

## Wootton Wawen Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Index of Representations received relating to Regulation 16 consultation

<b>Document Number</b>	<b>Name of Representative</b>	<b>Rep. No.</b>
1	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	WWNP01
2	Allens Caravans Estates Ltd	WWNP02
3	Denis Keyte	WWNP03
4	Guy Evans	WWNP04
5	Michael Dufty	WWNP05
6	Mike Crowther	WWNP06
7	Guy Jason Evans	WWNP07
8	Michael Dufty (online survey)	WWNP08
9	Margaret Mary Dufty	WWNP09
10	Keith Clarke	WWNP10
11	Ian Shenton	WWNP11
12	N Woodward-Smith	WWNP12
13	Vincent Ford	WWNP13
14	Stratford-on-Avon District Council	WWNP14

## Wootton Wawen Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Regulation 16 Representations: By Contributor

Rep. No.	Policy	Representation	Reg.19 Request?
WWNP01	Whole Document	<p>Thank you for the further opportunity to be consulted on the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for Wootton Wawen.</p> <p>We write on behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes who, as you will be aware from previous representations, have an interest in land at Alcester Road, Wootton Wawen.</p> <p>This is a formal representation to the pre-submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan and we wish to make the following observations:</p> <p>We consider overall that the LNP makes very little provision for any new housing development. This is a real missed opportunity. Key Issue 5 in the Plan states that the Plan must ensure <i>‘that any possible housing development serves the community by prioritising affordable homes for people with local connections and housing for young families, with the long-term aim of reducing the average age of the community’</i></p> <p>This is a laudable aim, but one that cannot be met without development on a scale that is simply not proposed within the plan. At the present time, we consider that house prices will continue to rise in the village largely fuelled by in-migrants looking to retire. These households can and will continue to outbid younger households and the very limited opportunities for affordable housing will be filled quickly but not necessarily by local people. Cumulatively, this will not contribute to a reduction in the average age within the LNP area.</p> <p>We anticipate that the site being promoted by Barratt and David Wilson Homes could provide the key to unlocking significant funding opportunities for highways improvement schemes. This would include new car parking for the station, taking pressure off local residential roads, and potentially providing an income for the local community. You will be aware that we have put highways improvements to the Parish Council and Warwickshire Highways and they are, in principle, acceptable.</p>	Not indicated

Rep. No.	Policy	Representation	Reg.19 Request?
	<p data-bbox="286 836 412 866">Policy H2</p> <p data-bbox="271 1347 427 1377">Policy ENV6</p>	<p data-bbox="483 170 1951 240">In addition, the development could also bring an equipped children’s play area and public park – both of which are uses acceptable in Green Belt.</p> <p data-bbox="483 288 1951 475">The village needs young people and families to move in and help it to sustainably grow and thrive or it will struggle to retain its vitality. We do not consider the Neighbourhood Plan in its current state will genuinely facilitate sustainable development and it therefore does not conform to all of the Basic Conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <p data-bbox="483 523 1951 790">Notwithstanding the above, the Government proposes to amend the NPPF (and specifically the test in para 89) so that neighbourhood plans can allocate appropriate small-scale sites in the Green Belt specifically for around 200,000 Starter Homes, with LNP areas having the discretion to determine the scope of such sites. The Government is keen to encourage local communities to consider opportunities for Starter Homes in their area as they develop neighbourhood plans, including previously developed land ‘washed over’ by Green Belt. This in turn would enable young people and families to move into villages such as Wootton Wawen. We would urge the LNP team to consider this emerging opportunity carefully.</p> <p data-bbox="483 837 1951 1066">We do not see how market homes can be restricted to people with a local connection and we do not consider there is a mechanism in planning policy terms to enable this. There may be scope to extend this beyond affordable housing to include starter homes, but as previously mentioned, the guidance is emerging. We would also suggest that evidence from the Choice Based Lettings database and information on re-lets and bids for second hand affordable homes should be taken into account as potential sources of evidence to support new residential development proposals.</p> <p data-bbox="483 1114 1951 1300">There should also be an acknowledgement in the policy that in order to cross-subsidise rural exception schemes (for which this appears to be a policy) with no identified grant funding, that there may be a viability case to be made. This policy can require such evidence to be provided before such a housing mix will be considered. This type of policy approach is typical within more strategic development plans, and demonstrates the sort of flexibility that is required to meet the requirements of para. 14 of the NPPF.</p> <p data-bbox="483 1348 1951 1457">This policy does not appear to be supported by particularly robust evidence. The Character Area Assessment work appears to be extremely limited and does not take account of the four iterative steps required, as set out in the Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland (2002).</p>	

