

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

Whole Plan – General Comments

Representations: Total received 46

Number in Support: 12

Summary of Representations:

The prominent comment is one of Repetition, or inclusion of standards which have become out-of-date. There are comments about the content contained in individual Policies which are better dealt with under those specific Policies.

Summary of Response:

It is acknowledged that repetition should be avoided where possible, and that the Submission Version would be brought up-to-date with changes to National Guidance and with the Core Strategy.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Plan General Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	-----------------------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	Contents Pages: Policy H3 begins on p.20, not p.19. Policy H4 begins on p.21, not p.20.	Will be amended in the submission version

		<p>Policy TC12 begins on p.53, not p.52.</p> <p>Policy CLW4 begins on p.102, not p.104.</p> <p>A number of policies state start and end pages but the majority just quote the start page. The page numbering needs to be amended for consistency.</p> <p>Objectives: The objectives are referenced A, B C... under each section and as such the Neighbourhood Plan contains seven Objective A's. It would be more helpful to give each objective a unique reference (e.g. 5A, 5B, 6A, 6B) depending on which section they relate to.</p> <p>Section 1 – pg 9: The statement intimates that the Town Council will be responsible for the implementation of the Plan. This is misleading: implementation will be a shared responsibility. More importantly, no consideration has been given to the implementation process. In particular, the District Council and its partner housing associations will have an important role to play.</p> <p>Section 2 – pg 11: Statement in relation to emerging Core Strategy (June 2014 version) is noted along with recognition of likelihood of further changes.</p> <p>Final sentence of fourth paragraph – as written, it appears to suggest that SDC is the Qualifying Body, not Stratford Town Council. This requires re-drafting.</p> <p>Section 3 – pg 14: The housing allocation for Stratford should be acknowledged as a minimum, not a target.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Section 4 – Vision: The inclusion of the Stratford-upon-Avon Vision Statement is welcomed. However, nowhere in the Plan is there any discussion as to how its delivery will be monitored and reviewed; nor are there any targets or benchmarks to provide a meaningful basis against which progress towards achievement of the Vision Statement can be assessed.</p>	Noted
			<p>Third bullet point – suggest add following to the end “...for shops, services and jobs”</p>	Noted
			<p>Fourth bullet point – suggest wording is amended to read “The town will be better at accommodating and managing visitors”</p>	Noted
			<p>Fifth bullet point – congestion ‘no longer being an issue’ may need to be clarified as not establishing the unrealistic expectation that it can be completely eradicated. An alternative form of wording could be “... and congestion will have been reduced and managed effectively”</p>	Noted
1003	WCC - Flooding		<p>Stratford upon Avon town has been, and continues to be, at significant risk of both river and surface water flooding. The attached extracts from the relevant flood maps clearly demonstrate this; as do the attached photographs taken of river flooding in the centre of Stratford in 2007. Besides this recent well-known river flooding event Stratford also suffers from significant surface water flooding events; see attached Stratford Herald Article (which relates to Western Road – identified as a development area in the plan). Neither of these flooding risks identified or considered</p>	

			<p>within the plan (not in relation to the developments themselves).</p> <p>We are concerned that other than policy NE2 in relation to Biodiversity there is no mention of flooding or flood zones in the relation to location or suitability of development for new developments within the Stratford upon Avon town area. These matters should be addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
1005	Natural England	Statutory Consultee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally welcomes the draft NDP • Pleased to note the aspirations in Section 9 • The provision of local nature reserves, protection of trees and hedges and a Neighbourhood BAP are commendable • Welcome the delivery of Section 41 priority habitats • SEA Screening – screening is necessary 	Supportive
1006	Highways England		<p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network. This network is a critical national asset and as such we work to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>The proposed development has a potential impact on the strategic road network, in this case the A46 trunk road.</p> <p>We are pleased that the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in a way that promotes sustainable and</p>	Generally Supportive

