

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

Policy H2

Representations: Total received 48

Number in Support: 16

Summary of Representations:

Primarily objection to the BUABs of Alveston and Tiddington, and location of the Strategic Gap

Summary of Response:

The Summary given for Policy H1 applies equally to the Representations made on Policy H2.

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.
- Maps will be revised for the Submission version.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H2	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	-----------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>Would query whether the strategic gap as identified on the proposals map between Stratford-upon-Avon and Tiddington should extend north of the B4086 in order to properly fulfil the aims and objectives of this policy. The accompanying explanation refers to “The built up areas of the Neighbourhood Area are surrounded by attractive countryside which contribute significantly to the character of the area. Progressive encroachment of the countryside by infilling parcels of greenfield land on the edges of the built up areas has begun to erode this character and further development should be avoided unless clear positive benefits for the Neighbourhood Area can be demonstrated”. Whilst not disagreeing with this statement, the attractiveness or otherwise of the countryside is irrelevant to the designation of the strategic gap. The function of the strategic gap is to maintain the separate and distinctive identity and character of individual settlements taking into account their landscape setting in the wider countryside regardless of the quality of that countryside.</p>	<p>Agreed that the SG should extend to the north of the B4086. Also agreed that reference to landscape should be removed because this could be used against the inclusion of the SG.</p> <p>The Area of Restraint already covers land to the North</p>

		<p>Has the distinctive character of each settlement been identified? -</p> <p>Explanation The first paragraph has a wider application and would be better placed in explanation to Policy H1. Expand second paragraph to justify the extent of each Strategic Gap.</p> <p>There appears to be an inconsistency, in that paragraph one suggests further development on the edges of the existing built-up areas should be avoided unless clear positive benefits for the neighbourhood area can be demonstrated, but paragraph two states more categorically that strategic gaps should be maintained with no further development.</p>	<p>Alveston Village Design Statement will be referenced. Tiddington is referenced in the Stratford Town Design Statement.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Delete ...”unless clear positive benefits for the Neighbourhood Area can be demonstrated.” with “...unless supported by other policies in this plan”.</p>
--	--	--	---

Agents and Developers' Comments			
516	Framptons re ROSCONN Group	<p>Policy H2 is objected to as its underlying intent is to restrict housing land supply. No cogent evidence base has been presented in the preparation of the NP to substantiate that there is a requirement for a Strategic Gap policy. The emerging Core Strategy has been prepared without such a policy provision. In identifying the Built-Up Area Boundaries under Policy H1, land beyond this boundary will be subject to countryside policies.</p> <p>The setting and individual character of Tiddington and Alveston can be preserved without the provision of a Strategic Gap policy within a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The evidence or justification simply relates to a requirement not to have a coalescence of Stratford, Tiddington and Alveston and to enable those communities to retain their own identity. Strategic Gap is a tried and tested policy method of achieving physical separation of settlements to facilitate such an objective. The fact that the CS does not proposal a Strategic Gap does not mean</p>

			<p>Tiddington will remain 'visibly separate' from the urban edge of Stratford upon Avon to the south-west with the proposed re-defining of the settlement boundary as shown at Appendix 1.</p> <p>It is not accepted that Policy H2 is justified by the contention that 'infilling parcels of land on the edges of the built up area' has eroded the character of Tiddington. High quality housing development with provision of new open space can make a positive contribution to the character of Tiddington as exemplified in the proposals for new housing at Knights Lane, Tiddington as demonstrated in planning applications 14/02766/OUT and 15/00920/OUT.</p>	<p>that the NDP cannot. The settlement boundary and the Strategic Gap run in parallel with each other. The Strategic Gap is seen as an additional requirement to emphasise the importance of this area.</p> <p>The SG refutes this point. These planning applications have been rejected by SDC and are currently under appeal.</p>
519	Daniel O'Donnell		<p>The preservation of the setting and character of Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston can be preserved without the need of a strategic gap.</p>	<p>It is unclear what alternative land use based policy mechanism could be used to restrict development in this location that would be as effective as the Strategic Gap.</p>
520	Charles Vickery		<p>A strategic Gap is not needed to preserve the setting and character of Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston.</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>