Rep. No.	Policy	Representation	Reg.19 Request?
		<p>These steps are set out below (summarised):</p> <p>Step 1 – Define the Purpose and Scope of the Assessment  Step 2 – Desk Study  Step 3 – Field Survey  Step 4 – Classification and Description</p> <p>The outputs of the characterisation process are then further refined and finalised by classifying, mapping and describing landscape character areas and/or types. The character descriptions are informed by the desk study and field work which will, of course, include stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>Neither our clients, nor the landowners were invited to participate in the creation of this part of the evidence base, and it is therefore presumed that the Character Area Assessment was not subject to any formal stakeholder engagement process.</p> <p>Further, the scope and purpose of the assessment has not been properly set out and it is suggested that it <i>'is intended to be used as a tool to inform the design of any future residential development proposals and to ensure that any such development is not only of high quality but also appropriate in character to the existing environment and content.'</i></p> <p>The reality is that the Character Assessment is being used to resist any development: <i>'Proposals which have an adverse impact on the landscape, skylines or important views will not be supported'</i> (Policy ENV6).</p> <p>Development <i>necessarily</i> means a change to the landscape, skyline and views (whether considered important or not) and the wording of this policy is both unhelpful and confusing. At no point do the authors of the Character Assessment show (on a proposals map) exactly where the landscape, skylines and views worthy of protection actually are. This policy is therefore unclear and would be reliant on a subjective judgement of such features and their importance which could lead to inconsistent decision making.</p> <p>Further, the Assessment was compiled <i>'using templates and pro- formas provided by 'Planning Aid England'. This has been supplemented by desk based research into heritage publications and local history material.'</i> The pro-formas are not included within the assessment, so it is unclear as to how the assessment has been carried out. No heritage or local history material sources have been referenced in the document.</p>	



Rep. No.	Policy	Representation	Reg.19 Request?
	Strategic Environmental Assessment	<p>Directive 2001/42/EC provides for the environmental assessment of certain plans and programmes. Article 1 sets out its objective and states:</p> <p><i>‘The objective of this Directive is to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to promoting sustainable development, by ensuring that, in accordance with this Directive, an environmental assessment is carried out of certain plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment.’</i></p> <p>Stratford District Council have issued a negative Screening Opinion for SEA and as such one has not been produced for this emerging plan. The Neighbourhood Plan as it stands seeks to introduce multiple village development boundaries which did not exist in the previous Local Plan Review and are not included in the adopted Core Strategy Proposals Map. As a result, potential alternatives to this have not been considered, nor the environmental impact of implementing such new boundaries. This effectively excludes some sites and adds some areas of land that could be developed, with no formal assessment of the cumulative impact of this development strategy has therefore taken place.</p> <p>In Stonegate v Horsham DC2 the Court criticised the conclusion reached by the NDP Steering Group over site selection. The Steering Group excluded sites to the west of the settlement on the basis these <i>‘would place unsustainable pressure on the local road system and infrastructure’</i>. The Court found that conclusion to be <i>‘unsupported by any technical or expert evidence’</i> capable of countering evidence to the contrary which had accepted in a recent planning appeal in the same settlement (see Judgment para 69). And at para 74, the Judge said <i>‘The problem here is that the absolute nature of the rejection of option C is unsupported by anything other than guesswork.’</i></p> <p>If alternatives have been rejected, as we suspect they have in this case, it is unclear what evidence – other than the Character Assessment, which we consider to be flawed – has been used to support this approach.</p> <p>We urge you to consider the points we have made in this representation and welcome the feedback you will be giving to participants following the consultation process and prior to the issue of any further version of the LNP.</p>	

Rep. No.	Policy	Representation	Reg.19 Request?
WWNP02	Policy H1	<p>We strongly support the designation of a Village Boundary which will provide clarity to decision makers and potential applicants within the Parish. We consider the boundary to be appropriately drawn, recognising the proper extent of the village. We further support the principle of new housing within the Village Boundary which conforms with the National Planning Policy Framework aim to boost significantly the supply of housing in sustainable locations.</p>	Not indicated
	Policy H3	<p>We strongly support the encouragement this policy gives to the redevelopment of brownfield land to create new homes within the Parish which conforms with the National Planning Policy Framework aim to boost significantly the supply of housing. Criteria a), b), and d) conform with the National Planning Policy Framework and will create high quality developments. Criterion c), however, it is excessive and goes beyond the requirements of the Framework and the Stratford on Avon District Core Strategy. Indeed, even in Conservation Areas, the aim is only to protect or enhance the character or appearance. The wording should be amended so that development is required to preserve and where possible enhance the character or appearance of the area.</p> <p>The final sentence is unnecessarily restrictive and fails to reflect the definition of previously developed land set out in the Framework. Annex 2 of the Framework states that previously developed land is: 'Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed surface infrastructure.' The definition acknowledges that it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed, but does not restrict development solely to areas occupied by permanent buildings and structures only. The definition should be amended to include reference to associated fixed surface infrastructure and thereby properly reflect the definition in the Framework. Moreover there should be a recognition that it may be more appropriate to develop in a slightly different location when this will improve the character and appearance of the area, with consideration given to the quality of proposed development and the layout of the site.</p>	