		<p>diverse development in the respective areas. We note that the employment allocation, Land South of Alcester Road (A46) and West of Wildmoor Roundabout, is situated adjacent to the A46. An assessment of the development impacts on our asset will be undertaken for this development in due course.</p> <p>We also note that the potential location for a further 700 new dwellings in the neighbourhood area has not yet been identified. We support your proposal that ideally new housing should be located in Brownfield areas where developments are best placed to make use of existing sustainable transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Consequently our response to your consultation is one of no objections and that we are satisfied for the consultation to continue further. However, should an updated Core Strategy propose further employment and housing allocations or other developments in close proximity to the A46, a review of the impact of these developments on our asset will be need to be considered.</p>	<p>Should the draft Core Strategy be modified for an iincreased housing allocation, the Neighbourhood Plan will be compliant but is not currently identifying additional sites.</p> <p>Noted</p>
1008	Historic England	<p>Thank you for the invitation to comment on the above Neighbourhood Plan. Overall Historic England considers that the Plan takes a positive approach to the historic environment and is a well-considered, concise and fit for purpose document.</p> <p>Historic England is supportive of the content of the document and we applaud the comprehensive approach taken to the historic and natural environment and the wide range of well justified policies that are clearly focused upon “constructive conservation”.</p> <p>We are particularly pleased to see the emphasis on local distinctiveness including nondesignated heritage</p>	Generally Supportive

		<p>assets and upon the importance of design- whether relating to shop fronts or new build development, where requirements for master planning and the use of “Building for Life 12”, Design Codes and a Design Review Panel are highly commendable.</p> <p>We would, however, question the utility of Policies BE11-12 since these designated heritage assets are already stringently protected by specific legislation, such that the inclusion of policies in the Neighbourhood Plan would seem to offer no additional benefit.</p> <p>By contrast, we note the absence of any Policy related to archaeological remains, although the rubric of the Plan makes it clear that the core of Stratford-upon-Avon has its’ origins in a medieval planned town. The following policy may be appropriate and has already been adopted in a number of “made” West Midlands Neighbourhood Plans, viz:</p> <p><i>“New development must take account of known surface and sub-surface archaeology, and ensure unknown and potentially significant deposits are identified and appropriately considered during development. Lack of current evidence of sub-surface archaeology must not be taken as proof of absence”.</i></p> <p>Finally, on a minor point we note that Policy TC 10 (by contrast with Policy TC 9) suggests in the final sentence that piecemeal development “should” be resisted rather than “will” be resisted- the latter wording would seem to be entirely justifiable in our view.</p>	<p>This will be added</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	---	--

Agents and Developers' Comments

501	C&WLEP	<p>Thank you for the opportunity for the Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership (CWLEP) to comment on the pre submission Neighbourhood Plan for Stratford upon Avon.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) drives the opportunity for local communities to be fully engaged in a genuine plan-led system, empowering local people to shape their surroundings with a positive vision for the future of the area. CWLEP is supportive of this approach and is pleased to review and comment on the pre submission Stratford upon Avon Neighbourhood Plan from the perspective of delivering sustainable economic growth and job creation within Coventry and Warwickshire.</p> <p>In reviewing Neighbourhood Plans, CWLEP focuses on the principle of presumption in favour of sustainable development. In particular, paragraph 16 of the NPPF states:</p> <p><i>“... it will mean that neighbourhoods should [inter alia]: develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development;”</i></p> <p>In this context, the following comments are made in relation to the draft Stratford upon Avon Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Stratford upon Avon Neighbourhood Plan provides a clear vision and associated objectives for the future of the area. It is considered, however that the timing of release of the Neighbourhood Plan is premature in light of the current situation with the</p>	<p>It is regrettable that the CS has experienced significant delays. However, this is not a reason to halt the preparation of the NDP or delay its progress towards submission to SDC. The NDP group is aware of its obligation to ensure conformity with the</p>
-----	--------	---	---

