

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

### **Policy CLW4**

#### **Representations:**

Total received: 68

Number in Support: 54

Number Neutral or outside scope of NDP: 10

Number of Objections: 4

#### **Summary of Representations:**

General support from residents. Concerns expressed by SDC, agents and two residents.

#### **Modification Proposed:**

The numbering will be changed to Policy CLW3. Policy will be revised to give clear distinction between “Local Green Space” and other “Open Space”. Areas of Open Space have been added to the policy. The designation of Warwick Road Lands as LGS will be limited to part of the site to reflect agreement reached with the owners of the land. Tiddington comments largely addressed in Tiddington SSB. Map will be amended to exclude garden at Manor Cottage (representation 082)

## Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW4	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---------------------------------------------	-------------	--------------------------------------------

<b>Statutory Consultees' Comments</b>				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>Second paragraph, insert “as valuable open spaces within the neighbourhood area” between the words “identified...and development”.</p> <p>Areas (a) to (f) as listed are deemed to satisfy criteria for LGS designation. Why don't the others meet the criteria? What are the criteria the locations have been assessed against (i.e. paragraph 77 of the NPPF)? This should be specified, for clarification.</p> <p>(j) should read “Welcombe”.</p>	<p>Policy will be amended</p> <p>Policy will be amended to distinguish between LGS and Open Space</p> <p>Will be amended</p>

<b>Agents and Developers' Comments</b>				
505	Boyer Planning re: Hallam Land Management	Policy CLW4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that the extensive area of land subject to the proposed LGS is worthy of designation or demonstrably special to the local community. Draft policy is therefore unsound</li> <li>• Sound and positive approach would be to designate LGS alongside sites required for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The NDP team is aware of the PPG guidance and believes that the extent proposed in the NDP meets the guidance. LGS does not have to be publically accessible. The extent of LGS shown on the proposals map is intrinsically linked</li> </ul>

				<p>and should be considered as a whole</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LGS designations are not reliant on residential allocations</li> </ul>
514	Stansgate Planning re Town Trust		<p>The Town Trust object to Existing Open Space and Local Green Space designation on two of its sites identified in the list as:</p> <p>a) Warwick Road Lands b) Rowley Fields (where it relates to land at Benson Road)</p> <p>Where Rowley Fields is concerned the objection relates to land at Benson Road, not the larger area of land known as Rowley Fields off Maidenhead Road. Furthermore, they object to the wording 'protected and enhanced' which places a level of burden beyond which the NP can deliver. Overall the policy is confused and difficult to interpret. It refers to protecting existing open spaces but provides no definition of what comprises an open space. It states such spaces will be protected and enhanced to ensure a suitable quantum and quality of recreational and amenity space but not all the areas in the list are publically accessible. The list of sites a) to m) does not clearly relate to Figure 11 which identifies a whole host of areas from SSSI to Green Belt and Area of Restraint which have no relevance to open space. What and where therefore, are the Existing Open Spaces that the policy seeks to protect and how will they be enhanced?</p> <p>The policy has an additional strand, it seeks protection over and above Existing Open Space and states 'the first six areas in the list satisfy the criteria</p>	<p>Following discussion with the Twon trust and Stansgate Planning, a compromise has been reached on the designation of Rowley Fields and Warwick Road Lands and local Green Space as follows:</p> <p>a) Part of Warwick Road Lands will be designated as Local Green Space and Figure 11 (to be renumbered as Figure 12a) will be amended accordingly;</p> <p>b) The land at Benson Road will be designated as Local Green Space</p>

			<p>for Local Green Space designation' including both Warwick Road Lands and Rowley Fields (which includes land at Benson Road). There is no evidence provided in either the NP or any background documents leading to its preparation to support this assertion.</p> <p>Paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) sets out the principles that such a designation should only be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Where it is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</li> <li>· Where it is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</li> <li>· is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 78 states that local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts. Planning Practice Guidance provides more information and states designation will need to be consistent with planning for sustainable development in the area. It states 'In particular plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and Local Green Space designation should not undermine the aims of plan making.' In this case as development needs are not yet known and the Core Strategy Inspectors report clearly identifies a need for additional housing it is premature to consider a designation with a permanence and constraint akin to Green Belt. The NP should reflect and accord with strategic development needs set out in the Core Strategy.</p>	
--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