WWNP03	Whole Document	<p>As a resident, I wish to make the following observations on the consultation document:</p> <p>Page 27 Sports and Social Club no longer exists. It's just called the Social Club.</p> <p>'The Patch' is not named on any map or official document. 'Village Green' is the generally accepted name. If the primary school is listed, why not the village hall pre-school – or should that be listed as a business?</p> <p>Page 30 Correctly known as Lower WaVensmere.</p> <p>Correctly known as Upper Wawensmoor.</p> <p>If Field Farm is listed, why not all the other farms? If it is listed because of the non-farming activities that take place there, those activities should be stated, e.g. vehicle repairs and equestrian centre.</p> <p>In view of its potential impact on the environment, Elmhurst Chicken Farm, Wawensmere Road, should be included as a Neighbourhood Business.</p> <p>Page 36? Edstone Hall, arguably the finest residence in the village after Wootton Hall and Austy Manor, should at least have a mention – even a photo. It is the UK headquarters of the Philadelphia Church of God. I suggest that 'Area 5 – Edstone' deserves as much coverage as Area 4.</p> <p>Page 39 The Old Mill Canal Bridge' caption is nonsense.</p> <p>Canal Bridge is more correctly The Aqueduct.</p> <p>The present village hall was opened in 1972.</p> <p>The 'Social Club' (see above) was built later.</p>	Not indicated
--------	----------------	--	---------------



		<p>Page 40 Photo shows the Social Club.</p> <p>The Dale was built on an open field. There were no original trees!</p> <p>Page 41 The allotments were formed in 1918. There are plans to celebrate their centenary, but not this year.</p> <p>Page 42 Probably now called Toll Gate House. Would be worth checking.</p> <p>Cottages built for railway workers in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century? Firstly, railway construction workers lived in makeshift temporary camps, and secondly Hill Cottage is certainly earlier than 1900 when the line was being built.</p> <p>The new Catholic church was opened in 1904. It did not replace the old cemetery chapel, which still exists.</p> <p>Page 44</p> <p>The 'large Victorian property' is outside the parish boundary.</p> <p>I was born in the 1920's and the houses numbered 1-16 Mayswood Road were well established when I first knew the road, so I suspect they were built in the mid-1920's. The family who had them built had no connection with farming, so it is nonsense to call them farm-workers cottages.</p> <p>Page 45 Not farm-workers cottages.</p>	
WWNP04	The Rationale (p.4)	<p>In the introduction at 1.1 it states that the plan is a community led framework for guiding future development and regeneration, I am very concerned that this is not the case as the Steering Committee has met in the sun lounge at Wootton Hall without any members of the public knowing about the meetings or being invited to take part. I feel that this is a missed opportunity for the residents of the village to be involved in the NP. The planning consultant employed by the Parish Council has expressed concerns about the openness and transparency of the process.</p>	Not indicated



	<p>The Vision (p.7)</p> <p>Strategic Objective (p.8)</p> <p>Policy H1</p> <p>Policy H2</p> <p>Policy H3</p> <p>Policy ECON4</p> <p>Policy ENV6</p> <p>Policy ENV7</p> <p>Policy AM1</p> <p>Policy AM2</p>	<p>The vision is commendable but unachievable without the NP being radically altered.</p> <p>The strategic objective is a good one but unachievable because they have not identified all the brown field sites, previously developed land and curtilages of gardens that already exist within the village.</p> <p>I am very concerned with the way that the village boundary has been drawn and it has also been altered at least twice without the involvement of the steering committee or Parish Council as a whole. If it had been drawn correctly a significant amount of housing could have been accommodated within the village using limited infill, development of brown field sites and the use of garden land without a significant effect upon the character of Wootton Wawen and its sense of community.</p> <p>There is nothing in the NP to correct the imbalance of elderly residents.</p> <p>The NP does not identify all the brown field sites within the village and residential gardens in rural areas are previously developed land. This is a recent policy change by the High Court and is not reflected within this NP. Car parking provision within the village is needed but there are no sites identified or plan of action to achieve this.</p> <p>This policy does not appear to be supported by any evidence such as the basic requirements such as desk top study, field survey and classification and description or to define the purpose and scope of the assessment and seems to be specifically designed to discourage development within the village and some of the points in it such as important views are unobtainable due to the topography of the ground.</p> <p>There are not four separate parts of the village as in figure 3 at page 21. Wootton Wawen is one single village and should be drawn as such.</p> <p>The flood plain is incorrectly drawn and has missed a large part of the flood plain and large parts of the village that regularly flood. This should be corrected.</p> <p>The map should be expanded to include all the facilities within the village to include the Navigation garage and Mayswood garage.</p> <p>Although a high priority for the village due to its elderly population there is nothing in the plan to address this. No sites have been identified or an action plan made.</p>	
--	---	---	--

