

## Responses to Representations made on the Pre-submission Draft Stratford Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Policy H1

Representations: Total received 72

Number in Support: 19

### Summary of Representations:

Primarily objections to the BUABs, especially for Alveston. Concern over the accuracy of the maps.

### Summary of Response:

- SDC is content with the NDP approach to drawing a BUAB around the built form of Tiddington and Alveston as existing. The process followed the criteria set out in the Guide to Defining BUABs contained in Annex 3 to the Local Plan Review 2006;
- Stratford Town has an existing BUAB (as defined in the Local Plan Review 2006). SDC is content that we show commitments (ie sites completed or with planning permission), or proposed allocation sites, outside the BUABs as proposed modifications to the BUABs. This is consistent with the approach used in the Submission Core Strategy;
- SDC is unconcerned whether Alveston and Tiddington BUABs are separated along Main Street, or congruent at that point. It is accepted that a BUAB does not necessarily define a village boundary, so some buildings could be within a village yet not within the BUAB (eg the Red House or the Old Rectory). It has been confirmed that the planning permissions granted for the Red House had been attributed to Alveston to count against that village's housing numbers in any case. There is, however, no clear reason to exclude The Red House or Avon Court from the Alveston BUAB and they are both included in the Alveston postcode on Wellesbourne Road;
- As for the Strategic Gap between Alveston and Tiddington, it is agreed that there is not much logic in extending it north of the B4086, Main Street, as that land is not a clear separation of development nor clearly open. The area proposed to the south of the road and east of the road junction of Main Street, Alveston Lane and Wellesbourne Road is acceptable.

**Modification Proposed:**

- It is proposed to alter the Alveston BUAB to include The Red House and Avon Court.
- It is proposed to exclude the Strategic Gap north of the B4086, Main Street.
- It is proposed to show all new Housing Commitments up to the date of submission as proposed extensions to the BUABs.
- Maps will be revised for the Submission version.

**Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses**

<b>Code Number</b>	<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Organisation represented (where applicable)</b>	<b>Policy H1</b>	<b>Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response</b>
--------------------	------------------	--	------------------	---

**Statutory Consultees' Comments**

1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>The built-up area boundary for Stratford Town as shown on the proposals map (Figure 2) appears identical to the existing Local Plan boundary and is out of date. The Neighbourhood Plan is an opportunity to draw the boundary in advance of this being done in the Site Allocations Plan. As a minimum, it should be amended to encompass the (five) existing housing commitments (also shown on Figure 2) with consideration given to the inclusion of SUA.2 on the Alcester Road. Similarly, the built-up area boundary for Tiddington should include the proposed allocations. The built-up area boundary for Alveston appears, on the map evidence, to be drawn 'loosely'. This is not in itself a problem, other than to query how consistent the</p>	<p>It had previously been agreed with SDC that the BUABs should include committed sites but that allocations would be shown as BUAB extensions.</p> <p>The loose boundary around Hillside should be reduced as this is overly generous. Much of this area is undevelopable as it lies within the active floodplain of the River Avon. This also</p>
------	----------------------------	---------------------	--	---

		<p>Alveston boundary is compared to the tighter drawing of Stratford-upon-Avon and Tiddington boundaries. Generally speaking, a 'looser' boundary will generate a greater demand for infill development.</p> <p>Is there a contradiction between the statement in Policy H1 that proposals for development outside the built-up area boundaries will be strongly resisted unless allocated, and the statement in the accompanying explanation that states that previously developed land within the Neighbourhood Area (i.e. potentially outside of the built-up area boundaries) would normally be considered sustainable and suitable?</p> <p>Are conversions/subdivisions/replacement dwellings resisted outside BUABs?</p> <p>As worded, this policy is more restrictive than the NPPF. It could identify areas where constraint is necessary if the evidence base supports it, but to guide all new development to identified sites is contrary to the NPPF which requires LPAs to identify an on-going 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p>By implication, this Policy supports development on "windfall" sites, by virtue of the cross-reference to Core Strategy Policy CS.15. These are more likely to be smaller sites, which significantly limits the potential affordable housing yield.</p>	<p>reflects the discussions held between the NDP steering group and SDC in a workshop on 19 November 2015</p> <p>Wording similar to "or supported by other policies in this plan" can be added.</p> <p>This is covered by Policy BE8 and the word "properties" in Policy BE8 criterion c) can be changed to "buildings".</p> <p>Agreed. Suggested addition above solves this conflict.</p> <p>Agreed. We are supportive of windfall sites subject to compliance with other policies in the NDP</p>
--	--	---	--

