiddington cannot accommodate them nor can Clopton Bridge. The main road in Tiddington gets backed up to Alveston when Stratford is busy and it has been made worse with the traffic lights installed in Birmingham Road. Plimico Lane and Boundary Lane are terrible. So before housing can go ahead the roads need to be addressed and you will be responsible for destroying Tiddington. Stratford has already been destroyed with all the houses being built and all the cafes and restaurants in the town. Where are the persons going to work, schooling, doctors, etc. People in the village have the right to send their children to the school in the village not travel miles</p>
--	--	--

			<p>to another school because the school is overloaded with children from outside the village. I am not a well person so I am angry that I have now got to once again fight for the protection of Tiddington Fields and Tiddington's Countryside. Yes, I livenext to Tiddington Fields but that is not why I am fighting against houses in Tiddington Fields becausethere is a possibility I will move from Tiddington. I will be honest it will destroy me to see those fields go and also the grounds of the Home Guard Club especially what this club stood for. It was totally wrong for Tiddington a Residence a Committee to confirm that Tiddington Fields was the preferred site when they only had 20% of the village filled in their firm. Please acknowledge that you have read all of the above and what you intend to do with Tiddington Fields due to the fact they should never be built on.</p>
--	--	--	--

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation Associated	General Comments
011	Clare Watson		<p>What is the point of this document? Developers are railroading housing schemes into our area, far in excess of the proposed maximum limit already. The council has behaved disgracefully by withdrawing its opposition to the Arden Heath Farm development and reaching a secret deal to fund a useless traffic light scheme at Clopton Bridge. I despair of local democracy - why would anyone bother writing letters, attending meetings, etc. (as I have) when this is the council's response? Too little - too late.</p>
025	Jane Dodge	Alveston Villagers' Association	<p>We support the fact that Alveston is regarded separately to Stratford and the principle of a BUAB. However, the BUAB included in the Consultation Document is not as we agreed through a village consultation process and we would like this amended to reflect that the Red House is part of the village and the strategic gap is the land to the South of B4086. At present we are up-dating our Village Design Statement which we would like to be an addendum to the NHP.</p>
098	David Bishop		<p>Housing and Population Explosion - I understand , but do not necessarily agree with the dictat, that the increase in residents of the town is inevitable through extra housing, but this can only change the town we live in for the worse. One only has to look at Birmingham Road developments to see the effect that increased residency on the compactness and safe environment that we are used to. Traffic - What happens if a "Bidford Bridge" type accident closes Clopton Bridge? This is likely to happen with the increase in heavy goods vehicle using it. We must stop the traffic congestion that is choking our town and driving people away by whatever means is available. Town Centre Shops - The uniqueness of the small independent shops in the town centre should be supported as they remain an attraction</p>

			to local shoppers and decline in recent years in the number of these shops has affected the experience of shopping in Stratford. Schooling - We are blessed with a superb education facility that covers for all levels of ability. This includes grammar schools which must be kept to offer the full range of high standards needed to support the town.
257	Bennet Carr, Headmaster	King Edward VI School	We support the overall aims and purpose of the Town Centre sections of the plan to protect the Town's heritage, to find a better balance between pedestrians and vehicles and to improve the environment. We support in particular; (as entered within sections)
266	Pat Boucurat		Dear Trustees, I read bridging the gap with great interest but noticed no mention of 2 great gaps in these discretions on a land for Stratford. They both relate to items desperately needed for people living in Stratford and the villages in the District. Everyday tired shoppers can be seen leaning on the windows ledges of British Home Stores waiting for buses, young and old alike who rely on transport. Where are seat (just enough for a few!) I feel ashamed for my town. Elderly residents are told to walk every day and they do but when shopping they need a seat for fifteen to twenty minutes (seats with backs please). They sometimes are in couples and one of them needs to sit while they shop. This doesn't involve millions but is more important than many expensive schemes for enhancing the town for artificial visitors. A polite little notice such as "seating for the elderly" or "senior citizens seating" would suffice and deter others. Please take notice - don't forget the needs of the elderly in this pleasant town which we so enjoy. Yours faithfully, Pat Boucarat (I'm in my 91st year)
270	Anne Giles		Response to Policy H3 - Local Service Village Allocations (Tiddington) Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on building applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields. Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington.

		<p>Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through policies CLW 4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access. Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park at Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open Space. The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process. Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane. We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by</p>
--	--	--

		<p>a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access. Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space. Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greeted longevity that simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all of the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other Issues: Policy CS.24 Health Communities: this policy states that there should be a minimum of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the "Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people". There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>
271	Reginald Vemtoal-Davies	<p>Response to Policy H3 - Local Service Village Allocations (Tiddington) Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on building applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields. Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through policies CLW 4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over</p>

		<p>the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access. Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park at Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open Space. The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process. Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane. We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access. Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space. Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured</p>
--	--	--

		<p>through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greeted longevity that simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all of the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other Issues: Policy CS.24 Health Communities: this policy states that there should be a minimum of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the "Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people". There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>
272	Mr & Mrs Nigel Dixon	<p>Response to Policy H3 - Local Service Village Allocations (Tiddington) Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on building applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields. Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through policies CLW 4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access. Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington</p>

