

Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan Group Feedback Report - v1.0 08/01/2018.

A printed copy of this report is available in both the Tysoe Tea Room and the Reading Room. Contact details have been removed from the submissions to comply with the Data Protection Act.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 1

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: I like the spread and sized of the different potential sites. Also that there is a back up plan (site 13) if sufficient cannot be found/the housing need goes up.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 2

Policy Number: H4

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Agree that Tysoe champion our own scheme if possible. We need a mix of young as well as elderly blood in the village. But the current house sizes do not cater for this. Unfortunately I did not see many younger people at the meeting who may fall into the "first rung of the housing ladder" to push home the idea. Moving into OAP status such as my wife and I we may want to stay in the village and downsize. Well done

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 3

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Site: Site 7

Comment: Currently the north corner of the field appears to be within the development boundary whereas the rest of the field is outside it. This is very odd, especially since on the northern third of this field in within the conservation area and the rest of the field is not. The development boundary should more logically run along Aspens SW boundary and then cross the field behind Wisteria House. See attached amended map.

Site 7 should therefore be reduced in accordance with the realigned development boundary

Parish Council response: Boundary will be re-examined

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 4

Page Number: 18, 36 & 37

Policy Number: BE1 & BE2

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Site: Site 7

Comment: Site 7 is too close to the listed buildings and within the conservation area. See Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Parish Council response: Comment noted - all sites have been independently re-examined.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 5

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: The residents of Lower Tysoe voted for no more than 3 properties within a development. Should more be granted especially along Lane End the no through road will not be sustainable for the amount of traffic required.

Parish Council response: While some residents may have taken a vote on this, others did not and this question was not part of the questionnaire given to Lower Tysoe residents. However the intention is that the three Tysoes retain their unique characters through the Neighbourhood Plan. Our consultant is undertaking an independent re-examination of the sites and we are taking feedback into account. Several dwellings have been removed from the Draft Plan including in Lane End.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 6

Policy Number: NE4/NE6

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Not only is this an area used to sustain local farmers with grazing, it also acts as a noise barrier for village "bussell" which is why we chose to live there.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 7

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Proposals for Upper Tysoe will create unnecessary traffic hazards and numbers spoken of seem disproportionate. I'm not a NIMBY but these things must be fair to all

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 8

Policy Number: H4

Comment: I do not think 6 months minimum is long enough, this could apply to anyone. This could have a short work commitment and then have the right to get a house here. This is the same for working here for 6 months, this isn't long enough time period. What do the parish count as affordable housing? It this beyond £200k as this is certainly not affordable for two full time works (who work in the village). Please don't make this village a commuting village or a place to be when you retire.

Parish Council response: The Affordable housing policy is being re-examined. There would be a scoring mechanism for allocation to ensure that dwellings were fairly allocated.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 9

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Site: Site 7

Comment: Please find enclosed highly relevant findings from the SDC Conservation Officer at the time of Mr Jervis's last planning application for this plot in 2014. The officer mentions everything that is so very important about this last open space in the centre of the village because this is right in the centre of the village the problem with traffic chaos and parking both sides of the main street will be much worse by traffic movement from this site. PNES values landscapes. The view of this field is part of the streetscape and open space in centre of the village. As are the drystone wall and ancient stone seat which would be damaged if this plot is used. Policy NE3 Tysoe is a known flood zone. This field floods often and after heavy rain

winter or summer. Ponds form in the centre of the field and ducks etc take advantage. I am surprised this site was not included in the open greenfield site list for protection as mentioned before there are no other fields like this left in the centre of Tysoe. This is it once it's gone that's it.

Parish Council response: All sites are being independently re-examined prior to the next Draft.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 10

Policy Number: BE14 & BE2

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: The decisive proposals have a strong emphasis, this is very positive for the whole village now and in the future. Great punch and determination is implied in the policy aims and stated unequivocally in the proposals that may be presented for decision. Great work, great plan

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 11

Policy Number: H4

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Housing of all sizes needs to reflect the occupants wage/income level below £25,000 (typical of people on minimum/low wage structure). The current house prices are way too high for people starting out on lower bands of a career or job and young families with children of pre or actual school on income

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 12

Policy Number: NE4/NE5/NE6

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Designated land/landscapes are vital to the village. These decisions are important to maintain the rural character and natural assets in the surrounding area. The areas in the policy are well defined for this purpose

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 13

Policy Number: NE1 & NE2

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Essential for all generations to value and enjoy now and in the future. These aspects are often taken for granted until they are gone. Please preserve these at all costs for everyone.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 14

Policy Number: H4

Comment: Local connection definition: Someone who has lived in the Parish for a minimum of 6 months.

In my opinion no other definition is needed as the above is very loose and would apply to anyone renting for 6 months. It needs to be all of the definitions or more specific. This needs to be buttoned down more otherwise "locals" will still not be able to live in the village.

Parish Council response: There would be a scoring mechanism for allocation to ensure that dwellings were fairly allocated.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 15

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Sites that do not have the land owners permission, in my opinion, must be taken off the plan. Land owners could be hounded by developers to release it or developers can obtain planning permission without their consent.

Parish Council response: Agree

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 16

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Site: Sites 10, 11

Comment: I have no objection per say to the sites on Lane End. However has any thought been given to the road situation? The road is currently single track but with the extra traffic of the 1 house already given permission and planning application for 3 more in the pipeline, then 2 further potential sites of up to 8 more houses the amount of traffic will significantly increase, possibly double

Parish Council response: Two sites have been removed.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 17

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Site: Site 5 and 12

Comment: Why is site number 5 outside the development boundary? It would also take any building outside the "building line" for Lane End. It would be the same for site number 12

Parish Council response: Comment noted. Boundaries are being revised.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: for

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: I note that in the National Planning Policy Framework the land designated local green space which is farmed by Kevin Welby, is owned by Warwickshire County Council. Can the WCC over rule the District Council and build on it?

Parish Council response: Local Green space are being re-emanied and once approved cannot be overruled.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 19

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: The amount of available space in Lower Tysoe. It is not populated like the rest of Tysoe. This is not 3 villages it is 1. Let Lower Tysoe have some of the responsibility for once. Why should they be exempt from normal development

Parish Council response: A number of dwellings have been built in Lower Tysoe since the start of the Plan period, (although building is not visible from the road). Most residents within the Tysoes believe that we comprise one village together and we are pleased that Lower Tysoe is part of the Local Service Village.

However, it is the intention of the Plan that the three Tysoes retain their unique characters and only take development which is proportionate to their size.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 20

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Site: Site 7

Comment: Re site 7. This part of the field it has previous planning application refused owing to the nature of the site. It is an open space and in proximity to Grade II buildings and their sittings the hedgerow and field and a home for wildlife. Our property borders this site our pond has newts in it which go into the field depending on season. The location of this field is near the centre of the village (war memorial stone, wall &

bench and grass bank which make the character of the centre of the village. This part of the field is only point which is in the conservation area and should be kept as an open space. Please see attached from SDC (Planning Committee Report)

Parish Council response: Site now excluded from draft Plan

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 21

Page Number: 19

Policy Number: H1

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: The development boundary currently divides our garden. This is not a practical positioning of the development boundary. The boundary should be redrawn to include the whole of our garden. Unlike other properties the area beyond the kitchen garden walls are not a field but just part of the garden

Parish Council response: Development boundary now re-defined

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 22

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: On a minimum of 3 sites where services would already be in place allocate 2/3 units for self build with priority to young people living in the village. Feeoffee would have been an ideal site for this to have happened. We need to ensure young people live and work in our village

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 23

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Site: Site 1

Comment: Development on Avon Avenue could set a precedent for other gardens

Parish Council response: If Planning Applications come forward they will be judged on their own individual merit

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 24

Policy Number: H3

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: I object to Herbert's Farm being considered a strategic reserve site for the following reasons: 1. We must maintain working farms at the core of the village, it is an intrinsic part of Tysoe's character as per Feoffee farm also. 2. Access to the farm via both Back Lane or Saddledon Street is already troublesome being single track lanes loaded with parked cars. The prospect of a further 25-30 cars using these roads as access would be very hazardous. 3. If that site was ever developed, and the farm buildings pushed up the farm lane, it would create further traffic and ample opportunities for accidents. 4. We must protect the of the listed thatched barn on Saddledon Street, a small part of old Tysoe and an intrinsic part of the Conservation Area. Apart from this objection I think it is an outstanding piece of work. Well done

Parish Council response: All sites are being independently re-examined prior to the next Draft.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 25

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Site: Site 4

Comment: The Roses Farm development is in the conservation area of the village. The road from the Epwell Road onto Main Street is too dangerous on health and safety grounds for 19 houses to be built

Parish Council response: No building will occur on Site 4 without a Highway Authority review of vehicular and pedestrian access.