	Area 4	<p>Page 45 Highlights Blue Hole Cottage which has now been excluded from the village boundary with no reasonable explanation.</p> <p>Page 46 Suggests that the only entrance to Field Farm is down a narrow lane this is not true as Field Farm has its own drive from the A34. It is a semi-industrial site which includes car repairs, barber pole manufacturing, equine business, storage and distribution, HMO and flat. It is a brown field site and single planning unit with mixed uses. The boundary of the village does not reflect the full extent of this brown field site. The photograph describing the stable block is not correct. The buildings described as a stable block used for livery purposes are in fact brick built storage and distribution area and the stable block is elsewhere on the site within the same planning unit.</p>	
WWNP05	Policy H1	<p>I wish to express the following serious concerns regarding the village boundary for Wootton Wawen as shown in their Neighbourhood Development Plan .</p> <p>A) In the pre-submission plan the village boundary (dated 13th November 2015) was drawn too tightly around the houses and not including the curtilage of these houses and failed to show some brownfield sites within the village. It also failed to include the Catholic Church and adjacent houses within the 30MPH zone.</p> <p>B) The final submission boundary (dated September 2016) is now even more tightly drawn around the houses within the village boundary and again not including their curtilages and even excludes some houses originally in the village boundary and certain properties beyond the railway bridge which are obviously a part of the village.</p> <p>C) Whilst I welcome the new planned affordable homes at the top of School Hill (and in fact am involved in finalising the planning agreement) this boundary seems disproportionate to accommodate the houses and needs revising.</p>	Not indicated
WWNP06	H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, ECON1, ECON2, ECON3, ECON4, ECON5, ENV1, ENV2, ENV3, ENV4, ENV5, ENV6, ENV7, ENV8, ENV9, AM1, AM2, AM3, AM4	<p>Support</p> <p>No additional comments</p>	Not indicated

WWNP07	H1	<p>Support</p> <p>However, the Parish Council have failed to be open and transparent in drawing up this boundary. They have failed to include the Catholic Church, St Peter's Church, brownfield sites such as the Navigation Garage, market garden and builder's yard in Pennyford Lane and the full extent of the brownfield site at Field Farm which has two accesses. These are previously developed sites that Peter Drew, Planning Inspector said would be suitable for development within greenbelt villages such as ours. Other houses that were included in the first submitted version such as Blue Hole Cottage and it's curtilage has now been excluded from within the village boundary. Houses on the Alcester Road within the 30 MPH zone and houses under the railway bridge on Wawensmere Road have all been excluded from within the boundary.</p>	Not indicated
	H2	<p>Support</p> <p>I support this to enable young people to stay within the village and help address the imbalance of the aging population within the village.</p>	
	H3	<p>Support</p> <p>However, The Parish Council has failed to include all the brownfield land and the curtilages/garden land of the houses within the boundary. From January 2016 garden land within rural villages such as Wootton Wawen are considered previously developed land and are suitable for limited infill.</p>	
	H4	<p>Support</p> <p>However, the Parish Council has failed to included all garden land of houses within the village boundary. Garden land at Field Farm was previously included in the first submitted version of the boundary and has been excluded from the final submitted version with no justification. Blue Hole Cottage and it's curtilage has also been excluded from the final version.</p>	
	H5	<p>Support</p>	
	ECON1	<p>Support</p>	
	ECON2 ECON3	<p>Support Support</p>	
	ECON4	<p>Support</p> <p>This is much needed within the village.</p>	

	ECON5	Support	
	ENV.1	Support	
	ENV.2	Support	
	ENV.3	Support	
	ENV.4	Support	
	ENV.5	Support Brownfield sites and curtilage of gardens and previously developed land should be used up before any best and most versatile agricultural land is used.	
	ENV.6	Object Any development will have an impact on landscape and the skyline but these can be mitigated with the planting of hedgerows and trees that in time will help a development blend in to the landscape.	
	ENV.7	Support	
	ENV.8	Support	
	ENV.9	Support	
	AM.1	Support	
	AM.2	Support This is much needed within the village due to the high number of elderly residents who are less likely to be able to travel to Henley in Arden medical centre.	
	AM3	Support	
	AM4	Support	