		<p>Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park at Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open Space. The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process. Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane. We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access. Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space. Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greeted longevity that simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all of the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other Issues: Policy CS.24 Health Communities: this policy states that there should be a minimum of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the "Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people". There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>
273	Miss Carol Vaughan		<p>Response to Policy H3 - Local Service Village Allocations (Tiddington) Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on building applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields. Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through policies CLW 4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access. Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park at Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on</p>

		<p>the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open Space. The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process. Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane. We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access. Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space. Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greeted longevity that simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all of the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other Issues: Policy CS.24 Health Communities: this policy states that there should be a minimum of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual</p>
--	--	---

		settlement and that the "Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people". There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.
274	Anthony Joseph Carr	<p>Response to Policy H3 - Local Service Village Allocations (Tiddington) Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on building applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields. Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through policies CLW 4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access. Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park at Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive</p>

		<p>area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open Space. The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process. Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane. We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access. Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space. Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greeted longevity that simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all of the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other Issues: Policy CS.24 Health Communities: this policy states that there should be a minimum of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the "Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people". There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space. Traffic is bad enough in the morning evening weekend this side of bridge more houses would make it cause real problem</p>
--	--	--

277	Penny Bowden		<p>1. I fully endorse every section of the pre-submission SNDP, and commend the Steering Group responsible for its preparation. If the objectives of this plan are fully adopted, it will help to ensure that the needs of the town are identified, controlled and addressed, to the benefit of all who care passionately about Stratford-on-Avon. 2. It is imperative that a new river crossing is built, at whatever cost, to cope with the ever increasing burden of heavy traffic on Clopton Bridge, and surrounding roads. 3. The lack of a bus / rail interchange, and bus station, with visitor facilities, needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. It is a disgrace that such a world famous tourist destination is lacking this basic and essential amenity.</p>
278	Joan Graham		<p>3rd July 2015 I agree with most of the proposals in the Development Plan. Preserving and improving where possible the essential character, while re-vitalising areas such as the canal zone. Traffic congestion is a major blight - the town needs lay-by facilities for coaches and buses - and a reduction in the number of heavy articulated lorries simply driving through the town. A new bridge over the river to take this traffic off Clopton Bridge is a major need. Developers should be encouraged to provide funds for such a provision - perhaps based on the number of vehicles that each development will bring to the town. It is in danger of becoming grid-locked all the time. Clopton Bridge just cannot cope.</p>
280	Paul Tomlinson	Scouts	<p>Building in Tiddington. I support the TVRA's site preferences for residential development and stress the need for a "strategic gap" (H2) to prevent the merging of Tiddington into a greater Stratford. I have two additional comments to make: 1. Parking in Tiddington village is a major problem with roadside and pavement parking resulting from Victorian terraced housing with no garaging. It is exacerbated by the mini shopping area which now under pressure from an application to develop two fast food outlets with their inevitable addition to the parking problem. There is no policing of parking in the village and this leads to a "free for all" approach with much illegal parking. A residential parking area on the unused section of the recreation area at the junction of Knights Lane and Tiddington Road could alleviate this problem by removing much of the residential all-day parking on the roadside. 2. Development of the Home Guard site has now received planning consent and 32 houses are to be constructed. This requires the demolition of the existing Scout Hut located on the Home Guard site for the last 50 years. The developer includes in his plan for a REPLACEMENT BUILDING OF THE SAME SIZE. With approximately 100 additional houses allocated to development of Tiddington AND further development on Loxley Road, there will be an increased demand for Scouting in the village. Currently the existing building barely meets demand and there is always a waiting list for local children. A30% larger building is required to accommodate at least some of the demand an all developers in the area</p>

		<p>should be made to contribute to a larger facility. Nobody at the District Council seems to be aware that this community organisation is in danger of being swamped by the expected development in the area and with development taking place piecemeal over time, there needs to be awareness that finance for a bigger Scout building needs to be available now.</p>
281	Michael Craig Scott	<p>Tiddington. I wanted to comment on the section in the plan regarding Tiddington. I must say that I believe that the small number of respondents to the Consultation Questionnaire (under 20% of dwellings), undertaken by the TVRA, was due to the general lack of urgency as no formal planning applications had been submitted at that time. This was the case with myself and as the planning threat becomes more real and the developers more ferocious, I find myself needing to be more involved in the process to protect my home and I believe that this is the case with many more of the residents of Tiddington, and if the consultation was run again I believe the level of participation would be far greater and the outcome different. Because of the very low response rate the TVRA committee seem to be almost self-appointed and closed to anyone else being allowed to join them. The conclusions they have come to seem ill-advised and appear to be the committee's personal preferences. They purport to represent the residents of Tiddington but seem to be in favour of a development which I am not. I am a resident of Tiddington. A development which this plan intends to support which goes against the results of the Consultation which the TVRA hold so dear. The questions of the consultation - 1. Tiddington as a separate settlement. 91% of respondents said that it is important to keep Tiddington as a separate settlement. However, there is no factual detail of the required size of strategic gap so this could be the width of a mean other proposed sites could provide this. 2. The Built up area boundary - 85% of the respondents agreed that the built up area boundary should be as shown on the plan. The Tiddington Fields site is outside of this area. 3. How many houses? 71% of respondents thought that the allocation of 76-100 houses as required by the district council is too many. 4. Where are your preferred sites? Despite Tiddington Fields site being the 8th most popular site from a list of 10 it is still being supported by this plan and is meeting the least resistance from the TVRA so this must be the personal choice of the committee. As a concerned resident of Tiddington I am worried that the village will be overrun by new development and will lose its charm and character which make it a wonderful place to live and the reason that developers know they can sell houses here for higher than average prices. I, and many other residents of Tiddington fear that the TVRA seems to have the ear and significant influence over local councillors and planners. The committee are in a position of power to push forward their personal views and not those of all of the residents of Tiddington and through poor judgement and short-sightedness could contribute to</p>

