

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

Policy H3

Representations: Total received 61

Number in Support: 16

Modification Proposed:

It is not proposed to alter the Policy, though the Explanation will be amended to take account of the final modifications to the Core Strategy, and will be further amended once the Core Strategy has been adopted.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H3	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	-----------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	The allocation of up to 92 homes on two sites in Tiddington is welcomed and conforms to the approach to Local Service Villages (LSV) as set out in Policies CS.15 and CS.16 of the Submission Core Strategy. A further reserve allocation would provide more certainty that the full housing needs are capable of being met. It is also noted that there is no reference to windfall development in Tiddington in Policy H3. Does this approach contradict Objective A?	Infill within the Tiddington boundary would be supported in accordance with Policy H1.

			<p>It is noted that there are no allocations proposed for Alveston and that its housing needs are expected to be met through windfall development. Whilst not convinced that this approach by itself provides sufficient confidence that the housing needs of Alveston would be met in the plan period, if it is considered that the reliance on windfall development is the right approach for Alveston (as opposed to an allocation), then the Neighbourhood Plan should build in some flexibility and identify a reserve housing site or sites (in Alveston or Tiddington) and include a mechanism to bring these forward for development should the rate of windfall development in Alveston not be as expected.</p> <p>It would be helpful if the explanation included a table to provide clarity as to how the housing needs are being met for each village (e.g. setting out the housing target, the number built since 2011, the number expected to be built (i.e. with planning permission), the number proposed to be allocated, and the number expected to come forward as windfall). Is the title of this policy appropriate, since the policy includes reference to windfall development, which by definition is not allocated?</p> <p>The justification in the accompanying explanation that further allocations cannot be accommodated is not considered adequate. Firstly, planning is about balancing different, and often competing, demands and whilst it is acknowledged that the ambition of the Neighbourhood Plan is to resist development on greenfield sites, this has to be balanced with the need to provide for an adequate amount of housing.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed. Title will be changed to “Development in Local Service Villages”</p> <p>The explanation will be made more robust.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>Moreover, to what extent does this 'justification' contradict the approach of Policy H1 of setting built-up area boundaries within which development will be focused, even on greenfield sites within these boundaries. Secondly, it is noted that there is reference to Tiddington being considered less sustainable than other locations within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. If this is the case, then the Neighbourhood Plan should compensate for this by providing to meet Tiddington's housing needs in these more sustainable locations. As drafted, the Neighbourhood Plan ignores the issue.</p> <p>The policy should clarify that windfall development is appropriate in Tiddington as well as Alveston. Suggest insert "small-scale" in both instances.</p> <p>Explanation Suggest adding the following form of wording to the second paragraph "There is scope for small-scale infilling and redevelopment within Tiddington."</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------

Agents and Developers' Comments				
508	Pegasus Group re: Gallagher Estates	Policy H3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy supports the allocation of 90 dwellings in Tiddington (Land at Oak Road) which our client is promoting. General provisions of H3 are supported 	Supportive
509	Framptons re: Red House, Tiddington Road	Policy H3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NDP only supports windfall development in Alveston. This conflicts with the CS which seeks to allocate 400 dwellings in the Cat 4 villages (with no more than 8% or 32 houses in any one village) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development boundary for Alveston will be reviewed in due course. The NDP team are aware of the recent attempts to gain planning permission on land

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2014 village survey agreed with a development boundary for Alveston which included Red House and showed a development plot on the land 	at the Red House and any extant permissions may influence this decision
510	Lodders Solicitors re: Land adjacent to Tiddington Road	Policy H3	<p>Summary of Representation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in accordance with Policy CS.16 of the CS which required 450 dwellings to be accommodated in the Cat 1 Villages with no more than 25% (113) in any one village Supporting text further exposes inconsistency with CS NDP is seeking to impose additional restrictions on Tiddington that are not in the CS Little justification to treat Tiddington different to other Cat 1 settlements CS has not yet been adopted or the final figures agreed No flexibility in the event that these identified sites are unable to deliver the anticipated levels of development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The figure of 25% (113 dwellings) is a maximum not a minimum. The policy is not inconsistent with the CS or in conflict with it. There is an expectation that additional homes will come forward during the plan period through windfalls. There have been recent examples of windfall in the village. The NDP is seeking to find allocations (or acknowledge commitments) in the village that do not exceed the current CS suggested figure. The NDP is not treating Tiddington any different than other Cat 1 settlements The NDP team will continue to monitor the CS and reappraise the situation if the housing figures are changed Allocations are deliverable and now benefit from planning permission
513	Stansgate		There is no acknowledgement in the policy that	See response to Rep 510 above