WWNP08	H1	Support The village boundary should be widened to include all public buildings and houses and curtilages and brownfield sites within the village.	Not indicated
H2	Support Sites should be allocated in the NDP for Seymour Homes request for affordable homes and starter homes for young people to buy.		
H3	Support All brownfield sites and curtilages should be included in the village boundary to help address the imbalance of the elderly population which is a major objective of the neighbourhood plan.		
H4	Support Essential all houses and curtilages included in the village boundary to enable limited infill so important in green belt villages as Wootton Wawen.		
H5	Support The village boundary should be drawn more realistically to include all houses and their curtilages and brownfield sites which would save the need for use of best and most versatile agricultural land.		
ECON1	Support		
ECON2	Support		
ECON3	Support		
ECON4	Support These essential parking requirements for the village should be identified with recommended solutions and timetable and must be included within the NDP.		
ECON5	Support		
ENV1	Support		

	ENV2	Support	
	ENV3	Support	
	ENV4	Support The flood plain is not accurately drawn in the NDP and should be amended.	
	ENV5	Support All previously developed land should be identified within the NDP and used before any best and most versatile agricultural land is used.	
	ENV6	Support	
	ENV7	Support	
	ENV8	Support	
	ENV9	Support	
	AM1	Support	
	AM2	Support Site should be identified for important satellite surgery so needed in this so elderly village.	
	AM3	Support There is a need for more young family housing to support the existing schools	
	AM4	Support	
WWNP09	H1	Object I object to this as this village boundary does not represent the full extent of the village as this is one village and not four separate areas. Area 4 and area 1 is connected by previously developed land, gardens and curtilages such as in particular market gardens and builders yards. I feel that by using these sites the openness in the green belt is not compromised especially in light of the high court judgement Stonegate v Horsham. I suggest the wording should be revisited to reflect the core strategy of SDC policy CS10. I recommend the village	Not indicated



		boundary should be expanded to incorporate all previously developed sites and curtilages and gardens which would help to address the high imbalance of elderly to young families as highlighted by 1.3 of NDP.	
	H2	Support This does not provide any starter homes to buy for young families or affordable homes for young families such as requested by Seymour Homes.	
	H3	Support Village Boundary should be amended to include all brownfield land within our village which would enable the village to create much needed homes and keep our village sustainable for future generations.	
	H4	Object This is too restrictive and does not reflect the fact that garden land in rural areas is previously developed land.	
	H5	Support Again more land should be made available in village plan so development is not too restricted and in unnecessary tight areas.	
	ECON1	Support	
	ECON2	Support	
	ECON3	Support	
	ECON4	Support There is no provision in the NDP to provide sites or finance due to proposed lack of development which means they will be impossible to achieve and this should be amended as to where and how it is proposed action is recommended on these.	
	ECON5	Support	
	ENV1	Support	
	ENV2	Support	

	ENV3	Support	
	ENV4	Support On the NDP the flood plain is not accurately drawn and should be amended to include all the flood plain.	
	ENV5	Support Previously developed land and Brownfield sites should be developed first.	
	ENV6	Object Any development will affect the landscape etc and the character of the village character assessment lacks evidence or take into account the local housing sensitivity study of Wootton Wawen.	
	ENV7	Support	
	ENV8	Support	
	AM1	Support	
	AM2	Support The NDP should provide recommended action on site and funding or it will again not be achieved and will cause the high proportion of elderly villagers to continue visiting Henley In Arden which is already over stretched.	
	AM3	Support The village school has very few village pupils due to lack of young families in village and development is very necessary for future young families in the village.	
	AM4	Support	

WWNP10	H1	<p>Object</p> <p>I think the boundary near Mayswood Road should be at the railway, and not slicing through the house gardens. Any building in this area would impinge on the views from the existing houses. Why is Mayswood Garage not within the boundary?</p>	Not indicated
	H2	Support	
	H3	Support	
	H4	Object As listed in H1	
	H5	Support	
	ECON1	Support	
	ECON2	Support	
	ECON3	Support	
	ECON4	Support	
	ECON5	Support	
	ENV1	Support	
	ENV2	Support	
	ENV3	Support	
	ENV4	Support	
	ENV5	Support	
	ENV6	Support	

	ENV7	Support	
	ENV8	Support	
	AM1	Support	
	AM2	Support	
	AM3	Support	
	AM4	Support	
WWNP11	H1	<p>Object</p> <p>The plan as shown in figure 2 is incorrect, as confirmed by Cllr. John Lawton of the submitting team on behalf of the Parish Council. The boundary to the East of Stratford Rd is redrawn to big as any development approved was only for the 14 affordable houses as it is greenbelt land. There is no justification for extending this. The Parish Council has accepted that the plan is incorrect. Many of the boundaries have been redrawn since the previous version and until 2 weeks ago the villagers would have been unaware of this. Even the Parish Council's own website had, until two weeks ago, been showing the wrong plan. Comments and opinion may have been incorrectly given based on what was on the Parish Council's website. These changes have never been communicated to the village prior to the consultation period. In the pre amble it states that there should be no development to the est of the railway line but there is already an industrial to the North West of this which, until this latest version, was drawn within the boundaries but in this version is outside and therefore classed as green belt. This cannot be correct. The owner of this site and business which emplys local people and contributes to the local economy has expressed his dismay at this as this could potentially discourage much needed expansion which, in one of the other policies, is a stated aim. This surely is a mistake as well. Many of the other boundaries have been altered without any discussion with the village.I count at least 14 amendments to the plan that was generally available to the village until 3 weeks into the consultation period. In addition there is no evidence to support the comnet that there should be no development to the west of the railway line and this could easily be challenged in the High Court as in the recent case involving the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan which was subsequently quashed due to a lack of evidence to support the statements made in relation to one site. This is a very similar case.</p>	Not indicated
	H2	<p>Support</p> <p>There is a national issue here in that the time it takes from survey to build is far too long.</p>	