**Agents and Developers' Comments**

505	Boyer Planning re: Hallam Land Management	Policy H1	<p>Unrealistic and unsound not to plan for development outside current BUAB or on greenfield land and to do so results in an overly constrained housing land supply that fails to meet objectively assessed housing need</p> <p>Policy should include criteria for sustainable development of greenfield sites through allocations</p> <p>Criteria for assessing suitability of greenfield sites in explanatory test should be expanded consistent with the NPPF and CS</p>	<p>The NDP team recognises the need to align itself with the CS allocations. The decision has been made to not allocate housing in the NDP over and above the CS allocations and the commitments – for which there are a significant number. A BUAB which reflects this position is entirely reasonable and acceptable</p> <p>The current BUAB will be reviewed in light of this ever changing position.</p>
507	JLL re: Gateway One	Developer's Agent	<p>This policy is supported in principle, as it sets out a permissive approach to housing development, provided that it is located in the built up area boundary. This policy also provides flexibility for windfall housing sites to be delivered throughout the plan period, which should improve the housing land supply position in the District. The Gateway site has the potential to deliver an element of housing and hence will assist in the delivery of this policy objective.</p>	Supportive
508	Pegasus Group re: Gallagher Estates	Policy H1	<p>No flexibility for sustainable housing sites to come forward outside of the BUAB's which has clear implications for meeting housing need and conflicts with the strategic policy provision of the CS and NPPF</p>	<p>It is clear that the BUAB will need to be reviewed in light of new allocations and commitments but the principle of a BUAB is sound and provide certainty against continued</p>

			Land to the east of Birmingham Road provides the opportunity for a high quality sustainable housing location outside of the Green Belt	unplanned speculative development around the town. Plan led development which takes account of the identified need is not contrary to the strategy of the CS or NPPF Land to the East of the Birmingham Road is not currently supported in the CS or the NDP
509	Framptons re: Red House, Tiddington Road	Policy H1	<p>A built up area is considered to demarcate the countryside from the urban area. Avon Court and the Red House have been excluded.</p> <p>Development boundary is drawn tightly around the village thereby placing a severe constraint on future development</p>	<p>The identification of a built up area boundary is not specifically about defining an urban area and the countryside. There are countless examples of existing development being located outside of built up area boundaries.</p> <p>The development boundary has been deliberately drawn tightly around the village to ensure that there is sufficient containment and limited urban sprawl. With specific allocations/commitments there is no need to extend the village boundary to allow for additional housing on the edge of the village</p>
510	Lodders Solicitors re: Land adjacent to	Policy H1	Development boundary is drawn tightly around the village thereby placing a severe constraint on	The development boundary has been deliberately drawn tightly

	Tiddington Road		future development	around the village to ensure that there is sufficient containment and limited urban sprawl. With specific allocations/commitments there is no need to extend the village boundary to allow for additional housing on the edge of the village
511	Savills re: Land in and around Alveston	Policy H1	<p>Built up area boundary is not compatible with and will prejudice the delivery of the CS</p> <p>Constraints on the village (heritage assets and flood plain) suggest it will be very difficult to accommodate the 32 dwellings anticipated for Alveston in the BUAB which could rise with the new OAN figure</p> <p>Arbitrary boundary is both unnecessary and unreasonably prescriptive</p>	<p>The NDP team will continue to monitor the CS and reappraise the situation if the housing figures are changed</p> <p>There are windfall sites available within the village which do not affect heritage assets and are outside the flood plain</p> <p>The site proposed by this contributor adversely affects the setting of an important heritage asset and was recently rejected at appeal</p> <p>A boundary for the village is proposed and careful consideration has been given to where this is drawn</p>
512	RPS re Taylor Wimpey and Miller Homes		The policy proposes an area boundary which tightly follows the current extent of development in Stratford Town. RPS considers that the Town Council should be mindful of the wider strategic context of development in Stratford and the need to	The SG is aware of its requirement to ensure that there is no conflict with the strategic vision of the CS.