	<p>planning re Mr C Swan</p>		<p>Alveston should deliver around 32 houses in the plan period to conform with Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy as currently drafted. Windfall development within the boundary is unlikely to deliver this.</p> <p>The approach to development at Alveston in the NP is to allow for windfall development only within the built up area boundary. This is inconsistent with Tiddington where an allocation of around 90 houses is stated and no justification is given why Alveston should be treated differently. The fact that Alveston is largely Conservation Area should not provide exemption from meeting the needs of the Core Strategy and there is a need to have flexibility to allow small scale proposals on suitable sites in or on the edge of the settlement. Therefore to allow only windfall within the built up area boundary of Alveston is unlikely to deliver the housing needed. There is a danger that the strategy of the Core Strategy will not be met and it will fall short on housing delivery.</p> <p>Furthermore, the restrictive nature of other policies of the NP in respect of a presumption against development of greenfield land (Policy H4), the resistance towards use of garden land (Policy H5) and the importance of heritage assets (Policies BE11 and 12) means few sites may come forward within the settlement as they may conflict with other policies of the NP.</p>	
516	<p>Framptons re ROSCONN Group</p>		<p>There is no justification for Policy H3 which simply seeks to promote less development than set out in the Local Plan and undermine its strategic policies (Framework paragraph 184). The NP cannot at this stage in the preparation of the Core Strategy identify</p>	<p>Policy H3 recognises the important role that Tiddington and Alveston play in supporting the growth of housing in sustainable locations around the town. H3 is fully</p>

		<p>the scale of housing that may be required to be provided at Tiddington to meet overall development needs of the District.</p> <p>No technical or environmental evidence has been adduced in the NP to substantiate that development in excess of around 90 dwellings would not comprise a sustainable pattern of development. No evidence has been adduced that 113 dwellings is an upper limit for sustainable urban growth at Tiddington.</p> <p>In so far as Tiddington is well located to the principal urban area of Stratford upon Avon – and the NP urges ‘best use of existing or planned infrastructure’, Tiddington is considered to be the most sustainable Category 1 Local Service Village in the District. In consequence the NP should properly recognise the locationally sustainability of Tiddington and its potential role in making a greater provision of the District’s housing needs.</p>	<p>justified.</p> <p>The allocation of 90 dwellings in proportionate to the size and scale of Tiddington. Technical evidence for the upper limit of 113 dwellings (25% of the 450 homes the Cat 1 settlements are excepted to deliver under Policy CS.16 of the CS) is a matter for SDC not the NDP.</p>
519	Daniel O'Donnell	<p>The policy, through the upper limit of the number of houses looks to promote less development than the local plan, as such would undermine the policies of the local plan.</p>	<p>Policy CS.16 says that no more than around 25% (113 dwellings) should be in any one Cat 1 settlement. 90 dwellings amounts to 20% of the total Cat 1 requirement (450 dwellings). This is not in conflict with the CS which merely sets an upper limit not a minimum number.</p>
520	Charles Vickery	<p>The policy, through the upper limit of the number of houses looks to promote less development than the local plan. It would therefore undermine the policies of the local plan.</p>	<p>See above comments for Rep 519.</p>

Residents' Comments				
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		No comment	-
018	Stephen Wreford		The NP for Tiddington are should support windfall development within the BUAB as per Alveston NP.	Quotas for housing development are defined in the Core Strategy. Windfall development within the BUAB is supported. Policy/explanation wording will be modified to stress this.
025	Jane Dodge		I agree with the maximum number of houses for Tiddington and the proposed allocation for Alveston of up to 32 windfall houses.	Supportive
038	Amanda Waters		No view	-
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We object to this policy as it does not make adequate provision, as noted above, for sufficient housing to be provided in Tiddington and Alveston to meet local housing needs and the wider housing requirements of the Core Strategy (Proposed Modifications to Policy CS.16). Specifically, NDP Policy H3 only supports windfall development in Alveston – previous analyses of the potential development opportunities in Alveston have demonstrated that less than 10 new homes are likely to come forward from this source during the plan period. As such it is necessary to identify at least one and potentially two housing allocation sites in the village, which as noted above is a Category 4 LSV where up to 32 new homes should be provided over the plan period. The policy, as written to support only windfall development, will only provide open market houses, and will not enable other types of housing such as local needs houses (affordable homes), housing for the elderly, and housing for young people to be provided in	This policy follows precisely the strategic direction contained in the Core Strategy taking account of the constraints of Tiddington and Alveston. The decision to support only windfall development in Alveston follows the arguments for limited development presented at a recent Planning Inquiry and the refusal of planning permission in that case. It is also in line with the needs and opinions of the majority of Alveston residents as canvassed by the Alveston Villagers' Association.

