

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

Policy SSB4

Representations: Total received N/A

Number in Support: N/A

Modification Proposed:

As the site now has benefit of full planning permission Policy SSB4 is no longer applicable and will be deleted.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy SSB4	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---------------------------------------------	-------------	--------------------------------------------

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>In (c) seeking an access through it to another site is likely to be unachievable unless parties come to an agreement.</p> <p>For (f), see previous comments.</p> <p>Is this policy still required following resolution to grant planning permission subject to signing of S106 legal agreement?</p> <p>Explanation: Should reference to Figure 12 in fact be to Figure 14?</p>	Policy SSB4 is no longer appropriate as the site benefits from full planning permission and is therefore now a Housing Commitment.

Agents and Developers' Comments				
508	Pegasus Group re: Gallagher Estates	Policy SSB3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the general thrust of this policy and allocation of our clients site at Tiddington Fields (Land at Oak Road) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted <i>NP</i> <p><i>(Moved from SSB3 Reqs)</i></p>
517	Framptons re Mr & Mrs Krauze		<p>Section 12 identifies the following housing allocation sites for Tiddington.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SSB4 – Home Guard Club – Allocation of up to 32 houses • Policy SSB5 – Tiddington Fields – Allocation of around 60 houses <p>The Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy Proposed Modifications June 2015 identifies Tiddington as a Local Service Village “Category 1 Village”. Appendix 2 of the Core Strategy Proposed Modifications details the methodology which was applied when assessing villages in the District. Category 1 Villages are one of the largest settlements within the District with: general stores that are large with long opening hours; a primary school; and, very good (at least hourly) bus services. Therefore, Tiddington is one of the most sustainable villages within the District. Policy CS.16 states that Category 1 Villages could provide approximately 450 homes of which no more than around 25% should be provided in an individual settlement. This would result in Tiddington being able to deliver up to 113 new dwellings during the plan period.</p> <p>As stated above, the Neighbourhood Plan has allocated up to 92 dwellings for Tiddington, some 19 short of the 113 that it could deliver. In order to support</p>	<p>Policy SSB4 will be deleted as the site has the benefit of planning permission. Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission. The Development boundary will now include these areas as Housing Commitments</p> <p>These numbers may change through the Core Strategy process and the NDP will reflect any amendments resulting.</p> <p>.</p> <p>The 25% is a ceiling not a minima.</p> <p>If the correct figure is 92 then this falls within the definition of “no more than around”. Mention will</p>

			<p>the Core Strategy the Neighbourhood Plan should include policies that allow for the additional 19 dwellings throughout the village. In any event it is submitted that no technical or environmental capacity assessment has been undertaken to provide a firm basis for the alleged upper limit to development at Tiddington. It is submitted that Tiddington is capable of accommodating further housing growth without undermining its character.</p>	<p>be made to Windfall developments.</p>
518	Framptons re Mr & Mrs Shakeshaff		<p>Section 12 identifies the following housing allocation sites for Tiddington.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SSB4 – Home Guard Club – Allocation of up to 32 houses • Policy SSB5 – Tiddington Fields – Allocation of around 60 houses <p>The Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy Proposed Modifications June 2015 identifies Tiddington as a Local Service Village “Category 1 Village”. Appendix 2 of the Core Strategy Proposed Modifications details the methodology which was applied when assessing villages in the District. Category 1 Villages are one of the largest settlements within the District with: general stores that are large with long opening hours; a primary school; and, very good (at least hourly) bus services. Therefore, Tiddington is one of the most sustainable villages within the District. Policy CS.16 states that Category 1 Villages could provide approximately 450 homes of which no more than around 25% should be provided in an individual settlement. This would result in Tiddington being able to deliver up to 113 new dwellings during the plan period.</p>	<p>See above comments to Rep 518.</p>

			As stated above, the Neighbourhood Plan has allocated up to 92 dwellings for Tiddington, some 19 short of the 113 that it could deliver. In order to support the Core Strategy the Neighbourhood Plan should include policies that allow for the additional 19 dwellings throughout the village. In any event it is submitted that no technical or environmental capacity assessment has been undertaken to provide a firm basis for the alleged upper limit to development at Tiddington. It is submitted that Tiddington is capable of accommodating further housing growth without undermining its character.	
519	Daniel O'Donnell		The TVRA survey undertaken does not fairly represent the different housing proposals options; as such the survey is fundamentally flawed.	Noted.
520	Charles Vickery		The survey undertaken by the TVRA did not fairly represent the different housing proposals options; as such the survey was fundamentally flawed.	Noted.