Feedback Type: First consultation

No: 26

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Site: Site 3

Comment: The Paxton garage site is not suitable for 3 new dwellings 1/2 dwellings would be appropriate

Parish Council response: Site now excluded from Plan

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 83

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Site allocations 6 & 7 Sandpits road access stated to be Sandpits Road. Sandpits Road is a single carriageway not suitable for 2 new access points. Extra traffic volume from 6 plus 9 = 15 dwellings will cause congestion and road safety issues. Sandpits Road is currently used as a rat run into the village centre more traffic volume and more access points will be increased hazards, a potential for accidents. Why is Tysoe Utility Turst land not included and mentioned (eg Feeoffee Farm) in any part of the document. 84 new dwellings from now is above SDC core strategy policy why. Need for affordable housing needs more explanation and better justification in the document

Parish Council response: Feedback noted. Any future development will be subject to Highway Authority review. Re Feeoffee Farm: sites cannot be proposed for development if owners have refused consent. The number of dwellings is being reduced. The affordable housing section is being altered.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 84

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: to sustain the facilities, post office, shop, pub, school, church, social club and hair dressers we need to encourage new families with children to the village. We need broad band to encourage working from home. Affordable housing must not be promoted as a commutable ie that the affordable housing will be provided off site. considerations of drainage, sewage, roads, traffic must be included in plan. If we do not have a good sustainable Np we will be subject to all developers and speculators. Tysoe needs to be in control of what and where we build

Parish Council response: comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 85

Comment: If houses of any demographic need to be built, the aesthetics which normally represent drive village life should be respected, eg properties with decent gardens, not homes so tight they look like they are in a town or city. Aesthetics must be considered.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 86

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: As a first time buyer, there was only one house I could afford to buy in Tysoe. Planning sites should include 2 bedroom homes in the centre of the village. Drainage, infrastructure needs to be documented to expand with the village. Telecoms & broadband need to be documented, so people can work from home with good infrastructure. More affordable housing to central village site for school children

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 87

Page Number: 23

Support/Object/Comment: Obect

Comment: I strongly object to the 19 dwellings proposed behind Roses Farmhouse for several reasons.

Firstly, the field in question is at least, in the areas of the countryside that should be protected from large developments so that their natural qualities can be enjoyed by future generations. Secondly, any vehicular access to the proposed site has not been explained. Parts of Epwell Road are narrow and there is no footpath therefore I cannot see scope for this already dangerous road to facilitate the inevitable increase in traffic flow.

The t-junction where Main street and Epwell Road meet is already a dangerous narrow junction for pedestrians and road traffic & any increase traffic flow will only increase the likelihood of an accident.

Items of historical significance on "site 4" and ridge and furrow pasture land. To demolish the land would be to forever lose that part of traditional rural life. Similarly a large development of houses around Roses Farmhouse will look totally out of place and forever spoil this part of Tysoe. Please reconsider

Parish Council response: Comments noted. Any future development of the Roses Farm site will be subject to satisfactory review by the Highways Authority.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 88

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: Although there may need to be some setting with site allocation and numbers, principles and policies make great sense and will add to control over local development. Thank you

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 89

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Support/Obect/comment

Comment: Tysoe is in the costwold Area and an area of natural beauty. We have no complaints regarding the proposal for 19 dwellings behind Roses Farmhouse, However, Epwell Road already has problems. Not suitable for the amout of traffic, including large lorries, tractors, school buses etc. The proposed 19 new houses should be linked to the Shenington Road, not Epwell Road

Parish Council response: Comment noted. Any development wil only take place subject to satisfactory review from the Highways Authority.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 90

Comment: Just to say how about some parking in the village. There are too many cars in Main Street now. Making it not safe to cross the road even. How long before there is an accident.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 91

Page Number: 23

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: The proposed development on the Epwell Road is ridiculous. Far too many houses for the site and an access onto an already very dangerous, narrow road with its three way junction. A nightmare with the present comparatively low traffic flow - an accident waiting to happen with hugely increased traffic flow.

This is still an AONB - beauty doesnt obey man made boundaries - to build here will spoil part of what makes Tysoe a beautiful and special place to live. Yes houses have to be built but in this instance there are better more convenient and safer sites to use. The fields which would be lost are ridge & furrow; Roman & both earlier and later artifacts have been found here and it is a haven for wildlife particularly birds and the beautiful birds of prey, who are fast losing their habitate everywhere. Building here means Tysoe will lose something precious and irreplaceable. Please think carefully before spoiling what you have.

Parish Council response: Comments noted. Any future development will be subject to Highway Authority review.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 92

Page Number: 21

Comment: If we have got to have new houses built in this village they must be what our own young people and older people require ie affordable rent and buy (youngsters) and bungalows for the older people. Big expensive houses we do not want. We want to know who needs what before any buildings are done. I had postcards trying to get me interested in some big expensive houses at Kineton. We do not want to be like that having our village about small development better than extending out into the fields

Parish Council response: Comment noted. We have conducted a Housing Needs Survey which, in conjunction with Waiting List information (supplied by the District Council) has given us information as to what housing is urgently needed in the village. The Draft Plan also stipulates that we need more smaller houses in order to encourage a younger age group to live in the village.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 93

Comment: Whilst it may be desirable for protection of character etc to maintain the "strategic gap" between Middle & Lower Tysoe this is clearly an area where smaller housing might be provided. Should discussions not be held with relevant land owners and a social housing provider to this end. This might also help with the school issue. There is an irony that if the school role falls and it is closed then it is best placed to be the next strategic housing site.

Parish Council response: Comments noted. Our Public Consultations showed many residents regarded the Strategic Gap as a feature of high importance. The Plan has to reflect residents' wishes.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 94

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Given that 70 houses are to be built between 2011-31, and so far 43 are either built or in planning stages the plan should reflect a further plan of 27 dwellings and 20% to this and a plan of 34 dwellings. Having a plan in excess of this number is not a good strategy. Any further dwellings within the boundary not highlighted in the plan could also reduce this number.

Parish Council response: Comment noted. Numbers have been reduced.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 95

Comment: Tysoe desperately needs affordable houses including social/rental to attract the young and keep the facilities here viable. Ideally it would be good to have smaller pockets of development BUT there would be no necessity in these to provide social housing. I would like to see small developments but realise the aim of affordable housing for the young can only be achieved by larger developments where the proportion of such houses would be greater. Would suggest 3 or 4 sites around the village of up to 20 houses to try to provide for what we need. Please remember sewage.

Parish Council response: The number and size of sites you suggest would greatly increase the number of houses being built and we have had numerous objections to the numbers put forward in this first Draft Plan. The Plan has to be accepted by a majority of residents in a referendum before it can be enforced so we need it to reflect the will of the majority.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 96

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: We are wondering why the AONB stops building between Middle & Lower Tysoe but it does not affect the proposed building in Upper Tysoe below the Windmill Hill.

Parish Council response: The Draft Plan does not propose building any houses in the AONB. Smarts Lane is not in the AONB.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 97

Policy Number: H5

Comment: It is all very well to talk about market mix and as was mentioned a lot at the consultation meeting "affordable" housing but how can this be achieved when a local social housing provier seems to be embarking open a policy of selling larger houses. Has any approach been made to Orbit in order to determine what its housing policy for the village is and whether it might assist towards the mix we desire.

Parish Council response: Orbit is responding to Central Government policy which requires Housing Associations to sell properties in order to build more. Unfortunately Orbit is not answerable to the Distric Council or the Parish Council and while we may not agree with their policy there is not a lot we can do about it. The policies in the Draft Plan are designed to encourage the building of small houses in the future.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 98

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Why is there a 20% reserve? This is not necessary. 70 IS THE NUMBER. Lower Tysoe is not a sustainable location - if floods and will only attract developers of large detached houses - not affordable to rent. I would like to see the village boundary line redrawn to eeflect to built up boundary.