			<p>accordance with Policies H6, H8 and H9 of the NDP. Also, the policy on market housing mix (policy H7) will not be met, as most of the infill houses, will have 4+ bedrooms, based on an analysis of previous applications, most of which have been refused. A housing strategy for Alveston based on windfall (infill) development will lead to an even more distorted demographic structure in the village with an increasing proportion of elderly people, rather than its rejuvenation, a key objective of the Village Design Statement. We therefore recommend that housing allocation sites for around 20 dwellings be identified on the Proposals Map for Alveston. We have annotated a plan for Alveston identifying a site for around 10 new homes on land off Church Lane in front of the church. We note that this site was recently subject to a planning application for 15 dwellings which was refused and subsequently subject to an Appeal. Although the Appeal was dismissed, the Inspector concluded that the proposed scheme would cause less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area, the Listed Buildings and the parkland setting of Kissing Tree House. We believe that a smaller, high quality designed scheme which delivers an element of local needs housing, benefits to the church in terms of off street parking, an extension to the burial ground (ashes only) and which enhances the setting of the church and other heritage assets will meet the tests set down in the NPPF under Section 12 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.</p>	
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree	Supportive
061	G Smith		The design of recent developments is very poor The development of Waterloo road is best described as	Supportive

			"little boxes all the same". If there is further development then such designs should not be accepted. Affordable should not mean design.	
065	K Tandy		This plan would significantly impact on Alveston in a negative manner	Quotas for housing development are defined in the Core Strategy
067	Richard Edward Hooper		The problems relating to the potential 90 houses in Tiddington also apply but on a much larger scale to the proposed development of 270 houses on the Arden Heath Farm which is coming up to appeal in October. This is prime agricultural land ,would detract even further from attraction of the green countryside but more importantly considerably add to the traffic congestion particularly around Clopton bridge with perhaps 500? More cars coming on to the Loxley road. There is not the infrastructure to support this particularly schools	Supportive
068	Geoffrey James Benney		I think that anything other than windfall development in Alveston would undermine the rural location and harm the village structure.	Supportive
069	Judith Benney		I agree that only windfall development should be permitted in Alveston. There are several sites where this would be appropriate. The recent Village Survey showed that there is no significant demand or more housing in the village.	Supportive
071	John Lavelle		The proposed development of 90 houses in Tiddington and 32 in Alveston would put immense pressure on the local facilities.	Quotas for housing development are defined in the Core Strategy
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree. We especially agree with the statement: Stratford-on-Avon District Council also indicated at a planning appeal in February 2015 that there should only be minimal development in Alveston during the plan period.	Supportive
077	Anne Parker		I did not know which policy no to insert this under: Bridge 68 on the SOA canal needs a longer hand rail	The NDP cannot prescribe down to this level of detail.

			by the flats - the steep slope always looks as though it could be slippery in wet weather and I avoid it when there is any hint of frost. The towpath is great for cyclists but under the bridges between the town and Timothy Bridge Road some are "blind" for both walkers and cyclists: Why are there no 'cycle speed bumps' to slow cyclists down as on the Lancaster Canal?	This comment does not relate to Pol H3 and should be responded to in the relevant Section
084	Mrs Jill Focardi		I support Alveston as a LSV Category 4, with only windfall development within the BUAB, any development is very limited by the Conservation Area and the flood plain.	Supportive
088	Mike Surrey		The infrastructure on the south side of the river cannot support the proposed expansion of Tiddington by up to 113 dwellings in addition to other development off the Loxley Road.	Quotas for housing development are defined in the Core Strategy
089	Stephanie Surrey		The infrastructure on the south side of the river cannot support the proposed expansion of Tiddington by up to 113 dwellings in addition to other developments off the Loxley Road.	Quotas for housing development are defined in the Core Strategy
095	Eric Ward		Agree	Supportive
120	John Michael Jesse		Alveston should not be considered a Local Service Village - no services exist.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. The Definition of Alveston as a LSV is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to alter.
127	Oliver Spicer	Studio Spicer Architects	Policy H3: Local Service Village Allocations Tiddington has been acknowledged as having to provide up to 100 new dwellings across the Plan period 2031 to conform with CS.16. It is unlikely that the proposed housing need within the village will be met without the development of Greenfield sites such	Planning permissions have been granted such that no further housing site allocations are any longer required.