			<p>The proposed allocation will undermine the ability of the District Council to provide sufficient land for development needs not only now but also in future years as such designation is to be given where it will endure beyond the lifetime of the Plan.</p> <p>Moreover, as the designation carries great significance to the future of such land, when the time is right, there must be a clear evidence base in place to demonstrate how these areas meet the criteria.</p> <p>Benson Road for example, is pasture land producing an annual hay crop, with a public right of way along the eastern boundary from Welcombe Road/Benson Road. It has been fenced off from the right of way since 2008. It is not recreation land.</p> <p>Furthermore, Planning Practice Guidance recommends where land is not in public ownership, the policy maker should have contact with the landowners at an early stage and to date no such contact has been made.</p> <p>The policy is confused and there are no grounds to give an added layer of protection to sites over and above open space.</p> <p>It is noted there is a definition of Open Space in the explanation to Policy CLW5 further on in the NP. It is defined as all space of public value and if it is intended this definition applies to those sites in CLW4, there is no evidence how Warwick Road Lands and Rowley Fields (Benson Road part) are of public value.</p>	
515	Friends of Rowley Fields and Rowley Fields Forever Groups	Policy CLW4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the designation of Rowley Fields as LGS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The NDP group is grateful for the support for Policy CLW4 and the supporting evidence that has been provided</li> </ul>

<b>Residents' Comments</b>				
004	Timothy Bailey		I very much support the policy statement aimed at protecting and enhancing our existing open spaces	Supportive
005	Lisa Bailey		I am delighted that the NP will provide greater protection for existing open spaces	Supportive.
006	Edward Bailey		Great - right thing to do	Supportive.
007	Brian Bailey		This is the right thing to do for future residents of Stratford	Supportive
008	Pauline Bailey		This is the right thing to do for future residents of Stratford	Supportive
009	Thomas Bailey		As a young adult living in Stratford this is really important to me	Supportive.
014	Dudley Harker		The protection of Rowley Fields should include both the large area and also the smaller area to the rear of Benson road which is accessed via a footpath from Benson / Welcome road. It should not have been separated from the larger Field to make planning permission easier.	Supportive
018	Stephen Wreford		Any public open spaces proposed within larger developments in/around Tiddington should be designated as Local Green Spaces to retain the public amenity value and enshrine valuable strategic gaps ensuring coalescence does not occur.	Noted.
023	Richard Howdle	n/a	It is vital that Rowley Fields are kept for future generations and are designated local green space and are NEVER allowed to be built on. They provide an area for recreation for so many people, both young and mature.	Supportive
024	Michaela Willson		Rowley Fields must be made protected green space. To build on the land would be a huge loss to the town	Supportive

			and its residents. It's the only natural place left and you can park for free	
029	Mrs Linda Roberts		Having perused the SNDP I would like to add my support for the area of Rowley Fields being designated an area of 'local green space' thereby securing its status as open space for the well-being and good of present and future generations. Throughout my 45 years as a resident this area has always been accessible and during these times of increased housing demands its loss would be a great tragedy for the community.	Supportive.
031	Keith Stephen Roberts	Member of Friends of Rowley Fields and also a member of Stratford Town Trust	I wholeheartedly agree that the area called Rowley Fields should be designated an area of "local green space" thereby securing its status as open space for the well-being and good of present and future generations.	Supportive
035	Ian Duncan Andrew		I fully support the policy to apply Local Green Space designation to give further protection from inappropriate development for the following: Rowley Fields.	Supportive
037	Janet Bosu		Protecting our existing open spaces such as Rowley Fields is extremely important for the wellbeing of the community of all ages, it is an area where one can walk side by side with nature, to watch the changing seasons is very special, we have no other open space quite like Rowley Fields, its benefits ante numerable and very special.	Supportive
039	Katherine Burnett	Canal & River Trust	Policy CLW4 – Protecting and Enhancing Existing Open Spaces states "...development which adversely affects these important spaces will be resisted." "The Canal Corridor running through the Neighbourhood Area (development associated with the Regeneration	Noted

