

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

Policy SSB5

Representations: Total received 48

Number in Support: 5

Modification Proposed:

The original proposals for housing sites in Tiddington in 2014 and 2015 have been overtaken by subsequent events and this policy has been revised to reflect planning permission granted for the site. At the time of submission of this NDP outline permission had been granted with means of access approved and all other matters reserved. In light of this it is felt necessary to retain an SSB policy for this site to control matters relating to detail. The pre-submission consultation NDP (May 2015) identified the northern part of Tiddington Fields for around 60 dwellings and the southern part for green open space/community woodland. The need for such additional publicly accessible amenity space, which has significant support, has been carried forward as an allocation in the policy which has been renumbered as Policy SSB3.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy SSB5	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	--	-------------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>In first line of policy it should read "Margaret Court".</p> <p>In (b) it is considered unreasonable to only reflect the needs of Tiddington.</p> <p>For (d), see previous comments.</p>	Noted.

			<p>The policy indicates the site is allocated for around 60 houses. However, the map accompanying the consultation questionnaire shows the Tiddington Fields site split in to 2 parcels (2A for 60 dwellings and 2B for 70 dwellings) and labelled together as 'site 2' on the map. This suggests the capacity of the proposal is significantly greater than the 60 dwellings proposed. It is unclear how the land will be utilised, or alternatively whether there is an error in the extent of the development area proposed.</p> <p>This site is in multiple ownerships and concern is raised as to the likelihood of its timely delivery in the absence of a clear strategy for delivery. Of particular concern is whether the non-standard allocation arrangements proposed for the affordable housing (indicative yield c.21 units) would work or even achieve their desired objective. By way of background, the current allocation arrangements (embedded in S.106 Agreements) provide for eligibility 'cascade' based on standard local connection criteria and normally starting with the host parish. Without a cascade (in effect a guarantee that any affordable homes will be able to be let) no housing association will choose to develop any homes. In this case, defining a first-tier local connection to "Tiddington" could be very problematic due to the need to define "Tiddington" by reference to a specific geographical area. This difficulty could be compounded by the requirement for a minimum 5-year local connection (the current standard requirement is for a minimum of one year). As a consequence, it is possible to envisage some unintended and perverse outcomes. The District Housing Enabler would be happy to work with the</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p> <p>Much of these comments has been overtaken by permissions granted, and the submission version of the NDP will reflect the current position.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Town Council to explain how nomination and allocation arrangements work, and identify practical solutions to the issues raised.</p> <p>This is likely to come forward as a formal outline application in summer 2015. It would be helpful if the Neighbourhood Development Plan emphasised the need to provide a landscaped buffer to the site at a reasonable depth so as to ensure a more definitive edge to the Tiddington Fields site.</p> <p>Criterion (d) seems to be repetition of an earlier policy.</p> <p>What are the standards that criterion (e) talks about?</p> <p>Where would the proposed 5Ha community woodland outlined in criterion (f) go?</p> <p>Explanation: Should read "Margaret Court".</p>	<p>The pre-submission consultation NDP (May 2015) identified the northern part of Tiddington Fields for around 60 dwellings and the southern part for green open space/community woodland.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Agents and Developers' Comments				
516	Framptons re ROSCONN Group		<p>It is submitted that the survey undertaken by the TVRA in July and August 2014 was fundamentally flawed in its distorted representation of development proposals on the periphery of Tiddington. As such little weight should be given to the preferences expressed within the Neighbourhood Plan. The comments made in respect of Site 3 are not a fair representation of the developer's proposals.</p>	<p>The NDP Team disagree that the TVRA Survey was flawed. The sites were either ones where there was known Developer interest or that had been proposed by residents. The Questionnaire went to every household and all residents had an opportunity to express their preferences.</p>
517	Framptons re Mr		<p>Section 12 identifies the following housing allocation</p>	<p>Policy SSB4 will be deleted as</p>

	<p>& Mrs Krauze</p>		<p>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 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</p>	<p>the site has the benefit of planning permission. Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5. 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>The figure of 92 falls within the definition of “no more than around”. Mention will be made to Windfall developments.</p>
--	-------------------------	--	--	---

			undermining its character.	
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>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</p>	See Response to Rep 517 above.

			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.	See Response to Rep 516 above.
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.	See Response to Rep 516 above.

Residents' Comments				
025	Jane Dodge		I agree	Supportive
026	Sandra Oram		How ridiculous to propose a development that uses a narrow residential road as the access. New Street is an old Victorian street meant for horses and carts, not cars and lorries. It is already nigh on impossible to get down in a car due to residents, naturally, parking outside their homes. There have been occasions when an ambulance has tried to get to get up New St and been unable to do so. So it will prove even more tricky for builders lorries. Oak Road is a little wider, but not much so access is again unacceptable. As to there being an access from the main road, I have understood that this will only occur if Cala Homes are in an agreement with Roscoe. If this is not the case, then expecting Oak Road to become a retrain for lorries is appalling.	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree	Supportive

064	Richard Eden		Summary note on the Neighbourhood Development Plan - How do you get the Public to engage in this? I'm sure lots of work and ideas have been done. I would suggest some competitions open to all SOA residents with ideas on how to expand the number of people involved. Thanks you. Richard Eden	Noted
087	Perry Yates		Development if this site would result in many existing dwellings being adversely affected in terms of traffic in dense populated area with narrow roads and impact on a small community. Increased congestion would result onto knight's lane and then produce a knock on effect along the Tiddington road and Loxley rd. There is already issues around peak times at the Clopton bridge with any development would exacerbate. The very essence of living in the village would be affected through increased traffic within local streets. Alternative sites have been suggested within Tiddington that may be preferential as these can be accessed from the Tiddington road or Knights lane which may be generally more acceptable to the village population as a whole. The impact therefore on the village could be more easily managed. Building on Tiddington fields would put the local area at risk of overcrowding and congestion which is not in keeping with current values.	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.
137	Andrew Cartwright		I responded to the Tiddington Village Residents Association questionnaire, although the limited response shows that it is of limited value. The draft plan does not represent my view. I think that the questionnaire was flawed and skewed towards maintaining a separation of Tiddington from Stratford, at the cost of other options. This has led to a cascade of decisions, leading to a poor outcome. If this was opened up again with a simple option list, then I think that a more representative result would be found. I	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.