		<p>Stratford on Avon Core Strategy - Interim Inspectors Report.</p> <p>The Stratford upon Avon Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges (at page 11) that it must be in accordance with the emerging Core Strategy and that changes to the Core Strategy may need to be reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan with associated further community consultation. We do not, however, concur with the view that changes to the Neighbourhood Plan "...might be limited to specific policies."</p> <p>The Stratford on Avon Core Strategy Interim Inspectors Report requires substantial further work in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 🏠 Objectively assessed need for housing – requiring the likely identification of additional housing opportunities. • 🏠 Additional work regarding the Sustainability Appraisal in relation to strategic sites. • 🏠 Review of employment land allocations. <p>It is our understanding that this additional work is currently being undertaken by Stratford District Council and will be subject to further community consultation prior to re-examination by the Planning Inspector. The additional work will have implications for the future role and function of the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>In fulfilling its role as the primary settlement within Stratford District and a key settlement in the broader Coventry and Warwickshire sub region it is critical for the Stratford upon Avon Neighbourhood Plan is consistent with the emerging Core Strategy document. This will ensure a coordinated approach towards sustainable economic growth, job creation and</p>	<p>strategic direction of the CS. It is not necessary to ensure conformity with non-strategic policies. The NDP can opt for a different approach on non-strategic matters providing there is sufficient and proportionate evidence to support its position. The NDP group is aware of the context of SUA in the sub region and the need to balance economic benefits with social and environmental benefits.</p> <p>Changes will be made to the NDP up until its submission to SDC to ensure that it is in accordance with the CS.</p> <p>The CS changes will not affect all policies in the NDP.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>housing delivery. It is not considered that this can be achieved until further work and additional community consultation has been completed in relation to the Stratford Core Strategy.</p> <p>We would therefore strongly encourage the Stratford upon Avon Neighbourhood Plan Group await the outcomes of the Stratford Core Strategy process prior to continuing the development of policies to ensure consistency with the Core Strategy. CWLEP also reserves its position to provide more detailed comments regarding the policy content of the Neighbourhood Plan once the Core Strategy process has been progressed and is reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The NDP group is of the view that it will continue to progress its NDP and will react to the Inspectors' next published report and the latest iteration of the CS when necessary.</p>
503	Accessible Stratford	<p>Response from Accessible Stratford upon Avon and Friends of Stratford Shopmobility</p> <p>Accessible Stratford upon Avon says: It is essential that 'access for all' is linked to every part of the plan from housing and design, open spaces, infrastructure, blue badge parking [close to shopping areas] and shared space [pedestrianisation]. There are many documents and guidelines to help with these decisions.</p> <p>Friends of Shopmobility says: It is essential for the residents and visitors to Stratford upon Avon to retain the Shopmobility service, which is provided by Stratford on Avon DC, even if the method of running it has to change. It needs to be in a central location for the convenience of users to access the shops and attractions in the town centre. It also needs to be under cover for users to keep dry while they transfer from their vehicles to the scooters and wheelchairs.</p>	<p>Access issues are largely covered under Part M of the Building Regulations.</p> <p>Agreed. This is a project rather than a policy and is currently included in TC1.</p>

		<p>belonging to Shopmobility. A number of parking spaces, also under cover of the current blue badge design are required at the same location.</p> <p>Previously there had been a suggestion Shopmobility would be sited on the edge of the existing Town Square in the end shop opposite the toilet block which has all the required attributes and parking in the NCP CP at the rear. But it was not possible to reach an agreement with SDC and NCP. This has been flagged to the new owners of Town Square as a community service they might be interested in supporting and will be mentioned in its planning application comments.</p>	<p>This could be included in TC5?</p>
504	Stratford Society	<p>Response from Stratford-upon-Avon Society</p> <p>I am writing to you on behalf of The Stratford Society in respect of your consultation draft for The Stratford upon Avon Neighbourhood Plan. I acknowledge that this submission is late but would wish it to be considered as a part of the overall consultation. The General Committee of The Society have considered the development of The NP over the past couple of years as has meetings of the membership of The Society. The Society supports both the objectives and approach taken by The Management Group of The NP under the guidance of The Town Council. We have considered the observations made by other bodies in Warwickshire, including The County Council and The Stratford District Council.</p> <p>We understand the process currently under way by SDC in the preparation of the next Core Strategy and we believe that the current NP (subject to consultation) takes fully into account the draft proposals contained therein. We do not see any significant issues between SDC proposals and those within The NP; particularly,</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