		<p>align with the emerging Core Strategy, its development strategy, housing requirements and requirement for greenfield development, which will provide a strategic framework for the District.</p> <p>Presently, the identified housing need in the District is 11,320 dwellings however, it has been accepted that this will rise, accounting for adjustments to housing need in the District. Whilst we do not yet know the extent of this increase, and indeed where the Council intend to locate new growth, the Inspector's Interim Report refers to Stratford town as the most sustainable location in the District and one which can accommodate increases in growth. As such, the Plan should accommodate future development requirements for the town and remain flexible, acknowledging that the boundaries are likely to change as the need for housing increases.</p> <p>The Town Council may be aware of the Council's latest Modifications to the Core Strategy, endorsed by the Council's Cabinet on 1 June 2015. This document included the proposed Main Modifications to the Core Strategy, including a reserve sites policy. Within policy CS.16 (d) of the emerging Strategy, the Council includes a new section which requires the identification of reserve sites, to meet up to 10% of the total housing requirement, to be released should the Core Strategy fail to deliver upon targets for growth.</p> <p>In addition to polices, the NDP can also bring sites forward as additional allocations. In the event of evidence of increased housing need, the NDP could give certainty to where development could be located, instead of piecemeal development that</p>	<p>This figure is now 14,480 dwellings.</p> <p>The SG will take account of the most recent iteration of the CS throughout its preparation.</p> <p>The SG will consider the need to allocate additional sites should the need arise through increased numbers in the CS.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>may lead to less sustainable outcomes.</p> <p>It is considered that Land at Bishopton Lane, promoted by RPS, is fully capable of meeting this requirement as it is strongly located to the town yet does not compromise the historic centre of Stratford, located in a well-defined non Green Belt location.</p> <p>Recognition of this point was made clear by the representative from the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) at the Core Strategy Examination in January 2015, who advised the Inspector that the Bishopton Lane site was the most obvious location around the whole town for future growth.</p> <p>It is considered that this proposal can produce a range of housing, consistent with the emerging NDP and infrastructure to meet the needs of the development. It is recommended that the NDP take a proactive stance and include Bishopton Lane as a housing allocation site for development.</p>	<p>This land is now subject to a proposed allocation in the CS (SUA.4).</p>
513	Stansgate planning re Mr C Swan	<p>Our client objects to the built up area boundary at Alveston. It is not in conformity with the Core Strategy and it is premature to define the boundary in advance of the housing requirement being settled.</p> <p>Policy H1 where it relates to Alveston is not in conformity with the emerging Core Strategy as it does not account for the fact that the village is identified in the Core Strategy hierarchy as a sustainable settlement where housing development will take place. Policy CS15 identifies Alveston as a</p>	<p>The BUAB for Alveston is drawn tightly around the village but allows for infill development to take place.</p>

Category 4 Local Service Village (LSV) and Policy CS16 as proposed to be modified, provides for approximately 400 homes in total of which '*no more than around 8% should be provided in an individual settlement.*' Therefore, to acknowledge its sustainable nature and ensure delivery of strategic policies, the NP should draw a built up area boundary at Alveston having found sites to accommodate around 32 homes in the settlement.

Policy CS15 in respect of LSV's states development will take place on sites identified in the Site Allocations Document; Neighbourhood Plan; and through small-scale schemes on unidentified sites within Built-Up Area Boundaries. The Site Allocations Document is not yet prepared and in Alveston no sites allocations are identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. In other words, no suitable sites for around 32 houses within the Built up Area Boundary of Alveston are identified. Within the boundary, much of the village is Conservation Area and any proposals will need to be considered having regard to this.

It is premature to define the boundary at Alveston in advance of the housing requirement being settled. The boundary is identified based on a Core Strategy housing requirement that is no longer relevant, as the Core Strategy Inspector has found a need for additional housing in the district. The amount of additional housing needed is not yet established and some of the additional housing may be located on sites in the Neighbourhood Plan area. Furthermore, the distribution of the quantity of housing between LSV's in Policy CS16 has not yet been confirmed and may change.