Parish Council response: Comment noted. Numbers have been amended. We have sought expert advice on the question of numbers and the reserve site. On balance the recommendation to go for a reserve (only to be used in the event that Stratford District's Housing Supply falters and that they force more housing our way) seems the most sensible path. Boundaries have been redrawn.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 99

Support/Object/Comment: Support/comment

Comment: The need for social housing would suggest the village would be better served by 2 or 3 large sites which must be backed up by the Neighbourhood Plan stating that developers must build affordables on site and not pay a commutable sum of the local authority

Parish Council response: Comment noted. Consultation showed there was a very strong preference for small sites and not large sites from residents. The Plan has to reflect this. Truly affordable housing can only be achieved through substantial subsidy in this area of Warwickshire. We are still seeking to create a suitable scheme.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 100

Policy Number: BE6

Comment: I am in favour of this type of development, but only if it can deliver smaller units that would be affordable rather than upmarket dwellings that are out of reach of young couples/families.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 101

Support/Object/Comment: Support/comment

Comment: I have no objection to the sites as put forward in the plan. I am concerned that during the period from now until the plan is finalised that further planning applications will be made and possible imposed. This could make the potential number of houses very much greater.

Parish Council response: We are seeking to move the Plan forward as quickly as possible.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 102

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: I do not agree with the emphasis placed on the preservation of the strategic gap between middle and lower Tysoe. Housing on the strategic gap would give the easiest possible access via two separate roads to the A422 and thus to stratford and Banbury. Contrast this with the 19 houses possible to be built behind Roses Farm on the Epwell Road that basically leads to nowhere or alternaitvely access through the entire length of the LSV to the A422. A no brainer in terms of increased traffic congestion, pollution, etc through the village.

Parish Council response: The Draft Plan reflects the opinions expressed in the Public Consultations, and many residents expressed a strong desire to preserve the Strategic Gap.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 103

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: I agree with all proposals for housing development coloured blue on the working map enclosed.

Parish Council response: Noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 104

Page Number: 19

Policy Number: H1

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Development boundary cuts off the bottom 20 metres of my garden. Insite that 20 metres is my garage. So the line is incorrect. Why cannot the line be drawn on the boundary of my garden with the field below. The current garage would then be correctly placed within the current development area.

Parish Council response: Boundary now redrawn

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 105

Comment: A brilliant plan. Well done. Lets get it a made plan.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 106

Policy Number: H2

Comment: Some of these sites are inappropriate for the number of dwellings proposed and for the infrastructure eg road access and drainage.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 107

Policy Number: All

Comment: Any new build to include footpaths/pavements for pedestrians

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 108

Policy Number: H5

Comment: No 4 bedroom housing required

Parish Council response: We have stipulated that more one, two and three bedroom homes need to built to redress the balance.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 109

Policy Number: H3

Comment: Agree in principle. Only use if absolutely necessary

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 110

Policy Number: H4

Comment: It would be preferable for all housing to be contained within the designated boundaries

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 111

Policy Number: H2

Comment: The amount of affordable housing seems quite low. Only one of the sites quotes 35% of the housing being affordable. The school is suffering falling roles and is losing a teacher at the end of this term. The village needs to attract couples/young families if it is to keep its school and a lower average age. Do we retired people really want to be surrounded by those of a similar age. The average age of church attendees is also pension age. New blood is needed. Affordable and rented housing please

Parish Council response: Comment noted.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 112

Page Number: 19

Policy Number: H1

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012k-svV2Ut34V-4e>

Parish Council response: Boundaries are being reconsidered and redrawn.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 113

Page Number: 30

Policy Number: NE3

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012q7aeRh7gVbDTc0>

Parish Council response: In the Design Statement we seek to encourage sustainable drainage and to use flood prevention measures. The infrastructure of the drainage system is outside our remit.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 114

Page Number: 29

Policy Number: NE2

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012sHi28ItIF-8PvE>

Parish Council response: Somewhat surprisingly, research into this area does not appear to show a clear correlation between street lighting and crime rates. It is believed that lighting can give criminals some advantages. Ideally any lighting should be targetted carefully so that the skies remain as dark as possible.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 115

Page Number: 43

Policy Number: App 2

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012xAR0a9WVSEp1IP>

Parish Council response: Comment noted. Design guidelines are being reconsidered.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 116

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Support/comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0121DX4JoAfbtULVS>

Parish Council response: Boundary will be reconsidered. We are adding a policy into the Plan to encourage the retention of trees and hedges.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 117

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0126mjl0p_ma39dD9

Parish Council response: Comment noted. All sites have been independently reassessed and reconsidered.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 118

Page Number: 37

Policy Number: BE2

Support/Object/Comment: Support/comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011AI3ENM6Jjk74C4>

Parish Council response: Comment noted. Village Design Statement is being amended.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 119

Page Number: 37

Policy Number: BE3

Support/Object/Comment: Support/comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012-HkGasdwZMgWwy>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 120

Page Number: 19

Policy Number: H1/H2

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013BlGM6EmLSLbHh1>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 121

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013F2zlz811A302Et>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 122

Page Number: 23

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013Iw_5C2kFVR-Zqd

Parish Council response: Comments noted. Any development will be subject to satisfactory review by the Highways Authority.

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 123

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013OM7gc4EDCpI-qL>

Parish Council response: Comments noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 124

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013SchCRTKBXgag15>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 125

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013UgEQ3b4joFlztS>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Second Consultation

No: 126

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013YwIpOmgSDrS93z>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Statutory Bodies

No: SB1

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: Whilst the Tysoe plan area contains no navigable waterways, which are our chief area of concern, the Inland Waterways Association (Warks branch) is pleased to offer general support to your efforts to build a robust Neighbourhood Plan to protect the Tysoe area from unwelcome and unwarranted development which could adversely affect the character of the village and surrounding countryside. We are keen to see well planned and acceptable development to enhance and maintain the viability of the area without destroying the essential character and beauty which has evolved over time.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Statutory Bodies

No: SB2

Comment: Many thanks for consulting Highways England on the most recent round of consultation in relation to your Neighbourhood Plan. Having reviewed the documentation I can see that the proposals are unlikely to warrant the consideration of Highways England given their scale and distance from our network (m40, A46). We therefore have no comments to make at this stage but would welcome being kept informed of the development of your plan.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Statutory Bodies

No: SB3

Comment: Comments in file

Parish Council response: Suggestions will be considered in next draft Plan

Feedback Type: Statutory Bodies

No: SB4

Comment: Comments in file

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Statutory Bodies

No: SB5

Comment: Comments in file

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Statutory Bodies

No: SB6

Comment: Comments in file

Parish Council response: Comment noted. Pay attention to their comments.

Feedback Type: Statutory Bodies

No: SB7

Comment: Comments in file

Parish Council response: Policy suggestion is noted and will be considered in next draft Plan

Feedback Type: Statutory Bodies

No: SB8

Comment: Comments in file

Parish Council response: Already handled by Alison.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 27

Comment: This plan represents the needs and wishes of Tysoe. Well presented. This will hopefully protect us from unwanted large scale developments and keep our village as the community we all enjoy being part of.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 28

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: comment

Comment: With regard to the proposed 19 dwellings at Roses Farm, Upper Tysoe, we would like to make the following observations: we are concerned that the Epwell Road from the T junction to the proposed development is too narrow to sustain further daily use by a possible 30 plus vehicles (assuming 2 car ownership). Immediately after the junction travelling in the direction of Epwell, the road is only wide enough to allow one car to pass at anytime. As pedestrians and regular users of this road (which has no footpaths) we have often had to stand to one side on the grass verge to allow other road users to pass, this is particularly noticeable at peak times for school traffic. The Epwell Road is a well used road with a potentially difficult junction to negotiate with a listed building immediately adjacent.

Parish Council response: Any development would only be permitted after satisfactory review from the Highways Authority

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 29

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: The NPC is to be congratulated on the tremendous amount of work that has gone into the plan. However, I have serious reservations about one particular aspect of the plan. I think it is a huge mistake to propose such a large development of houses at Rose's Farmhouse in Upper Tysoe. In the context of the area this is without doubt a large development, which would totally change the nature of the area. The great increase in traffic would cause noise pollution and fumes, not only for Upper Tysoe residents but for everyone living on the main road, all the way down into the centre of the village. It is the issue of safety which concerns me most. The road is habitually used as a rat run, often by speeding traffic. It is a very narrow road with a dangerous T junction; indeed very frequently we witness near accidents. The proposal to put affordable housing there is a dismaying one. Inevitably there would be families with young children who would need to get to school. The road is emphatically not safe for any child to walk on. It would be a case of when, not if, a child gets hurt. None of us would want that on our conscience. Social housing must be as close to the school as possible. The Committee must find alternative sites.