			as those identified as Site 2, Tiddington Field's, or Site 3, Land of Knights Lane. Both of these are contrary to other policies for development of Greenfield sites and impact on the Character and Conservation Area.	
139	Renny Wodynska		I am totally against further building, especially on green belt land in Tiddington. We cannot afford to keep building on green spaces. The road is already badly congested and we don't want a dual carriageway like the A46 as a result of the extra traffic backwards and forwards from Tiddington, via the edge of Alveston, towards the motorways. We are very happy for extremely limited development within Alveston, in the odd garden or green space ONLY. We are not aware of a lot of people desiring to move to Alveston !	Housing numbers in Alveston will be determined by the Core Strategy The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development. The choices made in the Neighbourhood Plan are considered the least harmful. The provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.
140	Alan George		I am totally against further building, especially on green belt land in Tiddington. We cannot afford to keep building on green spaces. The road is already badly congested.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development. The choices made in the Neighbourhood Plan are considered the least harmful. The provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.

153	Janick McOwan		<p>The exact number of dwellings to be allocated to Tiddington and Alveston should be clearly defined. 80 to 90 houses maximum for Tiddington would be a more suitable number, 112 would be too much. The proposed site identified for development known as Tiddington Field should be split into two sites 2a and 2b as in the TVRA survey to residents, site 2b being kept as a green space or woodland area.</p>	<p>These villages are “Local Service Villages” and their quotas for housing development are defined in the Core Strategy</p>
157	Richard Parry		<p>I do not agree with the plan to build on Tiddington Fields ref SSB5. I do not agree with this because:- - access to this development is through knight’s lane and oak road which are very narrow residential streets that would not cope with the massive increase in traffic and parking. There are other sights on knight’s lane in Tiddington that are more suitable as they will not impact on the core residential roads of the village. - the fields are used for walking, crops and are key to people's lives in Tiddington - the amenities cannot deal with the increase in people, the school is already to full and this will impact people who have lived in Tiddington years not being able to send their children to the school. - I feel there is no need for new housing but if it has to happen there are much better sites which will impact the village a lot less such as on Knights lane, if KL site is adopted by the plan then any planning should only be permitted if it commits to providing sufficient public open space to protect a strategic gap between Tiddington and Stratford. I hope there is a sensible decision made which will provide the needed number of houses, for benefits of Tiddington and not developers or land owners pockets, the plan for Tiddington fields SSB5 if ludicrous with a number of better options to adopt that will not rid it of precious fields where people exercise, walk dogs, etc. and</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development. The choices made in the Neighbourhood Plan are considered the least harmful. The provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.</p>

			make key residential roads of Tiddington an absolute nightmare and dangerousness for residents to use. Thanks	
159	Richard Applin		Related to Tiddington plans, specifically the fields behind Oak Rd. The village is a thoroughfare for traffic already. Oak road or New Street or Knights Lane would be strained further by proposed housing. The fields are used by many villagers as footpaths for dog walking, jogging, walking etc. Access to Oak road has not been stipulated, this is concerning. I would like to see plans for a 2nd bridge, or Eastern Rd connecting Alveston to Trinity Mead area , before any houses were built. Any building south of the river is adding to the already gridlocked at busy time's Clopton bridge.... Taking away green space , used for footpaths by residents must be a last resort.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development. The choices made in the Neighbourhood Plan are considered the least harmful. The provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.
162	Sarah Bramble		Tiddington cannot cope with additional housing unless services are increased too, specifically schooling and medical services. Traffic is already busy along the Tiddington Road and parking is particularly difficult, especially along New Street. Any additional housing should be on easily accessible sites, e.g. Knights lane and only if absolutely necessary. The council should adopt the original proposals of housing in Long Marston which incorporated a 6th form college, medical facilities, shops, schooling and adaptations to the infrastructure within Stratford.	The NDP seeks to ensure that adequate infrastructure is provided by developers for all new housing development. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development. The choices made in the Neighbourhood Plan are considered the least harmful. The provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.
167	Lucy French		It is essential that Tiddington remains a separate	Supportive

			village and is not incorporated into Stratford upon Avon. As such I support the selection of Tiddington Fields as the preferred site for further building but in order to prevent complete mayhem on the local residential side streets access must be from Main Street only.	
171	Emma Scott	Save 'Tiddington Fields' Oppose Planning (STOP) - action group STOP is an action group set up to campaign against any development proposed for Tiddington Fields. A number of residents have submitted the same/similar evidence in support for STOP.	Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 &	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development. The choices made in the Neighbourhood Plan are considered the least harmful. The provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.