		<p>think that traffic congestion was never considered and that a better solution is for land off Knights Lane is developed rather than the area called Tiddington Fields. I cannot see how the plan can provide and rely on safe access to Tiddington Fields through a site at the Home Guard Club, that has yet to be built, with detailed planning and no provision for through access. I feel that this is not a representative neighbourhood plan and should be changed to areas that can be accessed from the better road infrastructure of Knights Lane.</p>	
138	Alison Tor	<p>Neighbourhood Plan The Stratford Neighbourhood Development Plan does not reflect my wishes for the following reasons: Tiddington resident's survey and the neighbourhood plan As stated in the plan, the respondents to the survey strongly supported leaving the area to the south of the village as a strategic gap to maintain the identity and integrity of Tiddington. However, respondents were also strongly against building on Tiddington Fields. Nowhere in the survey were residents told that the maintenance of a large strategic gap would take priority over the residents' wishes for the Tiddington Fields to remain undeveloped. Given a choice, I, and I am sure many other residents, would prefer to have a smaller strategic gap by building off Knights Lane than destroying the Tiddington Fields. Although both are equally important as greenfield sites, the Tiddington Fields development would affect many more residents by allowing traffic from the new development to pass through the quiet residential roads of Tiddington. In addition, those living on New Street, behind which the houses would be built, would be overlooked. In contrast, a development off Knights Lane would mean that traffic would be unlikely to pass along any road</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p>

		<p>other than Knights Lane, leaving the remainder of the village undisturbed. The development would not overlook anyone's garden and would therefore be less offensive to the majority of residents. Furthermore, the best way to maintain a strategic gap between Stratford and Tiddington is to refuse any housing development towards the end of Knights Lane and on Arden Heath Farm. This is a huge site, which must support a substantial amount of wildlife (see the above section) and poses the biggest threat to the coalescence of Stratford with Tiddington. I suggest that another survey of Tiddington residents is made to enquire whether, if any building had to take place on greenfield sites, residents would prefer Tiddington Fields or land off Knights Lane to be developed. Biological Diversity and Ecological Impact How can greenfield sites be designated for development without a current Neighbourhood Biodiversity Action Plan? The neighbourhood plan states: Policy NE4 – Neighbourhood Area Biodiversity Action Plan A Biodiversity Action Plan shall be prepared for the Neighbourhood Area in consultation with key stakeholders and the public. All proposals should take account of the Local Biodiversity Action Plan and show what effect, if any, they will have on local biodiversity. Where development involves a loss of biodiversity or habitat, appropriate habitat should be created in mitigation. I have been unable to find any BAP for the Stratford area. By designating greenfield sites within Tiddington and the outskirts of Stratford for building, the council is not only failing to protect wildlife but is acting contrary to the above policy within the same document. Without an action plan for Stratford and the surrounding villages I believe no further planning permission should be given and no designation should</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>be allowed. With particular reference to the proposed developments at Arden Heath Farm, Knights Lane and Tiddington Fields, there is a danger that by considering the environmental and ecological impact of each proposal separately, the overall impact on biodiversity within the neighbourhood of Stratford is being overlooked. Each separate ecological impact report is worthless without consideration of adjacent or nearby developments. I am particularly concerned about the impact of these three proposed developments on the habitat of skylarks, a species that is fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act of 1981. There are many skylarks living and/or feeding on these sites and the crops on these areas are usually sown in the spring, allowing the larks to have 2 – 3 broods each year before the crop becomes too tall and dense for nesting. This has helped to maintain a healthy population of larks in the neighbourhood – with the added benefit of the pleasure of hearing larks from our back gardens! One example of the danger of considering ecological reports separately for each proposal is an ecological report for a developer about Tiddington Fields, which stated that although building would affect skylarks they would be able to move to the surrounding fields. This statement implies that there are no other proposed developments, and yet, Cala Homes has already been given planning permission for the neighbouring Home guard Field and the Arden Heath Farm site is also likely to soon receive planning permission. Thus, the available habitat for skylarks around Stratford is being considerably diminished. I intend to contact the RSPB and Nature England about this issue to determine the legal status of disturbing skylark-nesting sites. Every development that the council allows on a greenfield</p>	
--	--	--	--

			site leads to an encroachment of the countryside and the loss of agricultural land. Not only is this land important to the agricultural industry of the UK, but, as stated by the RSPB, much of the UK's wildlife depends on farmland. In addition it affects the living environment of the communities on the edge of Stratford and its villages. .	
141	Carol Crabb		I would like to object to the way the NP has not been clear about the development on Tiddington Fields at Tiddington. p125. The residents' survey split Tiddington Fields (TF) into 2 sites, 2a and 2b. It needs to be made clear that the recommendation is only for housing on site 2a. Land at 2b needs to be protected as green, open space (Tiddington does not have enough of this to meet the core strategy requirements for healthy communities). This is not at all clear in the NP document. We would like a reassurance that Tiddington should not take extra houses. Also, a submitted objection to the core strategy saying Tiddington should not be identified as a Local Service Village has not been responded to. Finally, the housing site decisions are determined by the residents' questionnaire, as only 20% of residents responded to the questionnaire and it was over a year ago, should this be what important decisions are based on? The number of proposed houses in Tiddington should be reduced as there are developments in very close proximity (Arden Heath - less than one mile away) which might be approved, which will affect traffic/schooling to a massive degree. Developers should be made to wait, instead of the speculative applications that are being submitted. Stratford is a beautiful tourist town, which is being spoilt by too many houses and too much traffic.	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.
142	David		Tiddington Fields should not be included for	Part of Tiddington Fields has