Parish Council response: Any development would only be permitted after satisfactory review from the Highways Authority.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 30

Support/Object/Comment: comment

Comment: Feeoffee Farm - This site was a popular choice for housing allocation as evidenced by surveys. The site, unlike other sites, appears to have been excluded from the plan. I understand informally that this was at the specific request of the landowner, a local charity dedicated to alleviating economic hardship. Apparently the trustees are more interested in "preserving the rural feel of the village" than they are in addressing their actual remit of alleviating economic hardship. In a legal sense it might be argued that the trustees are acting outside their remit. I believe that there needs to be much more evidence in the plan concerning this situation as, as a village charity, the whole situation should reflect the wishes of the village. If houses have to be built somewhere the decision does not preserve the rural feel of the

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 31

Support/Object/Comment: comment

Comment: There is no mention of the extra community infrastructure levy that can be earned by having a neighbourhood plan. It is 10% more than without one. This can make the village tens of thousands of pounds more than without a neighbourhood plan (approximately £75000 using approximate figures)

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 32

Comment: I am sorry but this seems to be a shopping list for developers. Do we really want all these fields filled up with houses?? How can we make serious objections to developments later down the line if we have already suggested these sites as suitable?

Parish Council response: Comment noted. We have now reduced the numbers in the Draft Plan. However, we have taken expert advice and have listened to those at the District Council. The general consensus is that Stratford will expect us to produce a fair contribution to the District's housing requirement as time goes on.

It is believed that the five year housing supply is likely to slip (developers engineer shortages deliberately) and if we are not ready with our Plan and our Strategic Reserve, Stratford will overrule the wishes of the village and sanction developments which we really do not want. No site will be universally popular, but we are seeking to put forward the more popular sites and those with the most merit for the village.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 33

Comment: As I cannot access the Feedback Form, I will leave a final comment here.... I do not understand why those responsible for the NP (especially in the form of an easy-to-read map: perfect for pinning on developers' walls) have created a target/shopping list of fields for Steve Taylor and his ilk to plaster with planning proposals. I know that NPs cannot actually stop development from taking place; but neither should they go out of their way to actively encourage it... – and definitely not to this extensive extent. It breaks my heart that we spent so much time and energy defeating Gladman, only to now appear to be on their side. PS: The comment form link does not work. If I were paranoid, I'd believe that democracy had flown out of the window, long ago.... Isn't having the NP spread over three files just ensuring that those of us who would prefer to read it online will either struggle, or simply be put off? When some accepted plans have only been single, short documents, why does ours need to be so complex? (We must be well on the way to satisfying our new housing requirement, anyway....) By the way: has any allowance been made for those who are disabled, and may need to access it in alternate formats? Thank you.

Parish Council response: Comment noted, please see response to previous comment. We will give more publicity to a contact number for people who have trouble accessing our information in the future.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 34

Comment: I am unsure what the purpose of the Tysoe Feedback Form is as well as the 'Post a Comment'. Are these one and the same - I have posted a comment, but not filled in the form as it is pretty complicated and difficult to understand - and I would say I tend to deal with these things often, so I am fairly sure you will find it puts most people off. I also do not think many people in Tysoe will have this in their sites. In my view the more democratic way of putting this about would be a paper version to each household as in the very first questionnaire. The controversial inclusion of Lower Tysoe has created a very loose boundary around the satellite hamlet. There is no infrastructure to support the development of the scale that Lane End is subject to. The access to shops would be the best part of a mile or across the footpath through to the Church. The boundary line showing the edge of the LSV, should have considered the style of the housing and the street scene along the road frontage in Lane End and Kinton Road. However a number of large backland developments have been proposed altering the nature and character of the settlement. Lower Tysoe was previously not part of the Sustainable Settlement of Tysoe. It has been added at a recent stage to be included in the LSV. There is no logical reason for this to have taken place as there are no Public Services or Facilities within Lower Tysoe. Why therefore have so many potential development sites within Lower Tysoe, been included within the draft Neighbourhood Plan which we cannot support in its proposed format.

Parish Council response: The comments regarding the boundary of the LSV and the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in the LSV are noted. The LSV boundary was drawn after consultation with residents and was

supported in public consultation meetings.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 35

Comment: There is clearly a huge amount of work that has been done by the NP Committee to protect our village. Please pass on my thanks. I have some concerns with the NP Process, some of which I include below: At the public meeting on Tuesday 6th June 2017, the Chair asked us not to contact our Parish Councillors concerning the NP but only to fill out the "Representation Forms" and return them to the Parish Clerk. The comments on these forms would then be published in full to Tysoe parishioners and the "Examiner". The NP is extremely important and will affect all of us forever. I would be obliged if you could advise me whether the Parish Councillors are within their powers to ask us not to speak to them, or otherwise clarify the Chair's statement. The timing of the launch of the Tysoe NP Consultation appears to run contrary to the Government "Consultation principles: guidance", in particular to launching a consultation during an election period (General Election, called 18th April 2017). The Guidance also states that consultations should last for a proportionate length of time. It was two weeks before an email was passed to me concerning the Parish Council approval of the release of the NP for consultation. There are 43 pages in "Volume 1" of the NP, and 76 pages in "Volume 2". I believe the amount of time allowed makes no provision for requests for additional information and/or for clarification questions. There is not enough time to then consider any further information, or the Parish Council's replies to the queries. Neither is there enough time for the Parish Council to read through the Neighbourhood Planning Act published 27th April 2017, nor the House of Lords' commentary. (see <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/consultation-principles-guidance>). I therefore request that the "draft NP Consultation" period is re-commenced at the beginning of September 2017 after the school holidays end, and last for three months. I believe this would provide a welcome rest for both the NP Steering Group and the PCC. It would also allow the Tysoe villagers some thinking time. I am unable to find a timetable for the Consultation and NP approvals process and the Referendum. I would be obliged if an NP timetable could be published on the Tysoe.org.uk. This would also help us to understand the timing of the various drafts of the NP. Could you advise me when the minutes of the Public Meeting held on Tuesday 7th June 2017 will be published and added to Tysoe.org.uk. I would be grateful if you would circulate this letter to all of the Tysoe Parish Councillors, and also let me know when I may expect a reply.

Parish Council response: we will take your comments into account during the consultation on the Second Draft.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 36

Comment: I believe that overall the draft plan has been produced in a very thorough way and addressed the main issues. It is vital that the village continues to be a vibrant centre where services, shops and activities can flourish. Protecting historical aspects of the village is key and design and build must be in line with the village character. We must also protect and enhance the natural environment including the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the wildlife, the cherished views and the local green spaces. The Committee that have produced the plan should be congratulated on their hard work for our community, however unfortunately I do have several areas of concern around the deliverability and conflicting nature of the plan and on this basis if we held a referendum based on this plan I would oppose it. Size of Houses. The village clearly has a predominance of larger house and does not fulfil the needs for young and old age groups and affordable housing. However the development of larger houses is driven by the need for financial return by the developers and landowners. Most developments to date have been larger houses as they deliver this financial return; these have not been for the benefit of the village. I do not see how the best and intentioned plan can stop this process. It is inevitable that the development that happens will be larger houses and once there are planned development sites agreed we will see 4 bedrooms houses developed on them. There is no financial return for a developer to build affordable housing and no financial return for the landowner to sell their land for this. The plan does not indicate where affordable housing will be other than at Roses Farm with round 7 houses whereas you have identified a need for 11 houses. Page 15 refers to a small development, sponsored by the Parish, offering well designed affordable housing. Such a scheme would be as near as possible to the village centre. It is unclear where this is but Roses Farm is the only site referred to and this is not in the village centre. Roses Farm. Indeed the development at Roses Farm is for 19 houses, with approx. 7 being affordable. I question the scale of this site as it contradicts the plan, which wants to control the size and scale of developments. Indeed you state that development on this site should be "carefully designed to