			<p>given that The NP relates only to The Town. We do not believe that The NP could realistically be different in scope, approach and content than currently subject to consultation due to the extensive involvement of people from The Town and the need to balance the ambitions of such people with the remit contained in government guidance. It is surely correct The NP contains both land use proposals and aspirations towards which The Town moves over time.</p> <p>We are pleased that The NP contains ambitious proposals for zoning development going forward and that the need for ‘fit for purpose’ infrastructure investment is recognised. It is not, in our view, the role of The NP to identify how the proposals should be financed as this responsibility rests with both County and District Councils once The NP is adopted. In the view of The Society, it is the role of The Town Council to make relatively minor investments within the sufficiency of the funding available from the precept on local community tax and from the share of the CIL produced for application towards The NP.</p> <p>The Society believe that there must continue to be a focus on the prosperity of Stratford Town Centre as this is a substantial employment centre, economic driver and reputation – ‘Brand’ asset. We strongly encourage all representative bodies to continue to invest time, money and effort into improving traffic management and distribution measures which we see as a significant risk to the continued prosperity of The Town. To date, the proposals contained within The NP are the only coherent group of proposals we have seen; having been drawn from the involvement of local people.</p>	<p>Agreed. But delivery is an issue which must be addressed. Such proposals are likely to be projects rather than policies.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>We further suggest that the strong beginning within The Plan to making The Town friendly to cyclists and pedestrians, as well as more efficient to traffic movements, should continue forward over The NP period. We support the continued development of all modes of public transport and greater cross modal capacity.</p> <p>Whilst there will be some changes as a result of this consultation we believe that the involvement of the people of Stratford upon Avon and the expectations raised should encourage a rapid movement towards a local vote on adoption of the plan as it is, in our view, ready now for that next stage.</p> <p>We in The Stratford Society remain willing and able to continue to support The NP process.</p>	
505	Boyer Planning re: Hallam Land Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support principle of the NDP which provides a positive opportunity to inform high quality design in and around the town • NDP is unsound on the basis that its overall approach fails to meet the tests of Para 182 of the NPPF • NDP does not take account of the Inspectors Interim Conclusions and is therefore inconsistent with the CS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no presumption in favour of sustainable development • Structural presumption against development of greenfield development is unsound • Emphasis on brownfield development is overly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Para 182 is not relevant. This is not a local plan • The Inspectors Interim conclusions will be carefully considered and the plan amended accordingly. Similarly the conclusions of the January 2016 hearings will be treated in the same way • The NDP does not have to expressly state there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development • Policy H4 will be

			<p>restrictive resulting in an inflexible housing supply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the principles set out in Section 1-4 of the NDP 	<p>considered below</p>
506	JLL re: Alscott Estate		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NDP area should be extended to include Atherstone Airfield • The NDP area includes land outside the TC administrative boundary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NDP is now set. The area designation was subject to public consultation. These comments should have been made at that time • The NDP area does not include land outside the TC boundary. Old Stratford and Drayton Parish does not exist anymore following a boundary review. All allocations are within the TC administrative boundary
508	Pegasus Group re: Gallagher Estates		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty over the CS and housing numbers for the district 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NDP team is aware that the global figure for the district is going to rise and that SUA will be a main focus of development being the most sustainable location in the district. However, in the past 12 months a significant amount of new development has been granted by the council and through the appeal process. Such sites are now commitments towards SUA's contribution to this increased global figure. A review of the BUAB and the need for allocations will be made following the release of the Inspectors conclusions following the examination hearings in January

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDP does not allow for inevitable increased housing within the NDP area • Ensuring a sufficient and proportionate evidence base requires an assessment of all potential housing sites to be undertaken • Prematurity – should wait until the CS is adopted • Steering group has failed to consult our client – contrary to PPG advice therefore NDP does not meet the basic conditions • Need to fully understand the constraints and opportunities of each available site as part of the sufficient and proportionate evidence base 	<p>2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At this time it is not envisaged that additional sites will need to be found over and above those identified in the latest iteration of the CS and commitments. However, this position will be monitored as the CS progresses • The NDP does not have to wait until the CS is adopted. Following the January 2016 hearings the global figure and contributions SUA has to play will be known and the NDP can progress on this basis • Given that there is no current intention to allocate sites for development there is no need to undertake an independent review of the available sites to ascertain which is the most suitable
510	Lodders Solicitors re: Land adjacent to Tiddington Road		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of proposed built up area boundary around Tiddington • Amount of housing catered for in the village • Not sufficiently flexible to accommodate growth • Will not enable effective delivery of the CS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the reps were made planning permission has now been granted for development on the edge of Tiddington including the proposed allocation. The development boundary will be reviewed during the latest iteration to take account of all commitments