	Wolstencroft		<p>consideration for housing development because I believe Tiddington Fields will impact more on the community, than Knight's Lane development. Currently many, many people use the open space as a community resource, including myself. The fields in Knight's Ln are not available as community spaces. Secondly, I frequently struggle with reversing my car down New St meeting traffic coming the opposing way. Increasing traffic flow will exacerbate this. I do not want New St to be one way as it is inconvenient and adds considerably to issues in Oak Rd. There are more families with young children living in New St, and with parked cars and increased traffic flow, this is an accident waiting to happen. Traffic from Knight's Lane development can at least access main roads, although traffic and local services will struggle with either development.</p>	<p>been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p>
144	Dr Derek Whatling		<p>As a resident of Tiddington now for some 30 years I have seen the changes over the years and accept that change is inevitable and not always a bad thing. However the recent proposals for housing on 'Tiddington fields' (Reference Policy SS-B5) will for the first time alter the character of the village to a point where it no longer fulfils the reasons why we moved here. Extra housing in the locations proposed will destroy the connectivity with open fields, recreation areas, country walks and the feeling of well-being this brings. Further, the 'strategic gap' between Tiddington and Alveston will be reduced undermining the diverse characters of the two settlements. As a biologist specialising in biodiversity I recognise the proposed development sites of Tiddington Fields are of little value taken in isolation. The land is arable, cultivated mono crops dominant and the soil heavily managed. Many hedgerows have over the years and more</p>	<p>See Response to Rep 155</p>

			<p>recently been taken away which has the advantage of making it easier for planners. Taken in its wider landscape context however, the resulting 'habitat nibbling' at the edges of the village reduce undisturbed available foraging and nesting opportunities for birds and diminish their invertebrate and mammal food source. This is a consideration which has to be taken seriously if Tiddington is to remain a meaningful margin between rural and natural areas. On the upside of down, recent farming inactivity is increasing biodiversity as the land reverts towards a more natural flora mosaic. The traffic has been steadily increasing in the village, as one would expect, but the addition of some 60 extra houses would result in further adverse pressure on the link roads of Oak Road and Knights Lane. In addition, New Street cannot take any more traffic as it is already impassable at times for emergency vehicles. These roads are barely adequate now for residential, NFU, School, Football club traffic. Parking for residents is at present extremely difficult in New Street and on Tiddington Road. In terms of infrastructure the village school, for example, is at capacity and any more children will have to travel elsewhere, further exacerbating the effectiveness of road networks.</p>	
145	Stephen Crabb		<p>I do not think that Tiddington Fields should be identified as a preferred site. It is too hard to access in the heart of the village and could lead to massive over development of the area, once Gallagher's have 'got a foothold' into the fields that are prime agricultural land. These fields should not be built upon. If we have to have extra houses in Tiddington - and I don't see why we should - the Knights Lane development is better for traffic and can be contained better.</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p>
146	Daniel Crabb		<p>I do not agree with the methodology used to choose</p>	<p>The NDP Team disagree that the</p>

			<p>Tiddington Fields as a preferred site. The fields on Knights Lane scored almost the same amount of points, but the question of coalescence was given a high priority, thus Tiddington Fields was recommended. I think this is not fair. The Knights Lane fields are more suitable. I do not think that Tiddington should have to accommodate 76-100 new houses - this is too many for a small village, which will not be able to support them.</p>	<p>TVRA Survey was flawed. The sites were either ones where there was known Developer interest or that had been proposed by residents. The Questionnaire went to every household and all residents had an opportunity to express their preferences.</p> <p>The prevention of coalescence (Core Strategy Policy CS.15) was deemed to be a significant issue in determining the location of new development for Tiddington. A recent appeal was upheld on the grounds of incursion into the significant gap.</p>
149	Mark Morrall		<p>I agree that Tiddington Fields (site 2b) is my preferred location for any development within the village. I firmly believe this offers the best protection for the village in terms of preventing coalescence with Stratford.</p>	<p>Supportive</p>
150	Anna Chambers		<p>Reference Policy SS-B5: Tiddington Fields should not be included as a supported site for new housing development in Tiddington because: - the site does more harm to our village than other equally preferred sites such as Knights Lane - It provides little public open spaces for local residents - with no access to main street traffic will have to use Oak Road and New Street which cannot cope - negative impact on local infrastructure including schools, hospitals and transport - there is a greater danger or erosion of the strategic gap between Tiddington and Alveston - proposed site at Knights Lane should be included</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p>

			instead as it provides both a genuine strategic gap between Stratford and Tiddington and will mean less traffic along the smaller roads in the village such as New Street and Oak Road	
153	Janick McOwan		The proposed new development on Tiddington fields (60 houses) should definitely have safe access from Main Street and not from Oak Road or New Street or Townsend Road which are narrow residential streets which would not be able to cope with the extra traffic (potentially an additional 120 cars) generated by the additional 60 dwellings. Tiddington Fields should also be split into two sites 2a and 2b, 2b being preferably kept as green open space or a woodlands area.	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.
154	Wendy Appleby		I support the allocation of Tiddington Fields (site 2a in the tvra consultation) for housing, with particular emphasis on affordable housing for local people particularly young people and families. The access should be via Main Street not via oak road or New Street as these are not suitable. There should be an allocation of amenity land for local residents particularly open spaces for children to play.	Supportive
155	Barry Martin Kigsbeer		An open invitation to Ms Gallagher to build more unneeded housing.	The housing allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. Tiddington is expected to have to expand to meet the Allocation for a Cat 1 Local Service Village, which could easily be around 100 new dwellings. The NDP was seeking to identify the least worst option, with Tiddington Fields selected taking into account both the views of residents, and other planning considerations.