reflect the low density and maturity of the part of the settlement". Page 14 refers to the concern about the scale of new developments and that the design and build should be appropriate and in keeping with rural character. Page 18 refers to the plan encouraging "smaller rather than large developments". 19 houses will not meet this statement in anyway and is completely out of proportion to the aims of the plan. I believe the only reason this site is so large is because it is the easiest way to economically create affordable housing. Once the floodgates have opened on this size of development the village will be exposed. The Committee must reconsider this decision as their own report states it should not happen. On this reason alone I would vote against this plan. Transport The village as stated on page 10 is the most remote parish in Warwickshire and I wonder what we can really do to alleviate issues. It is all very well to say public transport will be improved but we all know it will not be and that the transport providers want to reduce the services to the village. The village is dependent on cars and I question the comment "traffic and parking must be well managed while we work with the relevant authorities to push for adequate public transport". This plan is for developments from 2011-2031, so some 14 years in the future. Who is the "we" referred to and how are they going to manage this and work with authorities for the next 14 years? This statement is completely undeliverable. Business Site Preservation The plan refers to a need to increase local employment but at the same time plans for 3 houses at a property, Paxton's Garage; that is designated for commercial use. According to page 16 "Business sites will be preserved". This is a complete contradiction and this site should be developed for business use. Strategic Gap. The plan rightly protects the "strategic gap" between Middle and Lower Tysoe to preserve the open setting and characters of these settlements. I would question site 12's inclusion in this plan on this basis. This site is close to the AONB and is also a flooding site as well as being very close to the strategic gap. I cannot see a need for more reason to exclude it. There is a significant distance between the properties in this area at present and this land should be part of the strategic gap and the AONB. A development of 6 houses on this site will significantly change items that the plan has set out to protect. There has already been an erosion of the strategic gap with properties currently being built and future development on any part of this land will lead to the whole area being under pressure of development. The plan makes provision for an alternative site on site 13 Herbert's Farm. This is central to the village and would seem to be the ideal place for affordable centrally based housing. This site should be included rather than site 12 and site 4 as it meets the objectives in a better way. Conclusion Unfortauntely large areas of this plan are not deliverable and contradict the plans objectives and these should be re-evaluated before a final plan is produced.

Parish Council response: Comment noted. The Plan does give the Parish Council ammunition to require developers to produce smaller dwellings.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 37

Comment: I have included the following on a separate page, as it concerns the process. The Committee has in many ways done an excellent job, but I do have a couple of points to raise as regard the process. The consultation period is very short, particularly bearing in mind that it is happening during an election period. I hope the Committee will grant an extension, well into the Autumn, as the holidays are almost upon us. At the meeting at the village Hall which was held on June 7th we were told that we should not approach our Councillors individually. I am of course aware that the RDC voted to adopt this first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan, nevertheless I feel strongly that villagers ought to be able to approach individual Councillors in order to discuss the plan. After all it was we who voted for them. I would be grateful if you would pass my comments to the Neighbourhood Development Committee.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 38

Comment: Tysoe has to build some new houses in the village. The main reason Tysoe is a lively vibrant place to live is because it has a cross section of age groups which allows it to sustain a village shop. Post office, school, church, hairdressers, social club and pub. whilst we would hate it to be overdeveloped we think this plan is sustainable

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 39

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Overall, we believe the Plan a good one, and it is laudible that we should be seeking sites for new housing for the future wellbeing and thriving community of Tysoe as a whole. However, we would like to log our formal objection to the potential use of land behind/owned as part of Grisedale in Lane End Lower Tysoe. We do not believe that the erection of dwellings here would serve the purpose for additional housing in any way. Access is limited, the lane and sharp bend would not tolerate a potential additional 6 cars from 3 homes which are likely to be executive built standard, and facilities are a mile away by foot or by car. The purpose stated for the Plan includes the provision of homes for the young to encourage a younger demographic, schools use, community involvement, yet children would not have easy access to the school or transport, and there are plenty of other sites which could be used between Middle and Lower tysoe without expanding the area here. In addition, the magnificent open views across the fields behind Grisedale would be compromised, when pockets of land are identifiable across the lane and around the bend towards Kineton along the roadside if development were deemed vital. We strongly object; and purchased our home with local searches in 2014 showing no plans for development in this way. The aim to encourage younger people to move would be immediately negated as, whilst we are not "young we not old" and we would seek to move immediately should this go ahead accepting a huge loss of value of our property

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 40

Policy Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013ev1Fj7FMLp9J1E>

Parish Council response: Comment noted. Numbers have been reduced

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 41

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013jE-bdyWohGI0e1>

Parish Council response: Comments noted. All sites are being independently reassessed and results will be reconsidered for next Draft of Plan.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 42

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013kecleH91PII-c2>

Parish Council response: Comments noted. A Policy on trees and hedgerows is being added to the next Draft of the Plan. Sites are being reassessed.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 43

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013rLVwDs__-rvfd8

Parish Council response: Comment noted. No development will take place without satisfactory review by the Highways Authority.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 44

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013sTD9nc2J3pZFwy>

Parish Council response: Comment noted. All sites are being independently reassessed for the next Draft of the Plan.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 45

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM013ylsSmEqvzWP0Sk>

Parish Council response: We continue to work towards Affordable Housing in Tysoe.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 46

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0131_ozLkoxJSDD4P

Parish Council response: The document referred to was circulated by a resident in opposition to the Neighbourhood Plan. See new Draft Plan for updated numbers.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 47

Page Number: 21

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0137GYEJRRkoa0BuF>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 48

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0139n1RFIZU12j4s6>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 49

Page Number: 21, 3 & 40

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0mADG0OR9quCVNJYI>

Parish Council response: The owners of this Site have stated that they do not want to develop the Site. However by leaving the Site within the Development Boundary the Site remains available for future development if the owners change their mind and put forward a scheme which is acceptable.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 50

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0mAELQf-P4OziA6-u>

Parish Council response: Comments regarding Employment sites noted. All Sites are being independently reassessed for next Draft of Plan.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 51

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0mAJgJWqTIPIFN87>

Parish Council response: All sites are being independently reassessed for the next Draft Plan

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 52

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0mAMfyWIpWsAfA6Jt>

Parish Council response: All sites are being independently reassessed for the next Draft Plan

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 53

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0mASS2HwZeljDihiI>

Parish Council response: Comments noted.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 54

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: If we have to incur additional development lets have more affordable housing for young people & more retirement accommodation ie bungalows for elderly persons such as myself and my wife

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 55

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: I specifically object to the additional dwellings proposed for Sandpits Land. The area is highlighted is conservation land and the additional density in numbers will furtehr accentuate noise and traffic poultion which is already at an elevated level given that this road is used heavily by passenger traffic, heavy farm machinery and also buses

Parish Council response: All sites are being independently reassessed for the next Draft Plan. No development will occur without satisfactory review from the Highway Authority.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 56

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: I object to the number of houses planned for Sandpits Lane/road. The field behind the war memorial is a protected natural & conservation area. Vehicle access would be an issue, and the number of additional cars on Sandpits Road would not be welcome, and could potentially be dangerous. The introudction of speed bumps or a one way system would be sensible if this particular set of building goes

ahead. I am concerned in general about the amount of extra vehicles the additional houses would bring. Not simply additional family cars but also probable extra buses and delivery vans. Thought should also be given to the additional pupils for the local school and the additional patients at the local doctors surgery.

Parish Council response: All sites are being independently reassessed for the next Draft Plan. No development will occur without satisfactory review from the Highways Authority.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 57

Page Number: 21

Comment: Poor roads to support the extra traffic. Doctors appointments are hard enough to get without additional families. Not the infrastructure in place. Ruining the countryside. Too much traffic in the village especially during the school run. Could be additional 100 cars . Destroying the wildlife. Making the village too big and unwieldy. Cap the support the children

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 58

Policy Number: NE6

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: There are large areas of land that are unnecessarily categorised as strategic gap land when it's already AONB land. This is the land on the Edge Hill side of Lower Tysoe Road and the three fields behind Home Farm. AONB land already has its own restrictions. With the current proposal every single one of our fields have either strategic gap or AONB restrictions. We were hoping to be able to build a bungalow or small dwelling on a part of our land off the Lower Tysoe Road. The current proposal will make this impossible which is very disappointing for us as very long term residents of Tysoe.