			<p>There is no flexibility in this policy to allow for additional housing and until such time as an assessment of suitable locations on the edge of the settlements of Stratford, Tiddington and Alveston has been completed, it is not possible to define the Built up Area Boundary. This issue needs to be settled before the NP can progress.</p>	
514	Stansgate Planning re Town Trust		<p>The policy is based on a housing figure that is no longer relevant as the Core Strategy Inspector has found a need for additional housing. The amount of additional housing needed is not yet established and some of the additional housing may be located on sites on the edge of Stratford upon Avon.</p> <p>There is no flexibility in this policy to allow for additional housing and until such time as an assessment of suitable locations on the edge of the settlement has been completed it is not possible to define the Built up Area Boundary. This issue needs to be settled in the Core Strategy before the NP can progress.</p> <p>There is land at Benson Road that should be identified to meet future housing needs. Representations on behalf of the Town Trust to NP Section 12: Site Specific Briefs provide further information.</p>	<p>See comment above re new housing figure.</p> <p>There needs to be a defined BUAB in order to prevent the unrestricted spread of housing on the edge of the town. The BUAB has been defined having regard to proposed allocations and commitments which would meet the envisaged housing need for the town. It is not considered that there would be a need for further flexibility which would undoubtedly lead to further uncertainty and further non-plan led development.</p>
516	Framptons re ROSCONN Group		<p>Policy H1 is objected to on the basis that the wording is contrary to the cost / benefit approach of the Framework. The planning system operates on a plan-led planning system, not a plan-determined system. In consequence 'other material considerations' may justify the granting of planning</p>	<p>It is unclear what is meant by the phrase "plan determined system" and how this differs from a plan led approach. The NDP is a plan led approach, sites have been identified and</p>

			permission notwithstanding the provisions of the development plan or neighbourhood plan. Policy H1 should identify the proposed limits of the urban area only.	consulted upon and will be allocated in the plan. Not all sites put forward will make the grade and this is not an uncommon situation.
518	Framptons re Mr & Mrs Shakeshaff		This policy is too restrictive and other than the two housing allocations identified at section 12, there is no further scope for growth within Tiddington. Policy H1 does not accord with the Framework, Local Plan or Core Strategy Proposed Modifications.	It has been determined that Tiddington does not need to accommodate further sites than has been identified based on the latest CS housing figures in the context of Tiddington.
519	Daniel O'Donnell		Policy H1 is contrary to the cost / benefit approach of the NPPF, it should instead indentify the limit of the urban area only.	It is unclear what is meant by the cost-benefit approach to the NPPF.
520	Charles Vickery		Policy H1 is contrary to the cost / benefit approach of the NPPF, it should instead only indentify the limit of the urban area.	See response above to Rep 519.

<b>Residents' Comments</b>				
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Good idea	Supportive
018	Stephen Wreford		Housing applications within the built up boundary should be supported - whether they be single, smaller or medium sized developments.	Supportive

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?	The NDP seeks to highlight these problems to ensure that adequate infrastructure is provided to support all future developments
024	Michaela Willson		Too many houses and not enough infrastructure. Doctors, schools, roads, broadband. This is badly thought out	The NDP seeks to highlight these problems to ensure that adequate infrastructure is provided to support all future developments
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.	SDC is unconcerned whether Alveston and Tiddington BUABs are separated along Main Street, or congruent at that point. It is accepted that a BUAB does not necessarily define a village boundary, so some buildings could be within a village yet not within the BUAB (eg the Red House or the Old Rectory). It has been confirmed that the planning permissions granted for the Red House had been attributed to Alveston to count against that village's housing numbers in any case. It is accepted that there is no clear reason to exclude The Red House or Avon Court from the Alveston BUAB and they are both included in the Alveston

				postcode on Wellesbourne Road.
038	Amanda Waters		Support	Supportive
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 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	The comments made in this Representation are covered by the Policy wording.

			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.	
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support	Supportive
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree	Supportive
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.	Supportive
065	K Tandy		This plan would significantly impact on Alveston in a negative manner	It is not clear what negative impacts are envisaged in this representation.
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.	The choice of land at Bishopton Lane as a Strategic Land Allocation is outside the scope of the NDP, however any development of the land should accord with other policies within the NDP. This comment does not require any alteration to this Policy.
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.	See Response to Representation 025 above

069	Judith Benney		The BUAB for Alveston should include The Red House, this property is part of the village.	See Response to Representation 025 above
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.	This comment is addressed in the BE Section.
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.	See Response to Representation 025 above
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.	Supportive
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	See Response to Representation 025 above
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.	See Response to Representation 025 above
089	Stephanie Surrey		The village of Alveston has a Villagers Association who has the 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.	See Response to Representation 025 above
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree	Supportive
096	Nicholas Richard Chester		The Strategic Gap places some dwellings outside the Alveston built up area boundary which have	SDC is content with the NDP approach to drawing a BUAB

			<p>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.</p>	<p>around the built form of Tiddington and Alveston as existing. The process followed the criteria set out in the Guide to Defining BUABs contained in Annex 3 to the Local Plan Review 2006. However, see Response to Representation 025 above</p>
102	Mike Storey		<p>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.</p>	<p>See Response to Representation 025 above</p>
103	Joy Hawker		<p>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.</p>	<p>See Response to Representation 025 above</p>
110	MARGARET & Peter Woodhams		<p>In general we are supportive of the BUAB.</p>	<p>Supportive</p>
115	Mr Philip Brown	Savills on behalf of Mixed Farms Ltd	<p>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</p>	<p>This is within the remit of the Core Strategy</p>