				Regardless, however, of the draft proposals in SSB 4 and SSB5, the NDP has to take account of planning permissions granted at the time the final draft is submitted for examination and the Policies will now be modified accordingly, or even deleted.
156	Chris French		Site access must be from Main Street and not Oak Road.	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.
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.	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	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5. The southern part of Tiddington Fields will be allocated for green open space/community woodland.

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

			<p>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.</p>	
178	Andrea Fleet		As previous comment	Unclear what this previous comment was.
183	Sharon Taylor	Tiddington Village Residents' Association	<p>P121 Description of Tiddington Fields TVRA would like it to be acknowledged in this description that Tiddington Fields, site 2, is agricultural land, this information is omitted. This would then be an accurate description and in keeping with that of the description of site 3. This site also has public footpaths running around it and through it. P121 The information</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p> <p>The southern part of Tiddington Fields will be allocated for green</p>

		<p>regarding site 2, Tiddington Fields The information regarding the SHLAA Review of 2012 is imprecise as only the northern part of Tiddington Fields was identified as suitable for development in this document. Hence, TVRA's reasoning behind splitting the site into 2a and 2b. We would like this differentiation to be acknowledged clearly. P122 3rd bullet point, second sentence needs to acknowledge 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. 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.6. P125 Policy SSB5 Name of Buildings It's Margaret Court, not St Margaret's Court. P125 Policy SSB5: the importance of two separate sites for Site 2 and geographical accuracy The inaccuracy on the map highlights the need for Tiddington Fields to be identified as 2 separate areas as this policy erroneously links the sites together in its description of the "Land east of Townsend Road..."The TVRA site 2a is NOT the land "east of Townsend Road...". It is land of east of Oak Road, slightly north of Townsend Road</p>	<p>open space/community woodland.</p>
--	--	---	---------------------------------------

			<p>and just south of Margaret Court. TVRA wish the Tiddington Field sites to be clearly differentiated as in our survey (2a and 2b) with the area south of 2a as land which SHOULD be allocated, if a developer seeks permission to build, as open green space/parks/or community woodland with dimensions as outlined above according to population (CS.24 Healthy Communities) (CLW4 and CLW 5) 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 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. P121 Description of Tiddington Fields TVRA would like it to be acknowledged in this description that Tiddington Fields, site 2, is agricultural land, this information is omitted. This would then be an accurate description and in keeping with that of the description of site 3. This site also has public footpaths running around it and through it.</p>	
183	Sharon Taylor		<p>There is nowhere in Tiddington suitable for housing. Although I believe this is the lesser of the two evils as Knights Lane would lead to coalescence, I believe that the access to this site without being able to use Main Street as this plan suggests (and as Cala have already gained planning permission and their plan does not include this, so therefore, it's unlikely to happen) makes it untenable. There are pathways across the</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p> <p>The southern part of Tiddington Fields will be allocated for green open space/community</p>

		<p>fields, an abundance of wildlife, crops growing and it maintains the character of Tiddington as a village in close proximity to countryside. To take this away from the residents of New Street, Oak Road, Margaret Court, Townsend Road and Hamilton Road is a travesty. These residents chose to live in a village, near open fields. This NP will strip away what people have worked all their lives for: to own a house with space around it. The fields are "our lungs". Without the open space for communities as outlined in CS.24, these fields add greatly to a sense of health and well-being within the community. To take this amenity away without replacing open space could lead to physical and mental health problems. The policy wording would need to be changed so that the southern part of this site SHOULD include the amount of open space which the whole village needs, not just enough to sustain any new development.</p>	<p>woodland.</p>
204	Mr and Mrs Pritchard	<p>Big concern is that only 20% of Tiddington Residents completed the survey which informs this as a 'preferred site'. It's not a representative response rate and further consultation is needed with villagers about what their preferred site actually is. The survey happened in August 2014 when there were not any imminent planning applications ... perhaps villagers didn't understand the significance of the survey and chose not to fill it in. Also access to the development 'MUST' be via main street, not 'should' as stated in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is simply not safe to access this development via Oak Road (a narrow residential street where children play and there are lots of parked cars.) But how will access be made via Main Street? Through Margaret Court or the Cala Homes development on the Home Guard Club? ... Why would they want to allow extra traffic through their sites? This</p>	<p>The NDP Team disagree that the TVRA Survey was flawed. The sites were either ones where there was known Developer interest or that had been proposed by residents. The Questionnaire went to every household and all residents had an opportunity to express their preferences.</p> <p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p>

			needs to addressed. We feel that other sites in Tiddington would be much better for development. Access is biggest concern with Tiddington Fields, it's a safety issue, but also Tiddington Fields is a village amenity and we strongly feel that it should not be built on. It's a highly valued and used green space where villagers meet, make friends ... where we exercise and relax. It's the only place in the village where our children can run freely away from busy roads. We love Tiddington Fields and feel it should be protected farmland for villagers to enjoy, as they have done for generations.	The southern part of Tiddington Fields will be allocated for green open space/community woodland.
207	Mrs Christine Susanne Eastwood		Tiddington Fields should not be included as a supported site for new housing development in Tiddington because of a number of reasons which include: It is detrimental to the village as a whole due to the generation of extra traffic using the already congested roads (namely New Street and Oak Road) with the threat of a further entrance/exit by Margaret Court. Main Street is often difficult for traffic to negotiate as it is a bus route and latterly a route for large lorries from the Wellesbourne Industrial Park. The plan provides little or no open spaces for local residents and deprives them of current exercise and dog-walking areas. The character of the village and its separation from Stratford and Alveston will be eroded as no doubt, Gallagher's will apply to build more houses after the initial 60 with all the consequent pressure on schools, roads etc.	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5. The southern part of Tiddington Fields will be allocated for green open space/community woodland.
209	Robert Bessell	Retirement Security Ltd, Leaseholder and Managing Agent of Margaret Court,	We are very concerned at the proposal to build 60 dwellings adjacent to Margaret Court and although the Neighbourhood Plan specifies no more than 2 Storeys, the Plan circulated by Gallagher's provides for a building of 3 Storeys adjacent to Margaret Court, which duplicates the permission given to Cala for a 3	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.