Parish Council response: The Home Farm site sits within the proposed Development Boundary and is therefore eligible for development if an acceptable scheme were proposed. However, the fields on either side of the Lower Tysoe Road sit within the AONB and proposed Strategic Gap where development will not be supported.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 59

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: The current plan for Middle and Upper Tysoe proposes 45 houses in little pockets which is completely detrimental to the character of the village. They should have been spread all around the village in smaller plots and most of these houses should have been put on Oxhill Road next to the new build properties which would have preserved the area inside the conservation area.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 60

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Far too much traffic already. If Tysoe has to have 66 dwellings built, then this will work out at 132 vehicles because there could be two vehicles per household. Elderly people (I am one, aged 93) are already afraid to cross Main Street. Smarts Lane - 8 dwellings proposed - this is ridiculous. It is dangerous as regards exit onto Shipston Road in both directions and also Smarts Lane is an area prone to flooding.

Parish Council response: Comment noted. Numbers have been reduced

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 61

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: The 66 dwellings listed in Policy H2 are excessive against an outstanding requirement of 41 dwellings by 2031, as described in Section 2.0. If normal single infills of the type recently seen on Main St or similar, continue at only one or two a year, then the NP should perhaps allocate sites for between 13 and 27 dwellings only, an approach reportedly taken in the successful Long Compton's NP. Additionally, the recent white paper 'Failing our broken housing market' makes it clear that processes and methodologies to establish local need and therefore targets are changing, potentially as early as next year, and it therefore doesn't make sense to give developers a green light now on sites that may not be required or credited from next year.

Parish Council response: Comments will be considered in next draft Plan

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 62

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Policy H4 outlines a laudable desire for 11 further dwellings based on evidenced local need. Presumably this is being considered outside the development boundary because of affordability issues. If an affordable site could be found within the village close to services, then this would satisfy important accessibility issues, particularly for the elderly and count towards our required allocation of a further 41 dwellings. I have heard a lot of people discussing Feoffee Farm as such a potential site and think it should be an allocated site in the NP.

Parish Council response: Comment noted.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 63

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: I may have missed it, but I didn't see any mention of prioritising brownfield sites in the NP, which is a widespread planning objective. The NP has listed Paxton's garage, so I'm sure it is implicit, but it should be stated as a Policy as there will inevitably be other opportunities over time. One example is Orchard Farm Nurseries, which should therefore be within the defined Local Service Village and allocated ahead of some other more contentious sites (or their extent) anyway.

Parish Council response: Comment noted.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 64

Page Number: 30

Policy Number: NE3

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Policy NE3 is an incomplete lift from the document referenced in footnote 19. The full section needs quoting for it to have any meaning. It would actually be preferable for the Policy to simply require compliance with the linked document as these sections are designed to work together, rather than separately. Additionally, the accompanying explanation should also mention flooding risk in Smarts Lane and the Upper Tysoe rising main capacity issues, so as to signpost the significant upgrading works likely to be required as part of any development in Upper Tysoe.

Parish Council response: Comments will be considered in next draft Plan

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 65

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: I don't think the process by which the allocated sites have been arrived at, is particularly clear in the NP. The outputs from the various resident consultations presumably form a key part of the process

adopted, but there are obvious departures from those outputs in the NP, such as the exclusion of Feoffee Farm, which aren't addressed. It also isn't particularly clear how all the developments satisfy the stated Policy objectives, e.g. 19 dwellings behind Rose Farm v. encouraging small developments. I think it is important that some added explanation and/or linkage through both these points is included to provide the necessary transparency on how the allocated sites have been arrived at and in order to build support for the NP as a whole.

Parish Council response: Comments on process noted. Where owners have objected to the inclusion of sites the sites have been withdrawn from the Plan. In the Consultations, residents showed a strong preference for small developments, so this is reflected in the Site Allocations. However, the indicative number of dwellings proposed by the District Council will not be achieved without a larger development.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 66

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: I believe site 4 would be too dense. It should support no more than 6 dwellings. All of which should be affordable.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 67

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: the 19 houses in Upper Tysoe is very dense and 10 seems more open

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 68

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: No comments

Parish Council response: Noted.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 69

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: No comments

Parish Council response: Noted.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 70

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Building anywhere near the centre of a village with its narrow roads and lack of parking, creates harassment and ill feeling. New building should be near the main road with easy access to either Stratford or Banbury. To cause congestion, mostly at the busiest times of day, shows a selfish disregard for people's lives. Both in the present inhabitants and newcomers.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 71

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Whilst I am happy to support Roses Farm house & Paxton garage development. I do object to 1 dwelling in Avon Avenue, 15 dwellings on Sandpits Lane, 8 dwellings in Smarts Lane

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 72

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Happy with Paxton's garage & Roses farm but not with Smarts Lane, Avon Avenue & Sandpits

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 73

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Completely unfair to Upper Tysoe where more housing than the rest of Tysoe have been built prior to this so called plan. As usual Lower Tysoe is getting away with it again.

Parish Council response: Comment noted. In reality, Lower Tysoe has already taken proportionally more development than Middle and Upper Tysoe since 2011, the beginning of the Plan period.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 74

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Tysoe cannot support any more family or executive homes BUT does need some really affordable 1 or 2 bedroom homes for local people, also some light industry to employ them, now that agricultural opportunities are comparatively rare. The site where 15 dwellings are planned for Sandpits, near the village green, would be perfect to build a small Home for local fragile elderly, no longer able to cope on their own. This would offer local employment and be accessible for friends and neighbours to visit. Adequate parking should negate any vehicular problems in Sandpits, and it could be a real village asset. Localims!

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 75

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: If we are required to have around 50 further houses/bungalows in the village, it would seem sensible to keep them within the confines of the village, even if it means encroaching on the Conservation Areas. Specifically in Upper Tysoe I am attracted to the development of Paxton Garage and the tidying up of the area around Roses Farm House although there is the problem of the nearby T-junction. This is all preferable to spreading out into the greenfield site beyond the Church which seems to be happening.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 76

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: We feel the present level of traffic through Upper Tysoe is excessive and the extra proposed housing would increase it further as the residents of these houses would have to travel to work etc by car (house building nearer to places of work is surely more sensible). Upper & Middle Tysoe have had ample

new buildings and the village character and history are being destroyed for future generations. If houses have to be built in tysoe Lower Tysoe has many open greenfield sites.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 77

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Re Paxton Garage dwellings building 3 dwelling would result in a loss of privacy for our house. We moved to a quiet village to escape town living. This amount of development is unacceptable. Increased traffic caused by this amount of development is going to increase noise and reduce safety. This amount of property development is going to impact mains drainage. Re Paxtons garage 3 properties could equal 6 cars that could mean on the road parking at a dangerous corner. I believe this development will reduce the amount of light our property receives. My understanding is that there is currently a bat roost in the open barn on the property

Parish Council response: Comment noted.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 78

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0mAWBIBYTuZo80KiF>

Parish Council response: 1. Neighbourhood Plans are now being shown to have considerable weight in the planning process and they are the only tool we are being offered to increase our influence. We are not being offered a choice. 2: No site will be included in the final Plan without the express agreement of the landowner. 3/4: Comment noted. Sites within and outside the boundary seem to be equally contentious. 5: Stratford District Council tells us that the 'affordable' houses which stood empty in Back Lane had a problem with access and when this was resolved they were quickly filled. We have solid evidence for the need for Affordable Homes in Tysoe, acquired from the Housing Needs Survey which the Parish Council commissioned, and other information from the District Council. 6: Comment noted 7: Potential barn conversions: We agree that there are various potential barn conversions around the village, but the owners haven't put them forward. In any event, the District Council expects us to produce some so -called 'windfall ' housing in addition to the numbers in the Plan. 8: Comment noted. 9: Lower Tysoe has already built or had approved x dwellings in the Plan period since 2011. Comments on Sites: Noted. All sites are being independently re-examined prior to the next Draft of the Plan.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 79

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0mAZgMUs_TzMRIsOO

Parish Council response: Numbers have been amended, see next Draft Plan. Policy 1H Comment noted.

Policy H4: We are reconsidering the Affordable Housing section. Strategic Gap: It is always difficult to interpret data about public opinion and caution must be used. However, 29 people who put postcards in the ballot boxes at our Public Consultation Nov 2016 expressed the wish to preserve or extend the strategic gap.