Residents' Comments				
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		<p>Agree with keeping a gap between!</p>	<p>Supportive</p>
018	Stephen Wreford		<p>The "white land" to the East of the land labelled SS85 needs to be re-defined as "strategic gap". In its current form the proposed development on Tiddington Fields could then expand eastwards over these fields currently used to grow asparagus. The result would be</p>	<p>The Strategic Gap is designed to prevent coalescence between settlements and not as a mechanism to prevent appropriate development elsewhere.</p>

			a huge traffic issue on Oak Rd and New St as there would be no access to Main Street for cars from potentially up to another 2-300 houses.	
025	Jane Dodge		None of the houses on Main Street, Tiddington/Wellesbourne Road, Alveston should be the strategic gap between the two settlements. Making the Red House the strategic gap is dangerous as it could be considered as a very convenient space for a Relief Road in years to come.	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; 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.
038	Amanda Waters		Support	Supportive
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We object to this policy as it is not necessary. There is no requirement to identify a strategic gap to prevent coalescence between Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston. As it is intended that all new development will be confined to within the built up area boundaries (Policy H1) , as defined on the Proposals Map, any development outside these built up boundaries will be determined in accordance with policies regarding development in the countryside (refer Core Strategy Policy CS.25 Countryside and Villages). In recent years Planning Inspectors at Public Examinations of Local Plan documents have removed such policy designations as being unnecessary as they duplicate other policies of the plan. In any event the countryside gaps between Stratford upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston cannot	Strategic Gap is required to enable the distinct character of each settlement to be preserved. Therefore this is not agreed.

			be regarded as being strategic. Strategic gaps in my opinion relate to separation areas between major urban conurbations. By no stretch of the imagination are these settlements major urban conurbations. We therefore propose that Policy H2 be deleted, and any reference to strategic gaps on the Proposals Map be removed.	
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly Support	Supportive
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree	Supportive
061	G Smith		The proposed developments are greatly in excess of any requirements by the residents of the village and will result in the village becoming a commuter area. The local school and surgery are not large enough to absorb further growth. Bidford is a main through route, despite the A46 bypass, for large HGV vehicles, further housing will increase the traffic and the risk. The recent damage to Bidford bridge is an example of the result of overlarge vehicles using roads not designed for such vehicles. It is doubtful if the present drainage etc. can sustain further development The areas off Victoria Road H2c etc., presently absorb rainfall. They will not do so if concreted over with likely run off to local housing. Access to these areas will be via Victoria Road which is already overwhelmed by traffic.	This comment refers to Bidford
063	Tony Goddard		The strategic gaps defined for Stratford/Tiddington and Alveston are important to avoid the creation of one sprawling urban mass. Each area currently has its own distinctive character. There is a danger currently that Tiddington will just become a part of Stratford. It's about one field away from happening with current developer plans.	Generally supportive.
065	K Tandy		This plan would significantly impact on Alveston in a	It is not explained why there would

			negative manner	be a negative impact.
068	Geoffrey James Benney		The Strategic Gap is already in place as being the allotments, Memorial Field and open fields to the far side of Memorial Field. Including the already built up area on the river side of the Tiddington Road as part of a strategic gap does not make sense.	See response to Rep 025
069	Judith Benney		The proposed strategic gap is neither necessary nor appropriate. The land is already developed. There is a natural separation of Alveston and Tiddington created by The Memorial Field, the allotments, and the open fields between the Vicarage and Pimlico Lane.	See response to Rep 025
071	John Lavelle		On the map given to the Alveston Neighbourhood plan steering committee, the Red House was included in the BUAB. Why has the boundary changed? The Red House should be included in the BUAB for Alveston. Any plans for a new road within this strategic gap would have a major impact on the village of Alveston and the rural setting of the village. It would also have a major impact on the wildlife and the environment.	See response to Rep 025
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree We disagree with the location of the strategic gap between Alveston and Tiddington. The Red house should be included in Alveston, not as part of the strategic gap. The character of the Red house is that it is hidden behind a high wall - consistent with the style of houses described in the Alveston VDS and Conservation area document. Further, any development within the grounds of the Red House should be viewed against the criteria set out in the Alveston VDS that is to have particular regard to the street scene.	See response to Rep 025
077	Anne Parker		Overcrowding mix of pedestrians, passengers disembarking and passenger's waiting.at the bus stops at the bottom of Bridge St and there are no bus shelters. Also there is no safe crossing between the	The NDP provides guidelines as to the preferred layout of Bridge Street. Detailed design will be carried out at the Stratford District