			Zone should incorporate the Canal Corridor as a key feature of the scheme).” The canal corridor, as part of its multifunctional role, provides an area of open space. However, the protection and enhancement of the canal as an open space should not prevent the canal’s potential for being fully unlocked or discourage the use of the waterway network.	
042	Ms Jacqueline Burgess		I am pleased to find Rowley Fields recommended for inclusion in local green space. This vital lung used by so many is vulnerable to development by the Town Trust who ignore its importance for the young to let off steam and learn about nature, for the elderly as an important place to make social contact and keep fit and healthy by walking, and all the other users who daily walk jog or run through it. People throughout Stratford visit it regularly and use its open space. It is far closer to a great deal of Stratford than the Recreation Ground and should be preserved at all costs. Shakespeare himself is recorded walking through these fields on the way to Clopton. The local population joined together to oppose development of these fields whose original gift intention was to be used for the health and well-being of ALL the residents of Stratford without charge. People without the means to buy theatre tickets, attend sports clubs, etc. could exercise and enjoy this space without charge. Local schools frequently walk the fields, as do sports clubs exercising. Please protect this space, and its access from Welcombe Road.	Supportive.
042	Ms Jacqueline Burgess		Rowley fields is an important green lung for all generations, from children running freely to escorted walks with their local school, to the older pensioners who have an unofficial meeting place and always a joke and a smile for all passers-by. It is the only flat place to safely jog, walk, fly a kite etc. It is also FREE!	Supportive



			<p>No expensive admission fees no parking charges just wonderful nature and clean air. What's more, a study has shown that green space is 'equigenic' because it appears that it may help in creating health equality between richer and poorer people. The research showed that access to green / recreational space was the only neighbourhood characteristic tested which had this link to narrower inequalities in wellbeing, The study concludes that green space could have an important part to play in reducing socioeconomic health inequalities. Access to green space could show up to 40% improvement in these inequalities. That is what Rowley Fields represents, a strong local community space fiercely loved and protected by its daily users. I am a member of the Town Trust and in no way does its opposition to Rowley Fields being green space represent my view. Any statement by the Town Trust purporting to represent its members in its opposition to the land becoming green space is completely untrue.</p>	
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support	Supportive
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree. All current open space must be retained for free public access.	Supportive
058	Dudley Harker, Geraldine Harker		Please keep Rowley fields, including the land behind 7 Benson road as designated green space, no development allowed.	Supportive
060	Richard Price		To whom it may concern Having read of the proposal in the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan to include the nomination of pockets of existing green space as designated 'local green space', could we register our wholehearted support for this scheme. It is clear, given the undoubted need for housing on a national basis, that it is imperative that certain areas of localised green space are completely protected and not thoughtlessly sacrificed in pursuit of housing	Supportive

			need. Indeed, the requirement for housing should run hand-in-hand with the need for green space to counterbalance said development. We feel it is imperative that the areas of green space quoted in the plan (Rowley Fields, Shottery Fields and the Recreation Ground) should be protected in their entirety for both present and future generations and that, as a perpetual legacy of your administration, their sanctity should be upheld by unassailable law. We trust that you will ensure that this is the case.	
064	Richard Eden		Good	Supportive.
066	Brenda Stewart		I very much support giving Local Green Space designation to all these, especially Rowley Fields, to protect them from further housing development.	Supportive
072	Sylvie Laforest		Very happy to see that all of Rowley Fields has been included as valuable greenspace. I have heard that the Trust may object to the small 1.48 acres being included on the grounds that it is not Rowley fields. I have copies of the consultation event that was held last February by Stratford Town Trust which clearly indicates that Rowley Fields is 22 acres of land. Please let me know if you would like a copy of this document. Thank you for taking the necessary steps to ensure that the few remaining green spaces in Stratford are kept intact.	Supportive
073	Michel Toutant		Thank you for including ALL of Rowley Fields in the neighbourhood plan. There is so little green space left in Stratford that every little bit counts!	Supportive
079	Michael Warrillow		I welcome the proposal that a number of areas (and Rowley Fields in particular) are proposed as Local Green space. I believe the negative public reaction in the face of the recent Town Trust proposal to build on Rowley Fields show the overwhelming desire of the town to maintain this important space as recreational	Supportive