				(planning permissions).
511	Savills re: Land in and around Alveston		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing target for SUA and Alveston are unknown because SDC are reviewing the OAN housing figure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted
512	RPS re Taylor Wimpey and Miller Homes		<p>GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE NDP PROCESS</p> <p>Timing in Relation to the Stratford Core Strategy Process</p> <p>As a general point, many of the aims and policies in the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan (“the Plan”) have crossovers with the policy approaches in the emerging Stratford Core Strategy. The Plan openly acknowledges that the emerging Core Strategy is subject to change and the Plan will need to adjust accordingly once the Core Strategy is adopted. The Plan should be mindful of the likely changes to the Core Strategy, bearing in mind the recommendations of the Inspector’s Interim report on 18 March 2015.</p> <p>One of the shortfalls documented in paragraph 42 of the Inspector’s Report identifies the disparities in the employment growth forecasts, which in the view of the Inspector needs to be revisited. The Council are currently committed to these changes, which are anticipated to lead to increases in the overall housing requirement for the District.</p> <p>Revisions to the Core Strategy and its associated technical evidence base are being considered by Stratford at its Cabinet and Full Council on 20 July 2015, prior to further public consultation and re-Examination by the Planning Inspector (Mr Peter Drew) likely towards the end of 2015/early 2016.</p> <p>Whilst RPS understands the desire of the Town Council to progress its NDP, given the clear</p>	<p>The NDP team is aware of the crossovers and the need to avoid conflicts with strategic policies in the CS. It is also aware that changes will be made to the CS to take account of the employment and housing uplift as outlined in the Inspectors Interim Report</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP should not have to wait until the CS is finally adopted but the Inspectors findings from the next round of hearings in January 2016 will be</p>

			<p>relationship with the Core Strategy and need for consistency with its strategic policies, it is RPS's strong view that the NDP process awaits the findings of the Core Strategy Inspector's Report prior to proceeding further.</p> <p>To provide weight to this view, I provide some brief commentary below on the most recent High Court cases which have considered three NDPs and the weight given to emerging policies by the Court, which I trust the Town Council will find helpful.</p> <p>High Court Decisions on NDP Recent decisions by the previous Secretary of State (the Right Honourable Eric Pickles MP) to refuse housing schemes on grounds of prematurity to an emerging NDP have resulted in three such decisions being quashed by the Court.</p> <p>First, the Secretary of State ("SoS") filed a consent order in the High Court (May 2015) recognising that he could not defend his refusal of permission for 100 homes at Rolleston– on-Dove, Staffordshire, in December 2014. The Inspector had recommended approval, but the SoS refused on prematurity grounds. The Parish Council's favoured version of the neighbourhood plan had already been rejected by its examiner, whose suggested modifications obliged the SoS to accept that the "development would not be in direct conflict" with neighbourhood plan policies. He also failed to acknowledge that the land was allocated as a housing site in the emerging local plan.</p> <p>Secondly, on the same day, Mr Justice Holgate handed down his judgment in Woodcock Holdings v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, concerning the refusal of permission for</p>	<p>key to shaping the policies of the NDP The NDP will take into account of the Inspectors report.</p> <p>These High Court cases are known to the NDP group. However, they relate to decisions to refuse planning permission on the basis of conflict to an emerging NDP. They are relevant to the decision taking function not the plan making function. There is nothing in these high court decisions that would suggest the NDP process is halted until such times as the host authority adopt its Development Plan.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>homes in Mid Sussex in September 2014, again based solely on an emerging NDP and contrary to the Inspector’s recommendation. The judge criticised the poor quality of the reasoning in the decision letter. Following the failure to take account of paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) and indeed a SoCG signed by the Council. The Judge concluded that the SoS had placed too much weight on the importance of an emerging neighbourhood plan in his decision letter. The decision also included the suggestion that the absence of an objectively assessed need for the district increased the weight to be given to the draft neighbourhood plan policies. The judgment also confirms that paragraph 49 of the NPPF applies to relevant neighbourhood plan policies for housing supply and that paragraph 198 does not elevate the status of neighbourhood plan over local plans.</p> <p>Finally, the SoS also consented to judgment (May 2015) over his refusal of permission for up to 350 homes at Devizes in Wiltshire in October 2014, again based on an emerging neighbourhood plan. The SoS had refused it on the grounds that the application was contrary to the draft Devizes Area Neighbourhood Plan, which had not yet undergone examination. The decision letter was described in the Claimant’s details of claim as “incoherent”.</p> <p>I believe these three very recent decisions highlight the very limited weight given by the courts to the emerging NDP and re-enforces RPS’s view that the Town Council would be well advised to await the outcome of the Core Strategy process at Stratford, prior to progressing its current draft plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In all 3 cases the NDP’s subject to these court decisions were emerging plans. There is yet to be any case law on the weight to be attributed to an adopted NDP where a host authority has not adopted their own plan.</p>
--	--	--	---