		Tiddington	storey building also adjacent to Margaret Court. If erected these two buildings would drastically affect the quality of life of those residents in Margaret Court whose apartments would be totally dominated by an adjacent 3 storey building, which amongst other things would severely restrict daylight.	
210	Rachel Syson		The massing together of sites 2a and 2b is not appropriate. Site 2a, which is East of Oak Road is one which would be better developed. There are issues with access via New Street, which must be avoided if possible by providing access via Main Street and Oak Road. But site 2a is the preferable site for building on - and 2b should be designated as an open space/community parkland to maintain a Strategic Gap to Stratford, along with sites 3a,b and c. These sites are currently Agricultural land - green field sites. This has not been stated.	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5. The southern part of Tiddington Fields will be allocated for green open space/community woodland.
211	Alex Quinn		The number of houses proposed for Tiddington is out of kilter with its size, location and infrastructure - and more importantly with the views of local residents. The site of Tiddington fields in particular should not be included as a supported site. Approving building on the north end of the field opens up the opportunity for further development across the south of the field which would have disastrous effect on the village. Oak Road and New Street are not equipped to deal with the current volume of traffic so increasing it would have an extremely negative effect. Parking is also an issue and new developments are renowned for not providing enough spaces which will lead to further on-street parking which is already at dangerous levels on Oak Road and New Street. Emergency and service vehicles are often unable to get up New Street due to this. No provision has been made to improve local services to deal with the number of new residents. The	The housing allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. The NDP was seeking to identify the least worst option, with Tiddington Fields selected taking into account both the views of residents, and other planning considerations. Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.

			<p>school is already often at capacity and the approved development at Arden Heath will undoubtedly make this situation worse. Consideration should be given to the impact the Arden Heath development will have on Tiddington as new residents there will undoubtedly make heavy use of the village's facilities which means that development should count towards Tiddington's allocation. If development has to be made in Tiddington it should be on a much smaller scale and the site at Knight's Lane should be considered instead. This is already a major traffic route and so won't impact the smaller roads in the village.</p>	
219	Steve Duddy		<p>I support this development as the most appropriate plan for fulfilling Tiddington's requirement of 75-100 new houses.</p>	Supportive
221	Lindsey Quinn		<p>Tiddington Fields should not be a supported site for development. Allowing building to take place on one part of the field will encourage further development on the rest of the area which will have a devastating impact on the character of the village. Neither Oak Road or New Street are suitable for an increased level of traffic that would come as a consequence of developing on these fields. Suggesting that a link road to the Home Guard site would ease this is misleading. On-street parking is already a serious hazard to emergency vehicles and pedestrians on Oak Road and New Street, a hazard which would be significantly worse with increased traffic flow. New developments never provide enough parking so the overflow would undoubtedly affect surrounding streets. Neither Oak Road or New Street are designed as major through routes, which they would become if this development were to go ahead. Green field sites should not be suggested as primary sites for development within the village. The number of houses assigned to the village</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p>

			is not in step with the views of local residents and is utterly arbitrary - there is no good reason for that level of housing to be associated with Tiddington.	
222	Gareth Walton		If Tiddington does have to have extra housing then surely Knights Lane is the better option. The impact for the village would be far less as it does not involve opening up internal streets to a greater volume of traffic.	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.
224	Gina Print		I disagree that the Tiddington Fields be indicated as a preferred site for development. The land on either side of Knights Lane (Site 3) should be more seriously considered or reconsidered. In this Plan, it appears to be quickly dismissed. Rosconn has submitted a revised application for a reduction to 60 homes (not 100-200 as originally presented to the residents) and has submitted a revised planning application which allocates open space and clearly provides a green buffer which allows a strategic gap between Tiddington and Stratford. I believe at the time the TVRA submitted the village's results, the application was for 100 homes and no strategic gap had been allowed for. Thus, at the time, making it an unfavourable site. However, it is now clearly a more attractive proposal and should be stated in the Neighbourhood Plan as a site to be seriously considered. The Tiddington Fields have a serious access issue which will greatly disrupt the interior, quiet, residential area of the village. New Street cannot seriously be considered as an option for access, as it already has major issues with parked cars on the road. It is a very narrow residential road, with very few driveways. There is absolutely no way that contractors/suppliers during the term of the build would get thru the road, thus forcing all access down Oak Road. Oak Road is a quiet, residential, also narrow road. This sort of activity, during the build	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.

		<p>would be hugely disruptive to the village and directly to the residents along Knights Lane and Oak Road. So, we have access during the build as an issue and access to and from 60 new homes, as an issue. Although the Neighbourhood Plan recommends that access "should be" provided, there is currently NO other confirmed access point on any submitted application. Therefore, it is a huge risk to include the Tiddington Fields site as the preferred site, when such issues have not yet been resolved or even addressed seriously in the planning application. Tiddington Fields should also be described as agricultural land in the general description on page 121.</p>	
225	Tim Print	<p>Paragraph a): It is recommended that access should be provided through the Main Street side via the Home Guard Club site. As I understand it there is currently no provision for this in the Home Guard Club development proposal and therefore Tiddington Fields should not be considered for development. Paragraph a): The phrase "...laid out, so as to reduce the increase in traffic along the existing narrow residential roads..." is unclear and misleading. I understand the intention but the word reduce is problematic. 60 extra houses would inevitably create a significantly larger volume of traffic on what are clearly identified as 'narrow residential roads'. Using the word reduce does not convey this at all. I disagree with Tiddington Fields being promoted for development over other possible sites in the village for the following reasons. I do not believe the recommendation of Tiddington Fields as the preferred choice by the Tiddington Village Residents Association (TVRA) is an accurate representation of the results of the survey that was conducted by them. At the time of the survey the proposals were as follows: site 2a (Tiddington Fields</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p> <p>The southern part of Tiddington Fields will be allocated for green open space/community woodland.</p>