			land and we should do all we can to preserve this for the future.	
082	Anthony James White and Christina Elizabeth White		Please remove our garden at Manor Cottage, 34 Shottery Village from the list and map of "local green spaces" on page 104. This is private land and not a public space.	Map will be amended
090	Steven Mark Bower		Our green spaces are under threat e.g. Rowley Fields and we strongly agree with the need for statutory protection for the benefit of the local community. We support the proposal of the Neighbourhood Development Plan to designate all of Rowley Fields as Local Green Space even if that is against the wishes of the Town Trust Trustees.	Supportive
092	Suzanne Helen Bower		Our green spaces are under threat e.g. Rowley Fields and I agree with the need for statutory protection for the benefit of the local community. I support the proposal of the Neighbourhood Development Plan to designate all of Rowley Fields as Local Green Space even if that is against the wishes of the Town Trust Trustees.	Supportive
093	Stephen Parker		I fully support the inclusion of Rowley fields as a designated green space which is of great importance to the town	Supportive
094	Emma and Colm Murphy	N/A	We thoroughly support the addition of Rowley Fields as a Local Green Space, which means it will be protected from inappropriate development. We understand that Stratford Town Trust oppose the allocation, citing 'charity' (money) reasons. However, as you have decreed that it meets the criteria, we expect you to uphold this position and also listen to the local community who are clearly very passionate about preserving such a beautiful area. In addition to this, we would expect further reassurance that the Welcombe Hills Nature Reserve is also protected	Supportive

			from development of any kind, including access roads.	
095	Eric Ward		Very welcome	Supportive
097	Barbara Anne Baro		I would like to register my support for this policy. Existing open spaces within Stratford-upon-Avon MUST be protected and enhanced.	Supportive
107	Katherine Stuart		I go running on Rowley Fields 4 or 5 times a week. There are very few natural green spaces in Stratford. Rowley Fields is one of them. It must be retained as such	Supportive
111	Mrs Jose Deer		Rowley Fields are used throughout the day and evening by all sectors of the community and for a variety of purposes. I am most concerned that the Town Trust seem bent on ignoring this unique asset to the town and its value to Stratfordians. They appear to be viewing it in monetary terms only.	Supportive
112	Kathleen Day		I wish to confirm my agreement that Rowley Fields be designated as Green Space. As a member of the Town Trust, I am appalled that they should object to Rowley Fields being thus designated. I attended their AGM last Wed to find they take no notice of Trust Members as the whole meeting was against them on this issue but no vote taken. The meeting was a farce and members think they still intend to build houses if they can. Please protect this wonderful place.	Supportive
116	Thelma Bates		There are not enough open spaces and green spaces. Functions on the recreation ground are well supported, perhaps more could be organised.	Supportive
117	Alexander Wilson		I strongly support the inclusion of the Rowley Fields and Welcombe Hills being designated as protected green spaces. As a member of the Town Trust I strongly disagree with their opposition to this proposal.	Supportive
121	Helen Rowena		I strongly support this policy and in particular the	Supportive

	Warrillow		inclusion of Rowley Fields as a Local Green Space. I make this comment in the knowledge that the Stratford Town Trust have advised they will be opposing this policy on the grounds of Rowley Fields. This is even more reason why I hope the Neighbourhood Development Plan will include it. The designation of Rowley Fields as Local Green Space will put it beyond the whims of developers and individuals who choose to put money above wellbeing. Even without going into the argument of protecting wildlife and habitat, it is clearly a public space much loved by a wide cross section of the town and it deserves to be protected for future generations. According to Fig 11, the Welcome Hills and Clopton Park Local Nature Reserve are already designated greenbelt within this policy and I hope Rowley Fields will be included as an essential part of this area.	
130	Claire Elizabeth Russell	None	I am pleased to see that both Rowley Fields and Welcome Hills and Clopton Park Local Nature Reserve have been identified as areas where adverse development should be resisted. Even better, that Rowley Fields should be designated as Local Green Space. I fully support these proposals.	Supportive.
131	Clive Alan Griffiths		I live at 117 Tiddington Road SOA and the area behind my property has a colour definition on a number of the maps shown as light green, or even lighter green, designating it as either an amenity green space or as an area of restraint, it is not clear. Furthermore the boundary line cuts right across my garden on some arbitrary line (the same with my neighbour at 119) unlike everywhere else along the Tiddington road where it clearly follows the edges of the property boundaries. This cannot be right. Please adjust the maps to show this amenity green space and area of restraint outside of my full boundary.	The boundary has been deliberately drawn to exclude this area of restraint/archeological from the BUAB