			the demise of this wonderful village.
282	Anne Marian Kiely		This represents approx. 10 hours of sitting in Town Hall/library reading and commenting on Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan. I have encouraged many of my friends who live or work in Stratford to complete this task - I do hope that at least some of them will have found the time to do so, and that our comments will make some difference to the various disastrous developments that are current being suggested as the way forward
285	Martyn Scott	West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust, Coventry and Warwickshire Division	From my point of view as long as the primary care facilities were expanded as shown in the plan we would not have an issue per say. We have the space at Stratford Ambulance Station to expand the workforce if necessary and would work closely with the CCG and other health partners to ensure appropriate pathways are in place. The only other relevant point for us would be building design to allow access for stretchers wheelchairs etc. which I know you already advise them of. If you need anything else please get in touch.
286	Denys Shortt	DCS Europe	I am very concerned that housing seems to be going at pace whereas business growth land is almost non-existent ! Below is an example of the current poor state of affairs. We are forced to look at Evesham Vale Park. I also do not think the Canal Quarter is deliverable. A recent meeting of Stratford Enterprise Park businesses confirmed this. Perhaps the neighbourhood plan needs to look into this ?
287	Mrs Miriam Dow		I am in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan as a means of making sure we retain Stratford as a beautiful market town which has a lot to offer, and to have some input into the detail of what might happen in the future, especially with regard to style of housing, traffic/road issues, retail/tourism.
288	Robin Sankey	Stratford Town Transport Group	As chairman of the STTG I attach the response of the STTG to the NP. As our response is in the form of a general comment entitled "Strategic Overview of Transport issues" it does not fit with the form of response on the NP website or the communication facilities offered there. Hence we submit it in this form. Elizabeth Dixon our secretary has kindly given me your email addresses. For the record The Stratford Town Transport Group is a joint working group of the Stratford Society, the Town council and Stratforward together with officers and elected members of the SDC & WCC, the local MP N.Zahawi, representatives of Stratford Voice and Cycle Forum and specialist transport experts. We hope that our thoughts are of use to your group.
291	Diana Owen	The Shakespeare	Strongly support - do complete globally, Stratford town centre visitor experience requires

		Birthplace Trust	improvement and investment, as well as modernisation to meet the needs of today's diverse audiences
292	Ian Prosser	The Historic Spine Action Group	<p>I am responding to the consultation on the NDP on behalf of the Historic Spine Action Group. The group was established in October 2009; its members are drawn from the main owners of properties along the spine route together with the Local Authorities and the Stratford Society under whose auspices it was set up. Its purpose is promote and protect the heritage of the town as expressed through the history and architecture of the buildings along the route from the Birthplace to Holy Trinity Church. We support the overall aims and purpose of the Town centre sections of the plan to re-invigorate the commercial life of the town whilst strengthening and protecting its heritage. We are very much behind the ideas for a better balance between pedestrians and vehicles to create for both residents and visitors a more relaxed ambience in which to enjoy all the town offers. We support in particular the historic spine as a concept within the town has been recognised for some years now as a focus for protecting and enhancing the town's heritage; it has been formally by them and with their members participating. It demonstrated that the co-operation things can be achieved in the town where competing interests and preferences so often inhibit progress. It shows that joint working is a way forward for the town and we would, on the strength of this experience, support the two policies TC1 and TC14 proposing potentially important advisory bodies for promotion for the town and for continuing overview of its parking policies. And on a note of constructive criticism, since I have made a case for the relevance of the Historic Spine could more be said in the introduction or explanation in the NDP to recognise its achievement, perhaps in the sense of showing some good practice of joint working as a foundation for further expressions of it. Yours sincerely. Ian Prosser</p>
295	Cllr Charles Bates		<p>Overall there are lots of very good things in the plan, particularly the need to preserve open green spaces, and the utilisation of the old railway bridge as an additional canal crossing. However, there is the need to reduce the repetitive nature of the plan, and provide details on the number of units of accommodation that could be provided in those areas identified for housing. Page 17 repeats much of what's stated on page 14, with this type of repetition continuing throughout the Development Plan.</p>