		<p>North) - 60 dwellings site 3a (Knights Lane) - 100 dwellings site 3b (Knights Lane) - 100 dwellings Each site received approximately 9% share of the votes (of a turnout of around 20% of the village residents). Based on these results and the wish by a majority of residents for a green buffer between Tiddington and Stratford, TVRA have chosen to recommend Tiddington Fields for development. However the proposed development for the two Knights Lane sites (3a & 3b), by Rosconn Group, has since been revised to a total of 60 dwellings from the potential 200 dwellings included in the survey question. The revised application also includes a covenanted green belt, to guarantee the long term protection against coalescence. This development of 60 dwellings would have significantly less impact on the village than the 200 dwellings which were in the original TVRA survey and which their recommendations are based on. I do not believe that with such a fundamental difference to the facts provided in the original question that the results can still be considered valid. I believe that the development of sites 3a and 3b would have less negative impact on the village than the development of 2a. Site 2a (Tiddington fields) has had a permissive footpath around it's perimeter for many years and is used by a large number of local residents including, dog walkers, families, playing children and residents of Margaret Court residential home. It provides a significant community open space that is valuable to the well-being of village residents.</p>	
230	Mark Taylor	<p>I have closely followed the detailed work done by the Tiddington Village Residents' Association and the results from their village consultation questionnaire, and I am in full agreement with their representation of the needs of the whole village. I do wish to make clear</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p>

			<p>that I oppose all development in Tiddington - the village school is full, the drainage problems are already manifest, the biodiversity in the surrounding countryside is hugely important both to the lives of the village residents and the cultural importance of our nearby town. The local infrastructure already cannot support the current level of development - day after day, it is becoming increasingly difficult to drive into or through our local town. I oppose any building on Tiddington Fields - the traffic implications for all residents of the village are unmanageable, and Knights Lane as a whole is becoming far too busy. Even further I oppose any building on the proposed Knights Lane sites - the need to keep a full strategic gap between Stratford-upon-Avon and Tiddington is paramount. The views from the village towards Alveston Hill are part of the essence of living in the village. The children going to Alveston School over the next 20 years should be able to look into the distance, to see countryside, and not to have their Forest School bordering on a housing development.</p>	
253	Daniel O'Donnell		<p>Tiddington. The TVRA survey undertaken does not fairly represent the different housing proposals options; such as the survey is fundamentally flawed.</p>	<p>The NDP Team disagree that the TVRA Survey was flawed. The sites were either ones where there was known Developer interest or that had been proposed by residents. The Questionnaire went to every household and all residents had an opportunity to express their preferences.</p>
259	Mr & Mrs Cyril Willoughby		<p>Tiddington Development. Access into Stratford will become even more difficult at peak times if not addressed properly.</p>	<p>Not within the remit of the NDP to control.</p>

279	Gloria Douglas		<p>SSB5 Tiddington Fields. I have reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan and have the following comments regarding new housing in Tiddington. I understand that the Tiddington Fields planning application by Gallagher's has now closed but knowing the length of planning applications, I am nevertheless putting forward my views on development in Tiddington and trust they will be given serious consideration. As housing has to be constructed in Tiddington, the best option would be Knights Lane. This would have less of a destructive aspect as it is a relatively contained area and would be the most favourable in respect to increased traffic. Tiddington Fields has always been an open area which I and my family and countless others have enjoyed for walking, bird watching and general recreation and should remain an open public space without having to take a car or transport. Its environmental value cannot be over-emphasised and it would be a tragedy to see it over-developed to housing. There is no over-turning of creation of a concrete jungle and, if this happened, future planners would realise that it was an enormous mistake. Please "close the door before the horse has bolted" and future generations would appreciate the foresight. Take into consideration also the physical and mental health enjoyed by users of this green space - an important issue in the 21st century. The traffic situation is also a huge problem, but as some housing has to be built, locating development in Knights Lane would be positive and might alleviate greater bottlenecks on Main Street. As is well known, traffic on Main Street is sometimes backed up to New Street with further dire congestion at the lower end. While selecting Knights Lane for development would result in a smaller strategic gap, I consider this to be of secondary</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p> <p>The southern part of Tiddington Fields will be allocated for green open space/community woodland.</p>
-----	----------------	--	---	---

			importance. The construction of 70/100 houses in a small village should be sufficient to meet overall housing needs in the town and County and a fair and equitable distribution if applied to all villages - at least for some time in the future.	
281	Michael Craig Scott		Tiddington Housing Allocation - Tiddington Fields. This application should not be supported. This site is a prime example of a site that should not be considered for development. The site is outside the built up area boundary on greenbelt land and no benefit to the neighbourhood has been demonstrated. The development will create greater traffic congestion both in Tiddington and Stratford. No increase in school places has been put in place to accommodate children of the families expected to suddenly appear in Tiddington with roots in Tiddington and demand to be housed. (I realise that the plan recommends that new and existing businesses are encouraged to grow in the Town but there is no evidence that this is happening and the situations vacant page of the Stratford Herald does not confirm the need for this level of residential development. The development will have a detrimental effect on the character of Tiddington significantly reduce the visual charm of the village. These houses are not required in Tiddington.	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.
283	Mrs L E Barnes		Policy SSB5 - Tiddington Housing Allocation Tiddington Fields. I am writing to put forward some comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan for future housing developments in Tiddington. I note from published information that at the eastern end of the village seems to have been targeted, with an approved application for 32 new dwellings on The Home Guard Club site and a new application for 60 plus dwellings on Tiddington Fields. I appreciate that it is very desirable to maintain a gap between Stratford and	Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.