	<p>H3</p> <p>H4</p> <p>H5</p> <p>ECON1</p> <p>ECON2</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>This statement is not consistent with the way the plan i figure 2 has been drawn where there is an industrial area that now sits outside of the boundary and would therefore , as far as this Plan is concerned, be classified as green rather than brown belt land. The indication from this document is that development in the industrial area which is therefore brown belt land, would not be encouraged. This is of concern to everyone from the owner of the business/site and the villagers who , who will benefit from employment opportunities and the local economy benefits from this. As has been seen with the Afordable Housing Scheme, where Stratford District Council Planners objected to the scheme on a number of grounds but the Pplanning Committee voted in favour, such statements as the above cannot be relied upon to protect the greenbelt.</p> <p>Support</p> <p>Support</p> <p>This statement is not consistent with figure 2 where the boundaries have been drawn that either exclude the industrial area to the North West or are drawn so tightly as to restrict any kind of commercial opportunity. Without expansion of the village, encouraging young families to move here, the few businesses that we do have will cease to trade. The Yew Tree Craft Centre struggles to attract enough footfall, so units turn over, the two local shops between them suffer from a lack of footfall that makes investment in them unattractive to the owners of such businesses or potential new businesses. The Garage to the NW of the railway line will now, as a result of this Plan b in a worse position to consider expansion, fearing that it will meet objections on panning grounds due to the weight of this Neighbourhood Plan. The local public house , The Bull, struggles to pay its way and has changed tenant many times over the last few years with extended periods where it has been closed. Making this a protected asset further discourages prospective new tenants. The oteh pub, the Navigation, could see its business severly affected by the new marina which will draw holiday traffic away from it which is a retrograde step. The drawing of these boundaries and the above statement are therefore inconsistent with one another.</p> <p>Similar comments as made about Econ 1 apply. The boundaries are drwan so tightly as there is little prospect of any new business wanting to locate itself with the village. There are almost no leisure and tourism facilities at present and the way this statement is framed, in particular (b) above, will make it difficult for any new entrant. Each new application should be judged purely on its own merit and not have pre conditions such as (b) attached to it as it would be for the owners of the existing facilties to decide on an economic basis, whether they should sell their land.</p>	
--	---	--	--

	ECON3	<p>Object</p> <p>This statement is far too narrow as it could be interpreted that all it does is say that each house should have ability to be connected to high speed broadband, not that the developers should lay all the necessary cables and the ISP providers the cabinets to allow the final connection should a household want it. This is too vague a policy and needs to be strengthened in my opinion.</p>	
	ECON4	<p>Support</p> <p>As there is no viable land , due to the way the boundaries have been drawn, this statement is inconsistent with figure 2 and H1 as any parking would need to be to the west of the railway line , which has already been ruled out if the pre amble to H1 is accepted. Whilst supporting ECON 4 in principle, in practice it is totally redundant and at odds with the pre amble.</p>	
	ECON5	Support	
	ENV1	Support	
	ENV2	Support	
	ENV3	Support	
	ENV4	Support	
	ENV5	<p>Support</p> <p>As we have seen in a number of places, however, Affordable Housing Schemes can cut straight through this policy with planners being unable to resist the will of developers and planning committees.</p>	
	ENV6	<p>Support</p> <p>Again, certain schemes such as Affordable Housing make this statement un enforceable if Planning Committees choose to ignore what their own planners recommend.</p>	
	ENV7	Support	
	ENV8	Support	
	ENV9	Support	