513	Stansgate planning re Mr C Swan		<p>General Comments</p> <p>Timing – The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is premature. Its purpose is to support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan and plan positively to support local development as outlined in Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It should therefore be prepared alongside the District Council’s Core Strategy to ensure it is consistent with the need to identify sufficient land to meet development requirements.</p> <p>Presently, the Core Strategy Inspector’s report has identified a shortfall in the amount of new housing identified and an increase in the housing requirement will mean more sites need to be found.</p> <p>Section 2 of the NP recognises that changes will be needed to the Core Strategy that will impact on the NP and Section 3 deals with Future Development Issues stating a figure for new houses that is out of date.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to designate land throughout the NP until the matter of strategic development need is settled in the Core Strategy. The NP should not progress further and once the strategic development needs are settled further consultation on the NP should take place.</p> <p>Evidence Base – there does not appear to be any readily available, published evidence base to support the policies and designations proposed in the NP. Planning Practice Guidance sets out that evidence is needed to support a NP and states ‘<i>proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and approach taken.</i>’ It states policies should be</p>	<p>See above comments.</p> <p>The figures will be updated in the next revision of the NDP.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>This is work in progress and will be published in due course.</p>
-----	---------------------------------	--	--	--

			<i>'clear and unambiguous and 'It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence'</i> (Paragraphs 040/041 Ref ID 40/41-040-20140306).	
514	Stansgate Planning re Town Trust		<p>General Comments</p> <p>Timing – The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is premature. Its purpose is to support the strategic development needs set out in the emerging Core Strategy and plan positively to support local development as outlined in Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It should therefore be prepared alongside the District Council's Core Strategy to ensure it is compliant and consistent with the need to identify sufficient land to meet development requirements.</p> <p>Presently, the Core Strategy Inspector's report has concluded there is a shortfall in the amount of new housing identified and an increase in the housing requirement will mean more sites to be found. He has recommended certain locations have scope to accommodate additional housing including in the settlement of Stratford upon Avon.</p> <p>Section 2 of the NP recognises that changes will be needed to the Core Strategy that will impact on the NP and Section 3 deals with Future Development Issues stating a figure for new houses that is out of date.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to give designations to land in the NP until the matter of strategic development need is settled in the Core Strategy. In this context the NP is premature and should not progress further at this stage in the emerging Core Strategy process. Once the strategic development needs are agreed and incorporated in the Core Strategy further consultation on the NP should take place.</p>	<p>See above comments on prematurity.</p> <p>See above comments on housing numbers.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>See above comments.</p>

		<p>Evidence Base – there does not appear to be any readily available, published evidence base to support the policies and designations proposed in the NP. Planning Practice Guidance sets out that evidence is needed to support a NP and states ‘<i>proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and approach taken.</i>’ It states policies should be ‘<i>clear and unambiguous and ‘It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence’</i>’ (Paragraphs 040/041 Ref ID 40/41-040-20140306).</p> <p>Proposals Maps – Reference is made to the <i>Proposals Map</i> (for example Policies H1 and H2) and figure 2 is titled as such. There are multiple other maps called <i>Figures</i> each showing different designations on the same parcels of land. The type and number of maps is confusing and makes reading the NP difficult as you need to view all maps to understand the designations on one parcel. There should be one Proposals Map with all designations on the same Map. For example, land at Rowley Fields off Maidenhead Road has no designation on the Proposals Map but on other Figures has a Local Green Space designation.</p> <p>Groups to manage, monitor and review – the NP makes reference to a number of new groups to be set up, for example, the Town Centre Strategic Partnership, Car Parking Advisory Body, and Design Review Panels. Emphasis from central government is however to deregulate and reduce numerous levels of control in order to stimulate the economy and bring about growth. Too many groups with individual remits cause confusion and delay. It is considered to be unnecessary to have a separate group for each issue.</p>	
515	Friends of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Trust manages Rowley Fields and in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NDP is aware of the