			<p>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.</p>	
118	Ann and Trevor		<p>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.</p>	See Response to Representation 025 above
120	John Michael Jesse		<p>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 ?</p>	See Response to Representation 025 above

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.	The 2 sites suggested are outside the BUAB for Stratford, and are not supported by the Neighbourhood Plan unless they subsequently become sites allocated by the Core Strategy.
126	Clarissa and David Roberts		700 houses that is planned for the Town is not designated and currently applications for the 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.	Generally Supportive. This comment does not require any alteration to this Policy.
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	The Pre-submission draft was prepared in accordance with the then known requirements of the Core Strategy. It is intended that the Submission version will take account of the final modifications to the Core Strategy, particularly with respect to housing allocations.

			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.	A note will added to the NDP which recognises that boundaries cannot be accurately drawn on small scale maps. The BUAB drawn to prevent backland development.
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.	See Response to Representation 025 above. As for the Strategic Gap between Alveston and Tiddington, it is agreed that there is not much logic in extending it north of the B4086, Main Street, as that land is not a clear separation of development nor clearly open. The area proposed to the south of the road and east of the road junction of Main Street, Alveston Lane and Wellesbourne Road is acceptable.
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	Supportive

			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.	Supportive
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	This is a Strategic Allocation matter that is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood plan to deliver.
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.	Supportive
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		I strongly support this policy.	Supportive
174	Sarah Eglin		Agree	Supportive
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 COMMITTE, INCLUDED THE RED HOUSE WITHIN THE BUAB.	See Response to Representation 025 above
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,	Noted

			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.	Supportive
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.	Due to planning permissions granted there will need to be revisions to the map before submission.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Pleased to see no proposed increase in built-up boundary	Supportive
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.	This is not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan as it is a strategic allocation made in the Core Strategy.
208	KEVAN STUART RUSSELL		Due to its lack of user friendliness this is my 3rd attempt at completing this form. My comments are	

		<p>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</p>	<p>The NDP recognises that further work will be required to provide details of developments that the policies support</p> <p>The NDP provides a framework with which developers will be</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>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 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</p>	<p>required to operate.</p> <p>The A46 is recognised as a key arterial route.</p> <p>Charging for car parks is proposed to be under the control of an independent body, `Reference TC14</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>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 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</p>	<p>This would be classified as a "Distribution Road" and should be investigated as part of the transport Strategy Tiddington Issues below</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>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 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</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>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.</p> <p>* 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</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>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 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.</p>	
210	Rachel Syson		<p>Agree, but disagree with BUAB for Tiddington - see later responses to Section 12</p>	<p>SDC is content with the NDP approach to drawing a BUAB around the built form of Tiddington and Alveston as existing. The process followed the criteria set out in the Guide to Defining BUABs contained in Annex 3 to the Local Plan</p>

				Review 2006;
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.	See Response to Representation 025 above
213	John Fleming	Gladman Developments Ltd	Gladmans' representations to the Neighbourhood Plan have been submitted via email to enquiries@ourstratford.org.uk	The alledged email was not received.
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.	This is covered elsewhere in the Plan, in TC and BE Sections.
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.	Tiddington as Local Service village level 1, will be subject to a housing allocation as defined in the Core Strategy
228	John Campton		Strongly support concept	Supportive
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	Generally Supportive The Area of Restraint is retained in the Core Strategy and does not have to be repeated in a policy in the Neighbourhood Plan. Consideration will be given to whether it can be referenced for completeness.

			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.	Housing numbers in the Stratford upon Avon District are determined by the Core Strategy. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy, and the provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.
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.	Not agreed. We are following the wishes of the residents of Stratford and do not consider Policy 1 contrary to the NPPF.
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.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy, and the provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.
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	The BUABs were designed firstly to cover the existing extent of development in the

			<p>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 &amp; 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 far as infrastructure is concerned - public transport, doctor surgery, school places and traffic congestion in Stratford.</p>	<p>settlements in line with the SDC guidance. Any committed developments or proposed allocations outside these boundaries would be incorporated once the Plan has been approved. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy, and the provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.</p>
282	Anne Marian Kiely		<p>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.</p>	<p>Generally Supportive. Mapping will be improved where possible,</p>