This was the highest scoring response in the boxes. There were 12 votes in favour of preserving the Strategic Gap on the 'Vision Board' as well as the 28 votes at the Lower Tysoe Consultation. The Draft Plan (type face etc) Your suggestions have been noted. Thank you. Orbit: Orbit is selling homes in response to Central Government Policy. We have had expert advice that seeking to use and upgrade ex housing association stock is a very expensive way of creating Affordable Housing, which would increase the need for subsidy.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 80

Page Number: 20

Site: Comment

Comment: I understand one of the objectives of the NP is to define our Local Service Village, in order limit development to within the defined area, but also to define the area within which development counts towards Tysoe's housing target. With this latter point in mind, I query why the Proposals Map includes land to the north of Oxhill Road within the Local Service Village, but not to the south. I am aware of sensitivities around the recent planning applications on the whole of this field, but if the boundary was drawn with space for just a few dwellings facing the road and adjacent to existing similar properties, it may satisfy the NP policy requirements very well, now or at some time in the future and contribute to our targets, whilst not opening the door to unwanted larger development. The same approach could of course be considered at a number of the roads entering the three Tysoes.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 81

Page Number: 20

Site: Comment

Comment: I understand from the NP that the aim of the Development Boundary is to define an area of preferred development within the proposed Local Service Village. The so called strategic gap and certain large gardens are perhaps examples of why the areas defined by the Development Boundary and the Local Service Village are occasionally different, but why are they proposed to be different to the north west of Lower Tysoe and to the south of Upper Tysoe? Map 2 The Proposals Map refers. Does this not open the door to 'non-preferred' development in these areas?

Parish Council response: Boundaries are being redrawn.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 82

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0mAcPeRwTrZt9HA8i>

Parish Council response: All sites are being independently reassessed for the next Draft Plan. No development will occur without satisfactory review from the Highways Authority.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 127

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011EZBRZXLkN2_Kfw

Parish Council response: 1. Noted. Overall numbers in the Plan have been amended. 2. Expert advice has been sought and considered on these points. The Neighbourhood Plan does aim to denote those sites preferred by residents so that we are not just responding to pressure to agree to potential sites from developers or having having imposed on us from the District Council. While there will never be complete consensus about sites, we are taking all feedback into account and attempting to represent villagers' views fairly. 3/4 Roses Farm : All sites are being independently re-examined, and no development will take place without Highways Authority Review 5/6 We are still hopeful of achieving more of the truly affordable housing needed in the village and we continue to work on this. 8. When Stratford DC requires additional housing from us, then the Plan gives us the control over where it is built. Neighbourhood Plans are showing themselves to be effective in this. A Neighbourhood Plan may be an imperfect tool but it is the only one at our disposal. 9/10 Our leafleting and advertising has aimed to reach all residents. However, we have found that there are those who have no interest in participating, even when they are approached individually. Nevertheless the response to our 2017 consultation period was exceptional with more than 200 responses - which is regarded as extraordinary for a village the size of Tysoe. Comments about the Public Meeting are noted. On the positive side, residents have been encouraged to focus on giving us written feedback because

this allows everyone an equal voice, rather than relying on discussions at large meetings where, by the nature of the event, only the loudest or most confident voices are heard. Regular meetings, which allow time to answer residents' questions, are being held and more information in response to commonly asked questions will be circulated. Hopefully, over the coming weeks residents' questions will have been answered satisfactorily.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 128

Page Number: 4,35,42

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011L2mKaR62e4_Jy8

Parish Council response: Boundary will be re-considered. Other comments noted and will require plan amendment.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 130

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011TqdfIgCl-kGft7>

Parish Council response: Any development on site No 4 will have to be approved by the Highways Authority and the local planning authority.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 131

Page Number: 19

Policy Number: H1

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011VX5MEUtGDgJGJi>

Parish Council response: Comment noted. Numbers have been amended

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 132

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011YWvCZksSQJZm0Y>

Parish Council response: Sites to be included in the final Plan will need owners' approval. Other comments noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 133

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011c_6iVfbeERSigL

Parish Council response: Comments noted. Owners of Feeoffee Farm refused permission to build on the site therefore it cannot be included in the Plan. All sites including Herberts Farm are being independently re-examined. Stratford District Council expects there to be unplanned development within the village and

this 'windfall' is in addition to any dwellings in the Neighbourhood Plan. If you are aware of any brownfield sites which we have not identified please bring them to the attention of the NPG.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 134

Page Number: 31

Policy Number: NE4

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011gs6fGHWmoQF4S0>

Parish Council response: All green spaces are being reassessed. The comments are noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 135

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011kZxox-NmSa3JDT>

Parish Council response: Comments noted. All sites are being independently re-examined. Numbers have been reduced.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 136

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011o5h6MWuB1tLLgD>

Parish Council response: Comments noted. All sites are being independently re-examined.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 137

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011soQkTaxYMLL3Ew>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 138

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011xLQVJAZ9_L2iaB

Parish Council response: Comment noted. See new Draft Plan,

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 139

Policy Number: CONE4

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0110n7Clk8iGJa6Zy>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 140

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0117XcJQ3sJSUIr9n>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 141

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM011_znCZPTjEv_on6

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 142

Policy Number: NE4 & BE4

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012B31GaIlKDC_h7n

Parish Council response: Comments will be considered

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 143

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012HiZ0-pDAmfAf_r

Parish Council response: Suggestions will be considered in next draft Plan

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 144

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012JOZJzQ8fLW-CjM>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 145

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Whilst agreeing that infilling some sites is acceptable I do think it is important that we retain some green areas within the village.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 146

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012Mlo0vbqqbCoOp3>

Parish Council response: 1. Comment noted, numbers have been reduced. Policy H1: Our wish is to retain the individual characters of the three hamlets as far as possible. Policy H4: The Affordable Housing Section will be reworked. Strategic Gap. In the Public Consultation 29 people filled in cards expressing the wish to

retain or even extend the Strategic Gap. This was the most popular topic on the cards and was not in response to a prompt question. In addition 12 people agreed with the prompt question on the 'Vision Board' (supplied by a respondent) 'Preserve what is left of the green space between Middle and Lower Tysoe'. The consultation with Lower Tysoe produced a similarly enthusiastic response as you noted. The Pin exercise: This exercise was intended to give an idea of the support for various sites. The stand was manned and residents were allowed one pin per site. The Plan layout, print size etc: We will endeavour to improve this. Orbit: We have been advised that acquiring ex- Housing Association stock as a method of providing Affordable Housing is prohibitively expensive.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 147

Policy Number: H2/5

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012TXG4K5aviDqEIA>

Parish Council response: Comment noted. All sites are being independently re-examined.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 148

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012V0WdA6BeFJ1tU6>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 149

Page Number: 21/22

Policy Number: H3

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012bz8_DVTPxHQQH2

Parish Council response: Comment noted. All sites are being independently reassessed.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 150

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H3

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012fhmLMhdXzRGktr>

Parish Council response: Comments noted. Numbers have been reduced. All sites are being independently reassessed.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 151

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM012gt-4WSLQQef6XT>

Parish Council response: Comments noted. Numbers have been reduced.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 152

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0lzx7MkG5iQXX3sav>

Parish Council response: Traffic issues will be considered with any proposed site development

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 153

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0lzx24mzZf-CuBwidE>

Parish Council response: General comments noted and suggestions will be considered in next draft Plan

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 154

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0lzx4LSg0Yowb8Lx3L>

Parish Council response: All sites are being independently reassessed.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 155

Page Number: 21

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0lzx_ULjeOuQZ3S4WF

Parish Council response: Comment noted. All sites are being independently reassessed.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 156

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0l0DGNn2amyIdvraR>

Parish Council response: Comments noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 157

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0l0GlgB1eUdPOOMvH>

Parish Council response: The document didn't come from the Neighbourhood Planning Group. Comments noted.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 158

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0l0JYpLIhf-aCxOD4>

Parish Council response: Comments noted. The majority of residents of Lower Tysoe do feel that we are all one village and this makes our community stronger. Proportionate to its size, Lower Tysoe has had more building than the other Tysoes in the Plan period since 2011. While it seems clear that no development can please everyone, the ideal is that the Neighbourhood Plan would seek to ensure that all three Tysoes to retain their own character.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 159

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: we have made a couple of comments under separate cover but wish to compliment the committee on a very good piece of work and impressed that the village is able to take control of its own destiny in this way - Well done

Parish Council response: Comment noted.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 160

Policy Number: H2

Comment: The calculation method used for calculating the number of houses to be erected on a site is not explained in the document and needs to be clarified. It does not seem realistic in some cases eg sites, 2,3,5,9 and 11 are all supposed to have 3 houses but they vary enormously in size, access and usable shape

Parish Council response: Comments regarding site density will be considered in next draft Plan

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 161

Policy Number: BE4

Comment: The policy should suggest solutions for commercial parking areas. Page 17 says that traffic and parking should be well managed but it is already a mess and will only get worse as new homes are built. One possibility is that playing field car park is used more fully or even extended but no doubt there are other options

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 162

Page Number: 3 & 12

Support/Object/Comment: Object/comment

Comment: Land south of the Orchards is site 12 on page 3 and site 13 on page 12? This is confusing as the access points are completely different. I would object to the proposed highway access to this site as it is directly opposite the driveway to my property. Access at this area of Lower Tysoe Road is already hazardous with restricted visibility

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 163

Support/Object/Comment: Support

Comment: Possibility of no more than 5/10 in each development. Could Feeoffee Farm not be used for a development site?