	Rowley Fields and Rowley Fields Forever Groups		<p>2014 listed two parcels of land for housing development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Town Trust objected to the designation of the Benson Road parcel of land, which forms part of Rowley Fields, as LGS 	<p>current intentions of the Town Trust</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NDP group are keen to designate all of the existing Rowley Fields as LGS to preserve all of the land for future generations The Benson Road land should be treated no different than the rest. If planning permission is granted then this will clearly have to be acknowledged with the extent of the designation
516	Framptons re ROSCONN Group		<p>Section 1 The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) should acknowledge that the Local Planning Authority is Stratford on Avon District Council NOT Stratford District Council.</p> <p>Section 2 The NP should acknowledge that there may be changes to the Core Strategy following receipt of the Inspector’s Final Report on the Core Strategy. While the LPA has recently published Proposed Modifications to the Core Strategy these have not been subject to independent examination – and hence should be attributed limited weight. Of particular significance to this NP is the fact that the Objectively Assessed Housing Need for the District has not been determined. As such the NP cannot determine the scale of new housing development that might be considered appropriate for this Category 1 Village to meet the overall housing needs of the District.</p> <p>Section 4 The Framework states that ‘Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic’ (paragraph 154). A</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>A number of the policies have been transferred to projects.</p>

			Neighbourhood Plan should similarly reflect this principle. It is considered unrealistic to envisage within the Vision Statement that 'congestion will no longer be an issue'. Peak hour traffic on the highway network into Stratford upon Avon is likely to give rise to some incidences of congestion. The vision for the NP should be more realistic as to the achievements within the Plan period.	
517	Framptons re Mr & Mrs Krauze		In conclusion, the Neighbourhood Development Plan has not taken into full consideration of the Core Strategy Proposed Modifications. It has failed to deliver the required level of development required within Tiddington and has failed to provide creative and flexible policies which will both support sustainable growth and protect and enhance the existing character of the area. The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared without due regard to the provisions of the Framework which has introduced a cost / benefit approach to policies. The Neighbourhood Plan is written in a prescriptive format with the underlying intent to restrict new development.	This will take place in the next iteration of the NDP.
518	Framptons re Mr & Mrs Shakeshaff		In conclusion, the Neighbourhood Development Plan has not taken into full consideration of the Core Strategy Proposed Modifications. It has failed to deliver the required level of development required within Tiddington and has failed to provide creative and flexible policies which will both support sustainable growth and protect and enhance the existing character of the area. The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared without due regard to the provisions of the Framework which has introduced a cost / benefit approach to policies. The Neighbourhood Plan is written in a prescriptive format with the underlying intent to restrict new	This will take place in the next iteration of the NDP.

			development.	
--	--	--	--------------	--

Residents' Comments				
011	Clare Watson		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.	The housing allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. This Neighbourhood Development Plan is required to be consistent with the Core Strategy but can help direct decisions that are not of a strategic nature.
025	Jane Dodge	Alveston Villagers' Association	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.	Noted
098	David Bishop		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	The housing allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy and much of the future housing development in the Stratford on Avon District will be to accommodate inward migration.

			<p>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.</p> <p>Town Centre Shops - The uniqueness of the small independent shops in the town centre should be supported as they remain an attraction to local shoppers and decline in recent years in the number of these shops has affected the experience of shopping in Stratford.</p> <p>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.</p>	
257	Bennet Carr, Headmaster	King Edward VI School	<p>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)</p>	Supportive
266	Pat Boucurat		<p>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</p>	Facilities for buses and bus users is addressed in the INF Section

			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. 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	Duplicated comment x5. The housing allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. Tiddington is expected to have to expand to meet the Allocation for a Cat 1 Local Service Village, which could easily be around 100 new dwellings. The NDP was seeking to identify the least worst option, with Tiddington Fields selected taking into account both the views of residents, and other planning considerations. Regardless, however, of the draft proposals in SSB 4 and SSB5, the NDP has to take account of planning permissions granted at the time the final draft is submitted for examination and the Policies will now be modified accordingly, or even deleted.

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

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

			<p>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</p>	<p>Duplicated comment.</p> <p>The housing allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. Tiddington is expected to have to expand to meet the Allocation for a Cat 1 Local Service Village, which could easily be around 100 new dwellings. The NDP was seeking to identify the least worst option, with Tiddington Fields selected taking into account both the views of residents, and other planning considerations.</p> <p>Regardless, however, of the draft proposals in SSB 4 and SSB5, the NDP has to take account of planning permissions granted at the time the final draft is submitted</p>

		<p>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 area. It would also be in direct</p>	<p>for examination and the Policies will now be modified accordingly, or even deleted.</p>
--	--	---	--

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

			<p>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>	
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</p>	<p>Duplicated comment.</p> <p>The housing allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. Tiddington is expected to have to expand to meet the Allocation for a Cat 1 Local Service Village, which could easily be around 100 new dwellings. The NDP was seeking to identify the least worst option, with Tiddington Fields selected taking</p>