		<p>5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service 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>	
171	Emma Scott		<p>Preferred sites: Knights Lane I consider that the sites at Knights Lane provide superior option for any substantial new housing development needed to fulfil our housing quota. This site limits disruption to the rest of the village and is far more in keeping with the area. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses, there is a tree buffer shielding the majority of Townsend Road and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a sustainable strategic gap. This should be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites (inc Arden Heath, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6) on its outer edge, furthest from its closest settlement. This strategic gap comprised of public open space, publically owned or managed through a private</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development. The choices made in the Neighbourhood Plan are considered the least harmful. Open space provision will be a requirement in new developments in accordance with other policies in the NP. The provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.</p>

		<p>company has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Any development could be encouraged to introduce additional traffic calming measures, so improving the current issues experienced with people speeding past the school. Tiddington Fields</p> <p>Tiddington Fields should not be the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land. It provides a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and via which residents from all over the village enjoy excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4.</p> <p>However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only possible option is for their planning application to be resubmitted</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>(and risk rejection) and access to be provided over the area they've determined as green space. Based on information provided by planning officers at the town planning committee this would not likely be permitted. There is also a suggestion in the SNDP that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However this would be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Additionally, permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. The residents of Margaret Court have purchased their homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Church who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to a question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. At no point was it made clear that these</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>two questions would be considered together or that any question had a higher weighting. The view was taken that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. There needs to be some protection for the village to prevent a developer gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service</p>	
--	--	--	--

			Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.	
174	Sarah Eglin		agree	Supportive
176	NEIL JOHN FARMER & ROSEMARY CLARE FARMER		IT IS ESSENTIAL TO RETAIN ALVESTON'S STATUS AS A LOCAL SERVICE VILLAGE	Supportive
178	Andrea Fleet		I am not objecting to all development in Tiddington, I appreciate that the Home Guard development proposal has been approved, and we will no doubt have to have another small development. I am however objecting to the number of attempts by several developers to secure every bit of available land on the outskirts of our village, seemingly before a limit is set by a Neighbourhood Development Plan – which is yet to be adopted by the Stratford upon Avon District Council, for developments that are just far too big to fit comfortably within the infrastructure of the village – The land that is under constant aggressive threat is an invaluable green resource, and its existence is part of what gives Tiddington its identity. Over development on the Knights Lane sites will result in coalescence with Stratford upon Avon, which has already happened on the Tiddington Road side of the village. With increasing erratic weather patterns, torrential downpours and resultant flooding are more and more a feature of our lives. A lot of older houses in Tiddington have cellars which are prone to flooding – I know this from personal experience, having had mine flood twice due to existing old and unkempt storm drains being unable to cope with the volume of surface water pouring into	The objective of the Neighbourhood Plan is to try to control some of the concerns expressed in this comment. However, the Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development. The choices made in the Neighbourhood Plan are considered the least harmful. The provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.