	<p>AM1</p> <p>AM2</p> <p>AM3</p> <p>AM4</p>	<p>It could be argued that the above will protect existing businesses but deter new entrants as making such facilities community assets could have the opposite effect to that desired. There could be inconsistency with policy Econ 2 so whilst I support the headline, the detail may not be consistent with other policies.</p> <p>Support</p> <p>Support</p> <p>Other policies in this document restrict the social and economic development of the village which in turn will mean that the school will not be sustainable. This policy has grand aims but absolutely no substance due to the inconsistencies in H1, H3 , H4, Econ 1 &amp; Econ 4 which restrict rather than encourage developers of housing and businesses to meet the challenge of supporting the school. The other policies are drawn up as a series of individual statements with the school, as here, being the last thought rather than as part of an overall approach that encourages a sympathetic consistent and sustainable approach to developing and sustaining the school. Expansion of the school can only happen if numbers of entrants increases not, as we currently see, going down. This policy or the Plan generally does not encourage young families to move into the village which is the only reason that the school could be expanded. This policy lacks substance in the "How" it will be achieved. No one will redevelop the school or replace it with current or projected future numbers unless a more radical and holistic approach to the policies in this document are considered.</p> <p>Support</p>	
<p>WWNP12</p>	<p>H1</p> <p>H2</p> <p>H3</p> <p>H4</p>	<p>Object</p> <p>The west boundary line has been drawn along the railway line which excludes an old established brownfield site of Mayswood Garage which it has occupied for nearly 100 years. The old forestry offices and yard/workshop area is further up Mayswood Road and is another brownfield site. Both these sites are a source of employment and a service to the local community, they could well be developing over the next 15 years. It would be wrong to leave the boundary along the railway line putting those premises in the countryside and not including them in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Support</p> <p>Employees at Mayswood Garage require affordable local housing.</p> <p>Support</p> <p>Support</p>	<p>Not indicated</p>

	H5	Support	
	ECON1	Support	
	ECON2	Support	
	ECON3	Support Good broadband speed is desperately needed by businesses in the area.	
	ECON4	Support	
	ECON5	Support	
	ENV1	Support	
	ENV2	Support	
	ENV3	Support	
	ENV4	Support	
	ENV5	Support	
	ENV6	Support	
	ENV7	Support	
	ENV8	Support	
	ENV9	Support	
	AM1	Support	
	AM2	Support	



	AM3	Support	
	AM4	Support	
WWNP13	Whole document	<p>As a retired arch/planner who moved to Wootton Wawen some 12 years ago, I have observed first hand, the reluctance of the Parish Council and their carefully selected neighbourhood plan committee to embrace any kind of responsibility to alleviate the local or regional housing shortage.</p> <p>In their village boundary proposal basic planning principles have been ignored, mainly because existing residents do not want any new housing near them, particularly affordable homes.</p> <p>Irrespective of any formal representations that are claimed to be the wishes of the residents, the truth was clearly expressed at two packed meetings that I attended in the past 2 years. One on the subject of siting 14 or so affordable homes and the reservations being: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) That the siting of these homes on the main road north of the village was considered to be a mistake; mainly because it was not easy walking distance to all of the village amenities, therefore encouraging more care use within the village</li> <li>b) There was no footpath on the east side of the main road necessitating construction of a pedestrian crossing and consequently would endanger the safety of children at play.</li> </ol> <p>The Parish Council was aware by the tone of the meeting that more than 80% were against the proposed location, from a gathering of some 200 people, so no vote was taken. Their statistics for supporting this site later, was taken at a parish council meeting with only a handful of people present.</p> <p>The second meeting was a presentation to determine, from 5 possible sites, which would be the preferred location for core-strategy housing development. The preference was for land to the west of Pennyford Lane by a very strong majority. This same location was also chosen a few years ago by Stratford D.C. in their 'SHLAR' report as being the site that would cause least disruption to the existing residents. Incidentally, some of this land is currently the subject of a planning application for 30 houses (no. 16/02626/OUT). So in this proposed neighbourhood village boundary plan that, if approved, will determine future development, we see an extension to the site (marked ? on plan) that was turned down by the majority of villagers; and we see the eradication of the site that was preferred by both the District Council Planners and the villagers.</p> <p>Many of the houses that have a Wootton Wawen address and are adjacent to the built-up area, and the 2 churches, have not been included within the village boundary, although one site within the flood plan is included. There appears to be no provision for any infill sites. The only piece of land of any size that would be developable is two thirds of a mile from the village shop and further from the school &amp; station.</p> <p>It is not sensible planning to isolate prospective newcomers out in a virgin field away from the core of the village community. This would not happen if the powers that be adopted the more southerly site, which I am assured, would have a childrens play area and a sports ground with a pavilion, as well as being within walking distance of all of the amenities.</p>	Not indicated