		<p>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</p>	<p>into account both the views of residents, and other planning considerations.</p> <p>Regardless, however, of the draft proposals in SSB 4 and SSB5, the NDP has to take account of planning permissions granted at the time the final draft is submitted for examination and the Policies will now be modified accordingly, or even deleted.</p>
--	--	--	--

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

		<p>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.</p>	
273	Miss Carol Vaughan	Response to Policy H3 - Local Service Village Allocations (Tiddington) Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too	Duplicated comment. The housing allocation is the

		<p>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</p>	<p>responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. Tiddington is expected to have to expand to meet the Allocation for a Cat 1 Local Service Village, which could easily be around 100 new dwellings. The NDP was seeking to identify the least worst option, with Tiddington Fields selected taking into account both the views of residents, and other planning considerations.</p> <p>Regardless, however, of the draft proposals in SSB 4 and SSB5, the NDP has to take account of planning permissions granted at the time the final draft is submitted for examination and the Policies will now be modified accordingly, or even deleted.</p>
--	--	--	--

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

		<p>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	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	<p>Duplicated comment.</p> <p>The housing allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. Tiddington is expected to have to expand to meet the Allocation for a Cat 1 Local Service Village, which could easily be around 100 new dwellings. The NDP was seeking to identify the least worst option, with Tiddington Fields selected taking into account both the views of residents, and other planning considerations.</p> <p>Regardless, however, of the draft proposals in SSB 4 and SSB5, the NDP has to take account of planning permissions granted at the time the final draft is submitted for examination and the Policies will now be modified accordingly, or even deleted.</p>

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

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

			<p>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>	<p>Supportive</p> <p>2. A New river crossing would need to be delivered as part of the Core Strategy. 3. This is partly addressed in INF Section</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</p>	<p>Generally Supportive.</p>

			<p>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>	<p>A New river crossing would need to be delivered as part of the Core Strategy.</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</p>	<p>Generally Supportive</p> <p>1. Existing problems with parking are not within the competence of the NDP to influence or control. This is primarily a Highways issue.</p> <p>2. While the NDP would resist the loss of community facilities, the replacement in this case of a Scout Hut is a matter for the land owners and developers to negotiate with the Local Planning Authority in the first instance.</p>

			<p>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 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</p>	<p>The housing allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. Tiddington is expected to have to expand to meet the Allocation for a Cat 1 Local Service Village, which could easily be around 100 new dwellings. The NDP was seeking to identify the least worst option, with Tiddington Fields selected taking into account both the views of residents, and other planning considerations.</p> <p>Regardless, however, of the draft proposals in SSB 4 and SSB5, the NDP has to take account of planning permissions granted at the time the final draft is submitted for examination and the Policies will now be modified accordingly,</p>

		<p>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 the demise of this wonderful village.</p>	<p>or even deleted.</p>
282	Anne Marian Kiely	<p>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</p>	<p>Supportive</p>

			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.	Generally Supportive
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 ?	It must be recognised that the NDP covers 20 years and not all proposals will be deliverable in the near term.
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.	Supportive
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	Noted

			<p>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.</p>	
291	Diana Owen	The Shakespeare Birthplace Trust	<p>Strongly support - do complete globally, Stratford town centre visitor experience requires improvement and investment, as well as modernisation to meet the needs of today's diverse audiences</p>	Supportive
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</p>	The NDP fully supports the Historic Spine Action Group

			<p>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>	
293	Dr Richard Freer-Hewish		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A tactical fragmented nature of considered needs, favoured schemes and priorities, some at great detail and some vague and none coming under an overriding plan/vision • No proper transport vision or mention of restricting traffic into the town • Long winded explanations to policies • Need for a major transport study tackling problems over the next 20 years • Improved access within the town through a wholesale redesign of all roads is needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NDP group believe the overriding vision and sectional objectives are clear and the policy are not vague and sufficiently detailed • The NDP group has grappled with many issues in the town. One of the most talked about is transport issues. However, sadly, many of these cannot be covered in policies in the plan but are covered as projects • The NDP is conscious of the length of the plan and will be seeking to reduce its content rather than add to it

293	Dr Richard Freer-Hewish		<p>Figure 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle routes to the north of the town are omitted • Are proposed routes to go on this map? • Emphasis should be on 'shared space' 	Noted. Maps will be amended in the submission version.
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.</p>	Noted.