Residents' Comments				
018	Stephen Wreford		The provision of access to any proposed development over Tiddington Fields via the Land at The Home Guard Club. This will simply allow mass development over all of the currently "white land" to the East of the land referred to as SS85. WHERE IS THE SPACE TO COMMENT ON POLICY SSB5!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Policy SSB5 - This policy is not supported at all. This land is outside the BUAB as defined and so should not be supported. It will lead to massive traffic safety issues in New Street and Oak Road. There is no agreed access via The Home Guard I understand so	This Policy will be re-written to reflect the current position. It may be deleted.

			this policy MUST NOT BE ADOPTED.	
025	Jane Dodge		I agree	Supportive
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree	Supportive
138	Alison Tor		Too late - planning permission already given - see comment to Policy SSB5	This Policy will be re-written to reflect the current position. It may be deleted.
155	Barry Martin Kigsbeer		Development of Tiddington Fields will be highly detrimental to village life, bringing traffic misery especially in Oak Road and New Street and will be a precursor for further unneeded development along the rear of Hamilton and Townsend Roads. A far saner answer is proposed on land to the east of Knights lane where traffic access is straightforward and does not disrupt existing residents in the same way.	This comment relates to SSB5
171	Emma Scott	Save 'Tiddington Fields' Oppose Planning (STOP)	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.	This Policy will be re-written to reflect the current position. It may be deleted.
171	Emma Scott		Tiddington Fields 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	This Policy will be re-written to reflect the current position. It may be deleted. Much of this comment relates to Policy SSB5

		<p>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 possible option is for their planning application to be resubmitted (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.</p>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

			<p>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 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.</p>	
178	Andrea Fleet		As previous comment	Not clear what previous comment is referred to.
183	Sharon Taylor		Cala already has planning permission to build on this site. NP needs updating to reflect this.	This Policy will be re-written to reflect the current position. It may be deleted.
183	Sharon Taylor	Tiddington Village Residents' Association	<p>P122 -123 Home Guard Club Site As it now looks more than likely that Cala Homes will develop on it and build 32 new homes due to planning permission being granted for such, the policy SSB4 and explanation needs to reflect the situation at the time of adoption. Clarification on Building Applications outside Policy SSB4 and SSB5 is needed. The TVRA would like there to be some protection for the village if a developer succeeds in gaining planning permission outside of Policy SSB4 or SSB5. Currently, in July 2015, there is potential for this to happen and TVRA would like a clear statement in the Neighbourhood</p>	This Policy will be re-written to reflect the current position. It may be deleted.

			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. We would like a definitive statement on the number of houses permitted to be built in the village regardless of where.	
210	Rachel Syson		The Cala Homes planning application has been approved, so I think this should be noted in the document. Consideration needs to be given to access to any development on Tiddington Fields via Main Street through this plot. The white areas in Fig 14 should be part of Strategic Gap. At the moment they are	This Policy will be re-written to reflect the current position. It may be deleted.
219	Steve Duddy		I support this development but would want to see the provision made for floodlights in the identified football pitches so they can be utilised all year round at all times of the day.	Supportive
259	Mr & Mrs Cyril Willoughby		Tiddington Development. Access into Stratford will become even more difficult at peak times if not addressed properly.	The Housing Allocation for Tiddington is a strategic decision of the District Council. Infrastructure considerations will need to be taken into account when development proposals come forward.
281	Michael Craig Scott		Tiddington Housing Association - Home Guard Club. I agree that this application should be supported. While it should not be reason to grant the further development of Tiddington Fields site. I am concerned that this site will be used by developers as leverage to persuade the planners to allow the development of the Tiddington Fields site as it offers a more agreeable access route. If I was cynical it would suggest that the only reason that developers have considered this site is to use it as a gateway to the Tiddington Fields site	This Policy will be re-written to reflect the current position. It may be deleted.

			with the first phase being the 60 houses closely followed by a further 60 further punishing the current residents for a profit. The 32 houses planned for this site will more than satisfy the demand for housing in the Village of Tiddington.	
295	Cllr Charles Bates		Saint Margaret's Court, which is in Tiddington, isn't in figure 12.	This is a mapping content issue.