134	Roger Holbeche		Please see comments CLW1 and 2 above. The inclusion of Rowley Fields, including the Field to the rear of no 7 Benson Road will continue to fulfil the aim of protection of existing green spaces. This area is one of the very few left which gives the wider population of all ages of Stratford the opportunity to enjoy healthy outdoor pursuits. For the Town Trust to fence off the Benson Road parcel, which is the subject of a legal action to suppress resident's rights, is illegal and would be wholly improper.	Supportive
135	Kate Bates		I would support areas A to F being designated Local Green Spaces, in Particular Rowley Fields	Supportive
136	Adrian Bates		I support the designation of Rowley Fields as a local green space	Supportive
139	Renny Wodynska		Insufficient areas have been identified - people need far more designated and permanent green spaces.	The number of open spaces is currently under review and will be increased.
151	STEPHEN JOHN TURNER		THE PLAN OFFERS NO DEFINITE PROTECTION TO THE OLD SHOTTERY HALL ESTATE, BORDERING ALCESTER ROAD AND CHURCH LANE. TOGETHER WITH THE ADJACENT SHOTTERY FIELDS, THIS PROVIDES A GREEN CORRIDOR ON THE WEST OF THE TOWN. IT IS A LUCKY SURVIVAL, BEING A PRIVATE ESTATE - MUCH AS THE ROYAL PARKS SURVIVED AND NOW PROVIDE A GREEN LUNG IN CENTRAL LONDON. IF FURTHER DEVELOPMENT IS EVER ALLOWED (THE EDGES HAVE BEEN ALLOWED TO BE ENCROACHED UPON ALREADY) IT WILL BE AN IRREVOCABLE LOSS. IT SHOULD RECEIVE AT LEAST THE SAME PROTECTION AS ROWLEY FIELDS, WHICH ARE ADJACENT TO THE WELCOMBE HILLS. FUTURE GENERATIONS WILL NOT THANK US IF THIS AREA IS SACRIFICED TO	Noted

			DEVELOPMENT. IT CURRENTLY FORMS PART OF THE 'HOLE IN THE MINT' OF MASSIVE DEVELOPMENT IN THE SHOTTERY AREA. DONT LET THAT HOLE BE FILLED IN. IDEALLY, THE AREA SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO PUBLIC OWNERSHIP.	
174	Sarah Eglin		Agree - these are valuable recreational green spaces for the whole community to enjoy. I would like to see better pathways for disabled users to exercise their dogs on Rowley fields and perhaps some swings and slides in the small field for families. Shottery fields can feel unsafe - I'd like to see greater patrolling of the areas and stricter enforcement of fines for litter & dog mess. I like the outdoor gym facilities at the recreational ground and would like to see these at Rowley fields and Shottery too.	Supportive.
179	Helen Conn		I applaud the Town Councils plan re recreational space. At a time when lack of exercise, obesity and loneliness are serious social and welfare concerns for society - to not have public recreational space included in a plan would be a huge glaring omission. There is a proven direct correlation between mental illness, depression, social isolation and not having access to opportunities for exercise, recreation and social interaction. I am delighted that the Local Plan looks to serve the town's community by providing free local recreational space- this is real short supply especially in the north of the town. As a female often out walking, I am looking for something not hilly and safe, being frequented by other walkers, and also that is free to use and access. The recreational ground is good but I need to drive and pay to park before I can use. The Greenway is very good. It is also, impractical to use on certain busy periods as it can take a 30 minute car journey from north of the town to	Supportive.

		<p>the car park. For most of us, use of the Greenway necessitates use of a car which is not very convenient but relatively cheap as long as car parking stays free of charge. However, that determination is, as I understand it outside of the Town Council remit. However, the one space that "ticks all the boxes" for me is all of Rowley Fields (RF). It is not hilly or isolated like Welcombe Hills. Neither does it have cattle on, which I find intimidating, especially if I am walking alone with my dog. Like many in the town, I have been appalled by the Trusts actions in trying to sell off ANY of Rowley Fields. To stress, Rowley Fields is 22 acres of land stretching from Benson Road/Welcombe Road public footpath, behind Benson Road and up to the top of gateway by Clopton Tower House/Wheelhouse. That is three separate though conjoined parcels of land, 12 acres on the top slope (presently designated as Green Space, I think). The 7.8 acres in front of Maidenhead Road and very importantly the 1.48 acres behind Benson Road. It is very important to stress that I and many others feel that the Stratford Town Trust (STT) are being disingenuous when they say by virtue of their putting a fence alongside this in 2008 that it is no longer part of Rowley Fields or, rather desperately, when they refer to 17c usage when, more relevant, in their own public consultation on the possible development of RF, it was, properly referred to as one 22 acre plot of land. It is to the STT's shame, that they ignored "the overwhelming view of the town" when they greedily choose to continue to try to sell the 1.48 acres of Rowley Fields behind Benson Road. This green space, still used daily by people in the town and alongside the other 2 parcels must be kept as one whole for recreational use. I strongly support the</p>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--