			two sides for passengers. I would suggest bus stops be moved to the centre of Bridge St, outside M&S and Sainsbury's. This would also allow bus shelters to be erected and make a safe crossing to the centre island for those 'onward' passengers. To avoid buses waiting 'layovers' need to be provided at ? Current coach station. Also no mention for the provision of 'safe routes to school' in the plan for children and students to walk and cycle. If there is provision why is it not advertised in street plans etc.	and County Authority levels. Amend INF3 to cover this This comment has no relevance to Pol H2 and should be considered in the INF/ TC Section
084	Mrs Jill Focardi		The Red House, Tiddington Road should be excluded from the Strategic Gap as it is on the boundary of Alveston.	See response to Rep 025
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support, especially the gap between Tiddington and Stratford-upon-Avon along both Tiddington Road and Loxley Road / Knights Lane	Supportive
088	Mike Surrey		I am in favour of a strategic gap between Alveston and Tiddington; however it should be on the south side of the Wellesbourne Road and the Red House should be within the BUAB of Alveston.	See response to Rep 025
089	Stephanie Surrey		I am in favour of a strategic gap between Alveston and Tiddington; however it should be on the south side of the Wellesbourne Road and the Red House should be within the BUAB of Alveston.	See response to Rep 025
095	Eric Ward		Reword: delete "should" and substitute "will"	The wording was carefully considered.
096	Nicholas Richard Chester		The Strategic Gap places some dwellings outside the Alveston built up area boundary which have direct links with Alveston. These dwellings are the Vicarage and the Old Rectory both of which either serve or have served St. James Church in Alveston. The Alveston Villager's Association map which was submitted to the Neighbour Plan Steering Committee included the Red House inside the Alveston built up	See response to Rep 025

			area boundary. These three properties and their grounds should be within the built up area boundary rather than being included in the Strategic Gap.	
102	Mike Storey		I should like to comment on the Policies H1 and H2 regarding the BUAB and the Strategic Gap between Alveston and Tiddington, as shown in Fig 15. The proposals shown differ from the map that was consulted upon in our village meetings and the 2014 survey. In these the Red House was included in the BUAB. I fail to understand why the Red House has been excluded. The Strategic Gap can be drawn on just the south side of the Wellesbourne road would be more logical.	See response to Rep 025
103	Joy Hawker		The strategic gap between Alveston and Tiddington can be drawn just to the south side of the Wellesbourne Road.. This appears far more logical to me. How can an existing property represent a gap?	See response to Rep 025
105	Brian Johnson		Why does the Strategic Gap include two significant houses: the Red House built as the vicarage in 1847 and Avon Court, much more recent, but still a significant property? It would, in my opinion, be better to include the plots of these two houses in Alveston's built-up boundary.	See response to Rep 025
118	Ann and Trevor		Should it transpire that a Strategic Gap is agreed upon, then in our view this should be on the south side of the Wellesbourne Road and would, therefore, exclude The Red House which We have already stated in our comments on Policy H1 should be within the BUAB Map.	See response to Rep 025
120	John Michael Jesse		The Strategic Gap should not cut off the Red House from Alveston.	See response to Rep 025
139	Renny Wodynska		The Red House should be within the BUAB. This is what was submitted by the Alveston villagers' Association, following consultation with us, to the	See response to Rep 025

			Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee. I strongly am opposed to leaving large gap close to the River Avon, The Strategic Gap should be on the south side of the Wellesbourne Road and the Red House should be within the BUAB for Alveston.	
140	Alan George		The Red House should be within the BUAB. This is what was submitted by the Alveston Villagers' Association, following consultation with us, to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee.	See response to Rep 025
143	Chris Strangwood		I don't understand why the gap between the town and Alveston and Tiddington	A Strategic Gap is required to enable the distinct character of each settlement to be preserved.
153	Janick McOwan		It is a very important that a significant strategic gap should be maintained in order to prevent coalescence between Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston and therefore preserve the character and individual identity of each settlement and community. I am pleased to see that the Stratford Neighbourhood Development Plan acknowledges the importance of maintaining a strategic gap.	Supportive
154	Wendy Appleby		I agree that Tiddington should remain as a separate and district settlement to Stratford-upon-Avon.	Supportive
174	Sarah Eglin		agree	Supportive
176	NEIL JOHN FARMER & ROSEMARY CLARE FARMER		WE, LIVING IN THE VILLAGE OF ALVESTON, BELIEVE THAT LEAVING A LARGE GAP CLOSE TO THE RIVER AVON ALLOWS A CONVENIENT SPACE FOR A 3rd RIVER CROSSING ALONG WITH AN ASSOCIATED BY-PASS LINKING THE BANBURY ROAD TO THE OLD WARWICK ROAD. OUR VIEW IS THAT A STRATEGIC GAP IS VERY MUCH IN ALVESTON'S INTERESTS, BUT THAT IT SHOULD JUST BE SHOWN ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE WELLESBOURNE ROAD AND THAT THE RED HOUSE SHOULD BE WITHIN THE BUAB FOR	See response to Rep 025

			ALVESTON AND NOT BE PART OF A STRATEGIC GAP.	
180	Evelyn CONN		Yes - the gap is very important.	Supportive
183	Sharon Taylor	Tiddington Village Residents' Association	3. P121 Description of Site 3 in the proposed Strategic Gap The SHLAA Review of 2012 only rejected one side of Knights Lane as being "identified with the Landscape Sensitivity Study as unsuitable for residential development due to unacceptable impact on the landscape character of the area" as the other side (Stratford Football Club's side) wasn't considered in the SHLAA. TVRA would like the wording of this to be more precise and accurate.	Subsequent planning permissions and refusals have overtaken much of the site allocation process.
183	Sharon Taylor		I agree that a strategic gap is needed to maintain Tiddington's status as a separate settlement. It would be very helpful if there was a clear definition of this.	Supportive
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Strategic gap should be preserved	Supportive
210	Rachel Syson		Agree to the policy, but disagree with the Strategic Gap on the Proposals map	A Strategic Gap is required to enable the distinct character of each settlement to be preserved. Also see response to Rep 025
212	David Tucker		Subject to the amendment above (Policy H1) to exclude the Red House, the Strategic Gap around Tiddington is supported.	Supportive See response to Rep 025
219	Steve Duddy		I strongly support the need to maintain a strategic gap between Stratford and Tiddington. Therefore I would not support the developments at Arden hill farm or on Knights lane. I believe the Tiddington fields north represents a much more suitable development for Tiddington.	Supportive
228	John Campton		Strategic gap - sound principle	Supportive

230	Mark Taylor		The boundary between Stratford-upon-Avon and Tiddington must be maintained in full - the space to breathe between Tiddington and Loxley Road must be maintained. The Arden Heath development on Loxley Road would destroy the aspect towards Alveston Hill - a vital part of the local countryside. The children in Alveston School must be able to use their forest school with an aspect towards the hill - not to be surrounded by development.	Supportive
253	Daniel O'Donnell		The preservation of the setting and character of Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston can be preserved without the need of a strategic gap.	Strategic Gap is required to enable the distinct character of each settlement to be preserved
281	Michael Craig Scott		Strategic Gap. Again, the plan seems to contradict itself here when stating that "Progressive encroachment of the countryside by infilling parcels of greenfield land on the edges of the built up areas has begun to erode this character and further development should be avoided unless clear positive benefits for the Neighbourhood Area can be demonstrated" then supporting the Tiddington Fields application. Surely no positive benefits to the neighbourhood have been demonstrated. It can only prove to be to the detriment of existing residents.	Noted, but subsequent planning permissions and refusals have overtaken much of the site allocation process.