		<p>them – so the idea of covering yet more open space with concrete seems like madness to me. The roads infrastructure is already unable to cope with the increase in traffic. Parking in the village is already a contentious issue, with increasingly more and more households supporting more than one car, with many of these cars being parked on the public roads. Often, people can't park in the road in which they live, thereby causing friction by taking up space in surrounding roads where there is a similar pressure. There is often quite simply no parking available for visitors. New housing developments tend to offer the minimum parking space per household, which given today's general increase in cars per household, is simply unrealistic. New developments will inevitable cause more parking pressure on already congested roads. New Street and Oak Road are simply not equipped to cope with the volume of traffic that a new development off Oak Road will create. Knights Lane is already under pressure with a school, a football club, and a residential home for the elderly located along it, not to mention being a car park as well. Recently we also had issue with employees from the NFU using the side streets as an overflow car park, but that has perhaps been resolved. There are already safety issues on Knights Lane for children and the elderly. It would be utter madness to increase the volume of fast moving traffic even more, which is what would happen were any of the proposed sites in the village to be realized. Travelling into Stratford has become untenable. It seems ironic that with more and more houses being built in and around Stratford, providing more and more purchase power, the town has seldom appeared as bleak as it is now with so many empty shops. More and more people from</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Tiddington travel to Warwick, Leamington Spa and Coventry to shop. Why should I have to travel all this way when I have a potentially perfectly good town 2 miles away from me? The proposed installation of yet another set of traffic lights on the south side of the river will, in my opinion, completely strangle traffic flow into Stratford. Cycling is simply not a safe option, and were I a mother of school going children, I would certainly not entertain it as a viable method of transport. Schooling in the village is another concern. Alveston C of E junior School is a wonderful village school, and by definition, that means small and intimate. Increasing numbers at the school will lose the school this character, and exacerbate the already critical traffic issues experienced by both people dropping off or picking up children, and residents on Knights Lane who suffer this traffic chaos. And then there is the question of where all these children will go to high school. Stratford High School is already oversubscribed. The catchment area for this school must have to be regularly altered to reflect the increasing number of houses within the town. At what point will Tiddington no longer fall within this catchment area? Students from Alveston experienced difficulty gaining access to SHS several years ago, Tiddington will be next. The next nearest, Kineton High School, will in turn will have its own pressures from developments there. There has been no mention at all of a new High School being built. Doctor's surgeries are under extreme pressure. To get an appointment with a popular doctor of choice, can take up to two weeks. Although sadly, that is almost hardly relevant as each doctor has so many patients on their books, that I think they hardly remember one from one visit to the next. Again, no</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>mention of new surgeries being built to cope with all the people all these new developments will produce. The environmental surveys completed by all the separate developers paint a rosy picture of life for wildlife in the remaining green areas after they have built -in isolation. Has any attention been given to the impact on the environment should several of these proposals actually come to fruition? A lot of people choose to live in Tiddington because of what it is and has to offer – a village with easily accessible green space. It is tragic that the heart and character of the village is under constant threat of destruction by over building. If not this threat this week, then another next week. A lot of residents are either elderly and unable, or young with families and getting through a week is trouble enough, and so unable, to be constantly campaigning and objecting to development proposals to keep our village from becoming an urban sprawl. This lack of complaint may be taken as acceptance, but it most definitely is not.</p>	
183	Sharon Taylor		<p>I believe the housing allocation for Tiddington is way too high. The village does not have the infrastructure (roads and education) to sustain such an increase in homes. As recently as 2008 a further 40 homes were added to the village and I believe this should be taken into account. Within the BUAB there is nowhere near enough space for another 100+ homes so it's necessary to build on open countryside to meet this number. I find this completely unacceptable. With a lack of any real communal open space within the village (nowhere near enough to satisfy this NP's plans own policies or CS.24 (Core Strategy), a much smaller number of housing would have been suitable, leaving the fields alone for our</p>	<p>Housing numbers in Tiddington will be determined by the Core Strategy The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development. The choices made in the Neighbourhood Plan are considered the least harmful.</p>

			unofficial breathing space.. More like 5 - 10 % of the 635 current housing stock., many of these flats for old people so don't take up too much land.	
184	Brian Rose		<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with</p>	Duplicate of Representation 171 (10 duplicates received). Same SG Response applies to all.

		<p>excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>	
185	Wendy Harris	<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive</p>	<p>Duplicate of Representation 171 (10 duplicates received). Same SG Response applies to all.</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 CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further</p>	
--	--	---	--

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

			<p>are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>	
186	Douglas Harris		<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding</p>	<p>Duplicate of Representation 171 (10 duplicates received). Same SG Response applies to all.</p>

		<p>roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the "Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is</p>	
--	--	--	--

			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.	
187	Pan Birch		<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which</p>	Duplicate of Representation 171 (10 duplicates received). Same SG Response applies to all.

		<p>provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>	
188	Doris Jeffs	<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building 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</p>	<p>Duplicate of Representation 171 (10 duplicates received). Same SG Response applies to all.</p>

		<p>be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>	
189	Terry Jeffs	<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided.</p>	<p>Duplicate of Representation 171 (10 duplicates received). Same SG Response applies to all.</p>

		<p>Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>	
190	Jonathan Webster		<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which</p>	<p>Duplicate of Representation 171 (10 duplicates received). Same SG Response applies to all.</p>

		<p>would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>	
191	Dorothy Hodge		<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as</p>	<p>Duplicate of Representation 171 (10 duplicates received). Same SG Response applies to all.</p>

		<p>a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space The SNDP currently suggests that site 2b (the area south of 2a) as land which might be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland. However there has been no agreement of this from Clifford Chambers Trust who own the land. Without a guarantee that site 2b will be dedicated as public open space, the area is simply vulnerable to further development. We will lose the only green space that Tiddington currently possesses. Process Tiddington Fields did not receive the majority vote, but an equal number of votes to Knights Lane sites. Knights Lane sites were discounted on the basis of responses to an unrelated question regarding the retention of Tiddington as a separate settlement. TVRA took the view that the land at Knights Lane would not provide sufficient strategic gap to retain Tiddington as a separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space.</p>	
192	Barry Robinson	<p>Housing allocation: The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is far too many. We do not have the infrastructure; schools, doctors or dentists to support any more housing. The major problem however is traffic. The internal roads are busy with local and commuter traffic and severely over-parked</p>	<p>Duplicate of Representation 171 (10 duplicates received). Same SG Response applies to all.</p>