			Town Council in determining all of Rowley Fields as local recreational land and not to be developed on.	
180	Evelyn CONN		<p>As someone who enjoys walking, jogging and a non-driving University student, the town is rather desperate for places for recreational areas - there are very few. The Rec is really very limited to use in summer as it is so busy, plus I have to bike there to use. Ditto the Greenway but I do not feel so safe jogging along here on my own, especially in winter when not so many people are on it. Therefore, for a single, female jogging or walking, reading outdoors the Rowley Fields is the ONLY place I can go. I am delighted you have choose to secure ALL of it as recreational space - I and the vast majority of people in the town support you here: well done for being in tune ! Wish the same could be said for our dreadful, Town Trust and their rapacious developer friends. All 22 acres of Rowley Fields (RF) needs to be preserved forever for the Town as recreational space. I and many others still use the 1.48 parcel behind Benson Road and shame on the Trust for fencing it off years ago - pleased it still used as a public recreational space: please ensure this is the case for the next 20 years ++. BTW when the Trust fenced it off years ago they told people different things why: it was because the wanted to turn it into livestock pasture and then others allotments (der without any water ?). The Trust here is, as my mates would say "well dodgy or sketchy". Please do not let them desperately cling to 18C folklore to why they, this month, do not consider the 1.48 acre parcel behind Benson Road part of Rowley Fields - it is. Their own public consultation clearly said it was Rowley Fields is 22 acres of local green space, all 22 acres is and should be formally designated as such. This is the</p>	Supportive.

			only way the growing local population can have easily accessible recreational space to use for generations to come. Please continue to protect all of this valuable green space for our recreational use.	
181	Carl CONN		I strongly support the Town Council in the protection of all of these facilities. They are key aspects which help improve and enhance the quality of life in the town. I would like to comment on several aspects: a) Warwick Road - this site is being circled by greedy developers and more should be made of its wildlife bio diversity with more bat boxes, bird nesting boxes and raptor sites. All of this can be done whilst improving the educational and attraction to visitors. It is also a useful flood plain and should be further developed and protected as such. c) Rowley Fields. Much has been written in the Herald and, I am sure from other residents. I strongly support your plan to designate ALL 22 ACRES of Rowley Fields as Local Green Space. Please do not be misled by the Town Trusts latest change of argument by now asserting that the 1.48 acres is NOT part of RF. It is as evidenced by their own: a) Public Consultation on RF. b) Press release from June on Public Consultation. And all earlier assertions. RF clearly falls into a Local Green Space designation and the positive change of tack by the Trust to not go against your plan on one portion of RF is partly useful. Such selective support of the plan, which I guess they were party to drawing up, is wrong. All 22 acres of RF needs full Local Green Space protection for the benefit of all of the residents in the town.	Supportive
183	Sharon Taylor	Tiddington Village Residents' Association	P122 3rd bullet point, second sentence needs to acknowledge this NP policy and Policy CS.24 Healthy Communities Policy CS.24 states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of	Policy SSB5 (to be renumbered SSB3) will be amended to address this point.