			<p>Tiddington, but it seems to me to be unreasonable, not to say unfair, to expect the residents at this end of the village to have to accept nearly all of the present requirement (90-113 houses). I have no desire to see any other residents adversely affected, but some development in the other suggested locations around the village, seemingly equally suitable, would have less impact on everyone. As you will see from my address, I am very much an interested party as far as Tiddington Fields is concerned. The impact of such a development on the quality of life would be considerable for the residents of Margaret Court, as well as for those of the surrounding residential roads. The loss of this open space, which is amenity very well used by walkers of all generations, would be a matter of serious concern. The lack of infrastructure in the surrounding area - inadequate schooling, no medical facilities nearer that Wellesbourne on Stratford, increased traffic on already very busy B road - has often been discussed but it remains no loss valid. I have also been told that a previous planning application was refused on the grounds of potential risk of flooding, although I have not seen written evidence of this. If this was the case, surely it must still apply! As a relatively recent resident of Tiddington, who came from crowded and noisy London, I am very concerned that these quiet country areas are threatened with being spoiled for so many people.</p>	
290	Reg Edwards		<p>Tiddington Housing Allocation - Tiddington Fields. Regarding the above subject I would like to make my own and no doubt many other people's objections to what we feel is definitely for safety and other reasons a ridiculous idea. 1. Sixty dwellings with all that entails, inadequate roads already overloaded 2. How will they cope with very heavy lorries conveying very heavy</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p>

			<p>Machinery and supplies. 2. With approx. 100 more vehicles after construction 4. What about school places could be 100 more? 5. Totally inadequate approach roads Oak and New Street, there will surely be accidents, even perhaps a fatality 6. I cannot see how any thinking person can even consider such a dangerous plan. Finally I could continue writing genuine reasons why not because quite honesty this is the most irresponsible plan imaginable. To whom this concerns please think again. Yours Sincerely, Reg Edwards</p>	
294	Mrs Angela Brook		<p>Although I am understand that more housing is needed, I believe the allocation for Tiddington is far too many as we do not have the infrastructure to support them. I am, therefore, objecting to both preferred sites on the following grounds:</p> <p>Tiddington Fields Currently provides valuable open space to the whole village and has several permissive footpaths which provide residents with a place to exercise and would be lost through any development.</p> <p>Access: With no access from Main Street, traffic would have to use Oak Road and New Street both of which are already busy with local traffic and severely over-parked as most houses own more than one car.</p> <p>Open Space: Building on this land would mean the loss of the villages open fields where many of us exercise and walk our dogs and where our children play. The SNDP suggests that site 2b may be kept as open green space. However, without agreement to this by Clifford Chambers Trust, this area will become vulnerable to further development and we will lose all these open fields and our only green space. Policy CS.24 Healthy</p>	<p>The housing allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. The NDP was seeking to identify the least worst option, with Tiddington Fields selected taking into account both the views of residents, and other planning considerations.</p> <p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p> <p>The southern part of Tiddington Fields will be allocated for green open space/community woodland.</p>

		<p>Communities states that there should be a minimum provision of 1.15 hectares of 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. I don't believe that Tiddington has this now so what we do have should be protected!!!</p> <p>Knights Lane Building on this land would not limit disruption to the village. It also provides open space for the community and wonderful views.</p> <p>Access: Although traffic would enter either from Loxley Road or Knights Lane, the increase in traffic would still cause problems for the village. These two roads are already busy with traffic for the Football Club and for the NFU and cause problems around the primary school when parents are dropping off and picking up.</p> <p>Open Space: Again, development on this area of land would mean the loss of our green open spaces. It also presents a risk of 'coalescence' with Stratford if the proposed Arden Heath development goes ahead. This could, potentially, mean even more homes could be forced upon the village as we become a suburb of Stratford. In order to remain a separate settlement, Tiddington needs to have a strategic gap around the village. There is, however, no guidance on how wide this gap should be.</p>	
296	Kate Rolfe	<p>Tiddington - in policy SSB5 we are promoting 60 houses however in the drawing there are two hatched areas. We need to remove the hatching of the second area nearest to the Loxley Road backing onto Townsend and Hamilton. Only the hatched area backing onto Oak Road should remain. Tiddington has</p>	<p>Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5.</p> <p>The southern part of Tiddington Fields will be allocated for green</p>

			no or very little amenity space. Developers in Tiddington must be encouraged to provide more of this.	open space/community woodland.
298	Helen Campbell		Neighbourhood Plan Page 124 and 125 With reference to the above plan, I have lived in this village for 56 years born in the house I live in and I am totally objecting to your idea that north of Tiddington Fields which is off Oak Road and Hamilton Road is the preferred site for these houses. If we have to have houses built then the preferred site for these houses should be in the field which is the top left of Knights Lane by Townsend Road and Knights Lane. Please read as follows: Tiddington Fields North and South Previous application of 188 houses were turned down by Planning who stated NEVER TO BE BUILT ON this was due to the cellars of old houses in New Street being flooded out and the unsuitable access to these fields. On occasions the farmer's tractors have been stuck in those fields just the other year this happened. So if you don't mind, I would like to remind the Committee on the Neighbourhood Plan from the dictionary what Never means "AT NO TIME IN THE PAST OR FUTURE, NOT EVER - NOT AT ALL". So why are these fields mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan Page 125. 2. To access these fields are roads which were built in 60's when there were very little cars I.e., not every house had a car not like today when every household could have one, two or three cars. Roads as follows a) Oak Road - Bottom of Oak Road is a very small entrance into the fields - (1) This is a nice quiet road with the occasional car travelling up the road. (2) Children play in this road (3) Cats cross the road also dog walkers. (4). If this is to be the main entrance to the housing then for months we will experience construction traffic i.e., diggers,	The housing allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. The NDP was seeking to identify the least worst option, with Tiddington Fields selected taking into account both the views of residents, and other planning considerations. Part of Tiddington Fields has been granted outline permission and this will be recognised in amendments to Policy SSB5. The southern part of Tiddington Fields will be allocated for green open space/community woodland.