		<p>as there is insufficient off-road parking provided. Additionally, staff of the NFU utilise the surrounding roads as overflow parking. Tiddington Road is gridlocked at peak times and the transport service is not viable for travel to work as it is too infrequent and unreliable. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. There needs to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. A clear statement is required in the Neighbourhood Plan that once the required number of houses allocated to Tiddington as a Local Service Village has been met, Tiddington will be exempt from any further development. A definitive statement is needed on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where. Preferred sites: Tiddington Fields Tiddington Fields is not the preferred site for Tiddington. Tiddington Fields is prime agricultural land so does not fulfil the criteria of Policy H4 regarding the prioritisation of brownfield land and currently provides valuable open space and recreation land to the whole village - as promoted through Policies CLW4 & 5. It houses a number of permissive footpaths which would be lost through any development and which provide residents from all over the village with excellent exercise and recreation opportunities. Access Policy SSB5 suggests that any access to Tiddington Fields should be via Main St, with a suggestion that any development should be considered in combination with Policy SSB4. However since the SNDP has been drafted, the site at SSB4 has been granted planning permission and no provision has been made for access to Tiddington Fields. The agreed site at the Home Guard seals off</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>any entrance with housing. The only option is for access to be provided over the area they've determined is green space and would therefore not be permitted. There is potential access to Tiddington Fields via the car park of Margaret Court, however this residence provides homes for vulnerable, elderly people. They have purchased these homes on the basis of their location, rural access and views. Not only would they lose this, they also stand to lose their only offsite parking and these residents would be put at risk from any access there. There is also a suggestion that access could be provided from Knights Lane. However permitting access from there would open up a vast area of land for further development and cause great disruption to an extensive area. It would also be in direct contradiction to any reasoning for not assigning sites on Knights Lane as the preferred sites. Open space</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>separate settlement. If Tiddington Fields is retained as the preferred site, then a number of corrections are required: - Only site 2A should be identified as a development site. - Site 2b and all surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. - No access should be provided via Oak Rd or other internal residential streets. Knights Lane We believe that the sites at Knights Lane provide a much better position for new housing. They are more in keeping with the area and limit disruption to the rest of the village. The fields are only overlooked by a small number of houses and the sites are at the top end of the village so would create a natural boundary. Access Knights Lane sites are accessible from a main road (Knights Lane), with no disruption to internal roads. The sites are on a main bus route and have easy access to local amenities. Open Space Knights Lane sites are able to provide a strategic gap. This can be secured through a requirement, on any development on or adjacent to the Knights Lane sites, to allocate a sufficient area of land as public open space (in accordance with Policy CLW6). We also believe that this strategic gap comprised of public open space has greater longevity than simply prohibiting building on privately owned land. Additionally, making Knights Lane the preferred site means that Tiddington Fields would be adjacent to the village boundary and form part of the strategic gap there. Additionally all the surrounding land should contribute to the strategic gap and not be available for development. Other issues: Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities: This policy states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual</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.	
194	Kerry Gulley	The allocation of up to 113 houses for Tiddington is totally disproportionate to the current size of the village and the infrastructure that supports it. Local roads in to town are frequently congested and the addition of traffic lights at Clopton Bridge is a long way from being proven as the solution. Tiddington has no doctors or dentists, no public recreational facilities and limited shops. Alveston school is already expected to be at capacity for the foreseeable future and secondary school children do not qualify for free bus travel to Stratford schools. All of this results in frequent short journeys to and from town by residents. In addition Tiddington, a relatively small village, contends with a large volume of commuters working at the NFU and using their Social facilities, plus users of Stratford Football Club and traffic for two local schools. If the current allocation of additional housing MUST be maintained, I believe the least impact on the local roads would be achieved by utilising land at the end of Knights Lane which would have access directly on to Knights Lane and encourage exit from the village at the Loxley Rd end, thereby minimising the impact on internal residential roads. However, careful consideration must be given to maintaining a strategic gap between development here and existing / new housing on Loxley Rd, in order to maintain Tiddington as a separate village entity. If this option is not possible and housing MUST be on Tiddington Fields this should be limited	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development. The choices made in the Neighbourhood Plan are considered the least harmful. The provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.