			<p>parks/gardens/amenity green space per 1000 people in an individual settlement and that the “Unrestricted Natural Accessible Green space for a Local Service Village is 0.75 hectares per 1000 people”. There is nothing in this extract on Tiddington to ensure that this policy is met for Tiddington which has very little communal open space. So the wording for the third bullet point, or elsewhere in the extract regarding any future potential development in Tiddington, needs to acknowledge this by stating that a significant and clearly defined (based on population) part of this or another bit of land, SHOULD be green space/parks/community woodland. Currently, this Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the requirements of the Core Strategy policy for Healthy Communities. We would like a designated area of Tiddington to be included in the list for "special protection" which should "rule out new development" and suggest site 2b as such. This would compensate for the lack of communal space in existence and prepare for the increase in population due to new housing.</p>	
183	Sharon Taylor		<p>Tiddington should have a designated area of green open space. Currently we have a tiny amount. With the extra housing SDC will be contravening its own policies (CS.24)</p>	<p>Policy SSB5 (to be renumbered SSB3) will be amended to address this point.</p>
199	Mrs Janet spencer		<p>I am very much in support of the plan to make Rowley Fields a Designated Green Space. It is extremely important to protect this piece of land which was gifted to the Townspeople of Stratford for leisure and recreational use and vitally important that generations to come continue to be able to enjoy this precious community amenity. It should be protected as a designated green space to prevent the town trust from selling it off to developers.</p>	<p>Supportive.</p>
201	Graham John	The Inland	<p>Support better open spaces especially for the canal</p>	<p>Supportive</p>

	Nicholson	Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	corridor changes	
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		I propose adding the large plot of land at Bishopton to the list of sites. This area has huge potential to form part of the "green necklace" or to be sympathetically developed as sports fields or as woodland etc.	Bishopton Lands has been designated by the Core Strategy for housing development
204	Mr and Mrs Pritchard		Protecting open spaces is very important. Is the Greenway included as part of the list mentioned? Also re. The Tiddington Fields development mentioned in the plan. The fields are currently a local amenity for villagers of Tiddington for exercise and relaxation ... should these not be protected and not built on? Tiddington has a lack of open space and this should be protected. Tiddington must have a protected space too.	Yes, the Greenway is included.  Policy SSB5 (to be renumbered SSB3) will be amended to address this point.
214	Anthony McIsaac		I support this policy as a priority	Supportive
215	Portia Hazel Conn		I would like to thank the TC for planning for greater recreational space. I specifically support: 1) greenway access - the should be tarmacked and allowed for greater use by bikes as well as joggers - ideally separately t marked parts of the path. 2) Recreational ground - please continue to get the council to stop car access onto this. It ruins it for a long time also this is too heavily used for locals in summer so we have to rely on Rowley Fields. Lastly better use of parcor and calenthestic equipment around the whole rec should be encouraged for tourist and local use alike. The present equipment is cited in damp shady area and of very poor design as to be a joke. 3) Rowley Fields - as a single female who likes to jog and walk I love the RF - it is safe, level (welcome Hills is too hilly and muddy with lots of cow pats plus I am scared of the cattle on the hills ) and I met friends and others jogging around the area. I use the benches for	Noted

			reading and chatting to other users of the Fields. It is a 365 refuge from work stresses and indoor life. In winter it is still useable and often the only way I get some outdoor light in the shorter days. I strongly disagree with the Trust in that all 22 acres of RF must be covered by local green space and that the land behind Benson Road must, rightly, be included in this protection. This part of RF has been fenced but it is still used by many locals. And shame on the Trust for putting a fence up ! It is part of RF of course and the desperate inconsistencies of the Trust should be seen for what they are: greedy, arrogant and ill advised to make a quick deal at the expense of their own beneficiaries that is the townsfolk of SOA.	
216	Kathy Starkey		I think it is important that Rowley fields should be designated as local green space and that the issue of selling the fields for housing does not arise again. They should be left as they are for future generations to enjoy.	Supportive
218	Kevin Gold		Rowley Fields should be designated as a green space, for the good of the community and kept as a natural place of leisure and recreation for everybody to use. There are not many left so keep it as it is.	Supportive
226	Debs Campton		The plan is right to wish to and enhance protect existing green spaces which give the Town its valued and special character. Local people prize their green spaces as the recent struggle of the townsfolk with the Town Trust over Rowley Fields testifies. The constant pressure for housing on the periphery of the town must be resisted..	Supportive
228	John Campton		Vital priority	Supportive
276	S. J. Everett		I strongly support more green space, particularly the designation of Local Green Space for areas a to f on p.103	Supportive.

295	Cllr Charles Bates		In addition to the list on page 103, perhaps Drayton Avenue, Hodgson Road and maybe Loxley Road (sports pitches land owned by District Council) and Manor Road (KES sports field) could be added.	The number of open spaces is currently under review and will be increased.
-----	--------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------