WWNP14	List of Figures	Fig.4 – Change title to ‘Heritage Assets and Flood Zones Map to match entry within NDP.	Not indicated
	Paragraph 1.11	A3400 road was de-trunked a number of years ago so suggest word ‘trunk’ is deleted.	
	Paragraph 1.14	According to 2011 Census, population of Wootton Wawen Parish was 1,318. Our estimate of village’s population is 1,100. Not sure where 1,500 figure came from but it isn’t accurate.	
	Paragraph 1.16	Suggest reworded to read ‘This Plan defines a village boundary...’	
	Paragraph 2.2	Delete word ‘affordable’ as provision for housing is wider than that.	
	Paragraph 2.5	Suggest first sentence is included in Policy H1 itself with words ‘and redevelopment’ inserted after ‘infilling’.	
	Figure 2	Suggest three amendments to the map: remove triangular area of land which is part of a farmyard; remove land to reduce size of ‘shield’ shaped site that equates to the site boundary associated with a recent planning permission for affordable housing; inclusion of entire rear gardens backing on to railway line rather than introducing an arbitrary boundary line just beyond the rear elevations of the line of houses on Mayswood Road.	
	Policy H2	<p>Consider policy might be better titled ‘Local Needs Housing’ as a community-led housing scheme can incorporate market dwellings, which is acknowledged within the policy.</p> <p>Consider adding within the Explanatory text a definition of ‘local needs housing’:</p> <p>“For the purposes of local needs housing for Policy H2 this will be based on a local connection with the Parish. A local connection is defined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Someone who has lived in the Parish for a minimum of 6 months</li> <li>• Someone who has previously lived in the Parish for 6 out of the last 12 months or 3 out of 5 years</li> <li>• Someone who has close family (parents, siblings or children) residing in the Parish for at least 3 years</li> <li>• Someone who has full or part-time work in the Parish and has been employed for at least 6 months</li> <li>• Someone who can otherwise demonstrate a connection to the Parish.”</li> </ul>	
	Policy H4	Replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’ in second line.	

	<p>Paragraph 3.2</p> <p>Policy ECON1</p> <p>Policy ECON2</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13</p> <p>Policy ECON5</p> <p>Policy ENV2</p> <p>Policy ENV5</p> <p>Paragraph 4.17</p> <p>Policy ENV7</p>	<p>In the third line, suggest insert words at end along the lines of ‘...local businesses.’</p> <p>Currently a ‘negatively worded’ policy. Suggest re-wording final part of first paragraph of the policy to read “...in employment use will only be supported where:”</p> <p>Currently a ‘negatively worded’ policy. Suggest re-wording the second paragraph of the policy to read “Proposals for the change of use or re-development of land or premises currently associated with leisure or tourism will only be supported where:”</p> <p>A3400 road was de-trunked a number of years ago so suggest word ‘trunk’ is deleted.</p> <p>In relation to the second paragraph of the policy, the creation of live-work development in open countryside would not be consistent with Core Strategy as it would involve creation of dwellings (see Policy CS.22, 8<sup>th</sup> para.). The exception would be if the building is of historic, architectural or other merit (see Policy AS.10 (d)). This principle should be set out in the explanation.</p> <p>Since the policy deals with 2 separate elements, introduce a heading of ‘Homeworking’ for paragraph 1 of the policy and introduce a heading of ‘Live Work Units’ for paragraph 2 of the policy.</p> <p>Within the first paragraph, insert ‘where appropriate’ between ‘and’ and ‘incorporate’.</p> <p>Remove “(Class B1a)” from second paragraph.</p> <p>Second paragraph, 5<sup>th</sup> line – replace ‘equivalent or better standard’ with ‘appropriate native species’.</p> <p>Currently a ‘negatively worded’ policy. Amend wording on second line to read “...will not normally be supported...”</p> <p>Suggest replace ‘on the map below.’ with ‘on Figure 3.’</p> <p>Suggested re-wording of policy:</p> <p>“Proposals which may affect a heritage asset will be required to include an assessment which describes the significance of the asset and their setting.</p>	
--	---	--	--

		<p>Proposals which lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss, or</li> <li>b) The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site and no viable use can be found, and grant or other funding or ownership is not possible, and the harm or loss is outweighed by bringing the site back into use.</li> </ul> <p>Proposals which lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be considered against the public benefits of the proposal including securing the optimum viable use of the heritage asset.</p> <p>Proposals, including changes of use, which enable the appropriate and sensitive restoration of listed buildings, will be supported.</p> <p>All proposals must conserve the important physical fabric and settings of listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments.</p>	
Paragraph 4.19		<p>Development within and adjacent to all heritage assets will be strictly controlled. Development which fails to conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area will not be supported”.</p>	
Paragraph 4.20		<p>Second line – replace ‘of’ with ‘on’.</p>	
Figure 4		<p>It seems from Figure 4 that there are some listed buildings outside CA and this should be acknowledged in the text.</p>	
Policy AM1		<p>The extent of the EA Flood Zones is more extensive than indicated on Figure 4 (see attached scanned image).</p>	
Paragraph 5.11		<p>In Explanatory text – Insert reference to Figure 5.</p>	
		<p>First line – replace ‘the villages’ with ‘the Neighbourhood Plan area’.</p>	