		<p>to the area currently identified as 2a to prevent future development sprawl across green space behind Hamilton Rd. Bearing in mind that access to sites 2a and 2b through Oak Rd and Hamilton Rd would not only increase traffic on these roads but would also impact on Knights Lane as a feeder road and New Street, no access to 2a should be allowed through Oak Rd or Hamilton Rd. Tiddington Fields is currently used by local residents as recreational space and accommodates permissive footpaths. Development of this area should include a guarantee that adjoining green space is protected from future development and given over as recreational space to replace that lost to development of 2a.</p>	
200	Susannah Parry	<p>I object to the Neighbourhood plan of Tiddington Fields being the preferred sight for new houses in Tiddington for the following reasons: - The proposed access from Oak Road and New street is unsuitable as these roads are small residential roads which are already very busy and could not take more traffic. There are many hazards already from parked cars and children playing in the street and increased traffic would lead to these roads becoming more dangerous. The turning from Knights Lane into Oak Road is sharp, meaning traffic has to swing out to get round it. This and the positioning of the a bus stop on one side make it a hazardous junction which with increased traffic could cause many problems. - It would be detrimental on the whole village to lose the fields which contain many footpaths which are used by public for exercise and dog walking. - The local amenities including the school would not facilitate an increase in villagers. The school is already full and difficult for villagers to get their children in to. - I feel that if the Village has to expand there are other more</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development. The choices made in the Neighbourhood Plan are considered the least harmful. The provision of the necessary infrastructure is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver.</p>

			suitable sites available such as Knights Lane which have less impact and disturbance on the village. Although I feel Knights Lane is the more suitable site for such expansion I still feel it is important that Tiddington remains a separate village from Stratford and that a suitable strategic gap is maintained.	
204	Mr and Mrs Pritchard		Tiddington Fields as 'preferred' site in Tiddington: only 20% of Tiddington Residents completed the survey on where proposed housing should be in the village. We are concerned that many villagers did not have their say, and as such the assertion being made here is not representative. There needs to be further consultation with villagers. A follow up survey to select preferred actual proposed developments should take place. The survey took place in August 2014 when there was no imminent planning applications, which may be the reason for the low response rate ... i.e. people didn't see any significance. Also, the Neighbourhood Plan states that access to Tiddington Fields 'should' be via main road . This has to be 'MUST' be via main road. Access to this development via Oak Road is simply not safe; it's a narrow residential road where children play and there are lots of parked cars.	Planning permissions have been granted such that no specific housing site allocations are required, and this issue has been overtaken by events.
210	Rachel Syson		Agree	Supportive
211	Alex Quinn		The maximum number of houses allocated to Tiddington should be reduced, particularly as there is no provision for improved services to support the additional strain on roads, schools, parking, access, public spaces and services such as GPs, dentists etc.	Quotas for housing development are defined in the Core Strategy
212	David Tucker		The LSV Allocations should recognise the special nature of Alveston, which is unique in the District, having most of the Village as a Conservation Area	Generally supportive.

			with several important Heritage Assets and significant Flood Plain constraints. Development should be limited within the BUAB to small scale and appropriate housing, which conforms to the Alveston VDS 2015.	
221	Lindsey Quinn		Greater effort should be made to avoid developing green field sites - these should be used in exceptional circumstances, not as an unfortunate side-effect.	Supportive
222	Gareth Walton		Any development on Tiddington fields would have major negative impact on the residential centre of the village, where parking and traffic is already at its limits. Local infrastructure is simply not up to the extra traffic and would make it a far more dangerous place for local residents, especially for the high percentage of elderly and children who live in the area.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy.
227	Maggie Greaves		Tiddington is in danger of being swamped by housing with all the proposed planning in the pipeline. How can residents make decisions when the answers/proposals are not fully there? Tiddington Fields does not have the correct access/exit through Oak Road on to an extremely busy Knights Lane. Planning permission has already been granted for 32 homes on the Home Guard Club that the village has yet to absorb.	Quotas for housing development are defined in the Core Strategy
230	Mark Taylor		Any of the developments suggested for Tiddington involve the destruction of arable land with huge diversity of wildlife. In the fields of Tiddington people can hear the larks which inspired the poetry of Romeo and Juliet - it will be a cultural crime to wipe them out.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose the strategic allocation of housing development defined by SDC in its Core Strategy. Some land will have to be allocated for future development.
253	Daniel O'Donnell		The policy, through the upper limit of the number of houses looks to promote less development than the	Quotas for housing development are defined in the Core Strategy

		local plan, as such would undermine the policies of the local plan.	and this Policy conforms with those.
--	--	---	--------------------------------------