		<p>cranes, delivery vans, workmen's cars etc. All coming down that road. I wonder if the road can take the pressure as under the tarmac is history, the prisoner of the war built the road with squares of concrete and their names and dates were on each square. I might ask the question as to why we should put up with that amount of traffic and noise and extreme danger to children and animals (5) Cars will not only use Oak Road to access the housing they will also use New Street which this street has major problems with traffic and parking Ambulance and Fire Brigade have had major problems accessing this Street even coming down Oak Road. One gentleman which died the sat nav on the ambulance sent them into New Street to get to Oak Road the ambulance could not get through so had to back out then go down Knights Lane to Oak Road. (6) Various premises in Knight Lane will suffer from extra traffic I.e, Tiddington Court Retirement Home, School, NFU and Football Club plus more traffic on Main Road and Clopton Bridge. b) Hamilton Road off Townsend Road - Small entrance to field Similar to Oak Road queries where by all traffic would have to come through Townsend Road into Hamilton Road c) Margaret's Court 24 hour care Retirement Home Private Road - this is a small Road with cars parked whereby a small entrance via gate to field. This road is owned by Margaret's Court. d) Plimico Lane - This is a narrow Lane and is already used as a dirt track and is extremely dangerous to walk down especially as there is a 50 mph limit. To gain access to Tiddington Fields for housing then this road would need to be widened to accommodate the traffic and this would be difficult as you have a public footpath running along side the road plus two houses, Restaurant, a Garage and workshop are on the edge</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>of that road. Neighbourhood Plan mentions main access from main road via Cala Homes Development depending where the access will be entering into Tiddington Fields. Ghalager's proposal looks as if access will come by Margaret's Court if that be the case then Margaret's Court will be piggy in the middle with Main Road on one side and another road albeit entrance of actual road on the other side of the Home. This is a 24 hour care home and as have residence with dementia and Alzheimer suffers, I hardly think gaining access from Main Street very suitable and could be quite dangerous for the Home. What do you think? 3. Tiddington Fields are the main countryside of Tiddington they run along side other fields known as three fields. These fields are used regularly by the Villagers, dog walkers and families going out for a walk. There are wildlife, protected birds i.e., skylarks, yellow hammers. Most important these days people work many hours and long distances so they need that countryside to relax and feel free and it is very important for children to be brought up in parts of the countryside to learn all about various things like wildlife birds, and things growing like blackberries, crab apples, damsons, sloes, cherries they do not want to be brought up in over built up areas. 4. Tiddington Fields the farmer grows crops in them. So these fields are used for producing things they are not laid to rest. There are so many houses destroying farmed fields and countryside. ONCE THE COUNTRYSIDE HAS GONE YOU CAN NEVER GET IT BACK. The builders Gallagher's say they will put a bit of open space and woodland etc. well firstly we don't need this as we already have Countryside and secondly this open space etc will only last a few years before the builders will put another application in to build on that. Thirdly</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>who will maintain this open space and woodland. I bet not the builders, it will probably be down to the Council which will be a further cost to their budget. Fields Top Left of Knights Lane /Townsend Road Obviously either site is not really suitable for housing but this field should be the preferred site as a) Only one field will be affected so not much destruction to the Countryside b) Can access this field straight from Knights Lane so does not have such a huge impact on roads like Townsend Road, Hamilton Road, Oak Road, New Street. c) However the cars from the new housing estate in this field would mainly use Muddy Lane (I think this has now been named Boundary Lane) this is a single track road and already overused with major amount of potholes and 50 mph, whilst travelling down that road within five mins passed 8 cars totally unsuitable and Loxley Road as their main access to Stratford the only time they will use Knight Lane would be going to the village. If coming from Wellesbourne they would more likely to use Plimico Lane which here again is not suitable as mentioned above will need widening. c) Would not affect Margaret's Court Retirement Home so the residence who suffer from dementia and alzheimers would be protected. d) One of the reasons you say this field would not being the preferred option due to the fact it might link up with Stratford a). This is ridiculous as the 270 houses planned in Loxley Road will almost certainly link Tiddington with Stratford and it will not stop at that number with the relaxed planning now made by the Government. b) By allowing Stratford Football Club being built in Knights Lane, yes it might be on the boundary of Stratford but it is still in Tiddington so yes you have linked Tiddington with Stratford via this Club. This Club should never have been built here huge</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>error by the Council. As mentioned before keeping Countryside is more important then linking Stratford At the end of the day 270 houses Loxley Road, 60 top Left of Knights Lane, 60 North of Tiddington Fields, 30 Home Guard Club. ? Garages ? Waste Land Off Knights Lane, Oak Road, Lawson Avenue, 50 Alveston plus the likelihood of more houses that the roads around Tiddington cannot accommodate them nor can Clopton Bridge. The main road in Tiddington gets backed up to Alveston when Stratford is busy and it has been made worse with the traffic lights installed in Birmingham Road. Plimico Lane and Boundary Lane are terrible. So before housing can go ahead the roads need to be addressed and you will be responsible for destroying Tiddington. Stratford has already been destroyed with all the houses being built and all the cafes and restaurants in the town. Where are the persons going to work, schooling, doctors, etc. People in the village have the right to send their children to the school in the village not travel miles to another school because the school is overloaded with children from outside the village. I am not a well person so I am angry that I have now got to once again fight for the protection of Tiddington Fields and Tiddington's Countryside. Yes, I livenext to Tiddington Fields but that is not why I am fighting against houses in Tiddington Fields becausethere is a possibility I will move from Tiddington. I will be honest it will destroy me to see those fields go and also the grounds of the Home Guard Club especially what this club stood for. It was totally wrong for Tiddington a Residence a Committee to confirm that Tiddington Fields was the preferred site when they only had 20% of the village filled in their firm. Please acknowledge that you have read all of the above and what you intend to do with</p>	
--	--	---	--

			Tiddington Fields due to the fact they should never be built on.	
--	--	--	--	--