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 164

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0I0OSTBwoKe3FK8I4>

Parish Council response: Comment noted.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 165

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM010RxM2v5rw-E6l6H>

Parish Council response: Comments on housing needs noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 166

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: I would like to see the AONB extended to protect more of Tysoe from development. EE is planning to install a mobile phone mast in the sewage works and not disguise it in any way.

Parish Council response: The extent of the AONB is outside of the scope of the Plan

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 167

Page Number: 21

Policy Number: H2

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: No 4 site allocations specifies land at Roses Farm for approximately 19 dwellings which seems too many for this particular site and should be reviewed.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 168

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: If the village wants to bring young couples and families to Tysoe, apart from affordable homes, there needs to be houses to rent. But this is always difficult to get housing associations to finance such a scheme. Also parents try to place their children in schools with "outstanding" Ofsted reports.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 169

Support/Object/Comment: Comment

Comment: The Roses Farm house site would appear to impact on few people but provision should be made for public footpath access to the village with the need for residents to walk down Epwell Road to cross the Shipston Road. With regard to the school role numbers I disagree with the statement made at the meeting on 29th June that larger sites are required to get young children to the village. What the school needs is a good Ofsted report to avoid children who do live in the village and its surrounding villages going elsewhere as they do at the moment. Smaller sites integrate far better into established villages.

Parish Council response: Comments noted. Pedestrian access will be considered for all potential sites.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 170

Comment: Please note our strong objection to any proposed development of the land currently Herbert's Farm close to the end of Back Lane. It would involve access via an unsuitably narrow lane already congested with parked cars and currently used by schoolchildren walking from the Old Fire Station Pre-School to the CofE Primary School.

Parish Council response: Comment noted. All sites are being reassessed.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 171

Comment: We have been told the housing requirement for Tysoe is 84. This appears to reflect SDC desires rather than the reality of the situation given the core strategy and the fact that local service village allocations

have been filled. The village needs to be properly informed of the situation. The neighborhood planning group have not met publicly (as required under regulations) since last 2016 and possibly not at all. The public has not been able to attend any meetings and there are no minutes. Work appears to have been carried out privately. If the parish council wish for consultation in the process they need to ensure sub committees follow the rules so that there is public scrutiny.

Parish Council response: Comments noted. The Steering Group is responding to these concerns about process and numbers are being reviewed.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 172

Comment: The TNP committee in many ways has done an excellent job, but I do have a couple of concerns regarding the process. The consultation period is very short, bearing in mind it is happening during an election period. I hope the Committee will grant an extension, well into the Autumn as the holidays are almost upon us. At the meeting at the Village Hall which was held on 7th June we were told that we should not approach Councillors individually. I am of course aware that the Parish Council voted to adopt this first draft of the neighbourhood plan, nevertheless I feel strongly that villagers should be able to approach individual councillors in order to discuss the plan. After all it was we who voted for them. I would be grateful if you would pass my comments to the Neighbourhood Development Committee, and to our Parish Council members. Thank you.

Parish Council response: Comments noted. There will be a further consultation period.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 173

Comment: Having attended one of the Neighbourhood Plan Public Consultations and read through the plan a couple of times, overall I have no objections to the Policy H2 – site allocations. I am in agreement with the plan going forward to the next stage, subject to the withdrawal of Policy H3 – Strategic Reserve Herberts Farm, shown as Map 2 location 13. Access is proposed via Back Lane, which is a narrow single track lane, offering no opportunity for widening. Existingly, the passage of residential traffic is problematic, aggravated by the constant use by the large agricultural machines, commercial Severn Trent vehicles accessing the water pumping station to the north of the farm and commercial delivery vehicles to the rear of the village store. This is further aggravated by the necessity of some residents and all visitors having to park along the lane, often on the footpaths used by small schoolchildren, dog walkers and pedestrians accessing the school, church and public footpath. There is no capacity for Back Lane to cope with the additional traffic created by 10 new dwellings – generating in excess of 20 additional vehicles, plus visitors and home delivery services (Tesco, Amazon, etc). Moreover, the re-location of the tenant farmer to the north of any proposed development would raise additional road traffic risks caused by the contact between these additional vehicles and the scale of agricultural and service vehicles accessing Herberts Farm.

Parish Council response: Comments noted. All sites are being reassessed.

Feedback Type: Other Feedback

No: 174

Comment: It seems important that the Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan should incorporate and justify a HOUSING DENSITY. An appropriate but low housing density would not only preclude box-like homes but also enable appropriate car parking allocations eg one space per bedroom needed in a RURAL community. A relatively low housing density would not preclude the development of social housing. It is not the role of the Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan to enrich developers nor encourage development – merely to provide local guidance as to how planning applications are considered.

Parish Council response: Comments noted

Feedback Type: Site owners

No: SO1

Site: 10

Comment: I write to inform you that I have no desire to release my land, marked number 10 on your map, for development and therefore would not wish to be considered for allocation in the Development Plan

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM010WIkNIu2wLjbnWr>

Parish Council response: Site now withdrawn

Feedback Type: Site owners

No: SO2

Comment: Thank you for your letter of 16th May 2017 regarding Local Green Spaces and the Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan. I would just like to say that I am not the owner of the Community Orchard but a director of the company that manages the orchard and as a main promoter of the orchard I would be more than happy to discuss this proposal as part of the formal consultation process. I am passionate about the orchard and its place within the community and how it contributes to the well being of local people and their education and well being. Please do contact me and let me know how I can help as part of the consultation process. I look forward to hearing from you.

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM010ZSVAiR-hDzJfcC>

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Site owners

No: SO3

Comment: Thank you for your letters which we received this evening reference the Neighbourhood Plan. We are seeking clarification on your question as to whether we are willing to consider releasing our land at the Orchards Lower Tysoe for housing development. Firstly, what does 'releasing our land for housing development' entail precisely and secondly what does the reference 'Lane to South of the Orchards' above the image refer to? Who should we discuss this with and can you confirm if it is related to any other development proposal bordering our property within the context of the Tysoe Neighbourhood plan?

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM010cEMhQ3EcjLVrln>

Parish Council response: Development on this site will only happen if the owner applies for Planning consent. The word "Lane" should be "land" this will be corrected in the next draft Plan

Feedback Type: Site owners

No: SO4

Site: 6 & 7

Comment: We are in receipt of your letter dated 16th May with regards to the two packets of land in Sandpits Road numbered 6 and 7 which we own. We can confirm that we would be willing to consider releasing the land in the future subject to having an input into the designs especially site number 6 as it is adjacent to our house. We would also need to consider our legal position for your proposal so we do not restrict our use or ownership of the land for the next 14 years and are happy to discuss this with you and the Steering Group

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Site owners

No: SO5

Site: 3

Comment: With reference to your letter dated 16th May. I would be willing for my land to be included in the proposed allocation for housing development BUT this would be sometime in the future and cannot commit to a definite date. Regards Dave Paxton

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Site owners

No: SO6

Site: 19

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM010j1VN1MtVwGLtdc>

Parish Council response: Comments noted

Feedback Type: Site owners

No: SO7

Comment: Details in Pack

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM010kuA2DKnveTxa-y>

Parish Council response: The proposed site is outside the proposed Development Boundary which has been drawn to recognise the current building line. All proposed sites and proposed Green Spaces are undergoing reassessment prior to redrafting the Plan.

Feedback Type: Site owners

No: SO8

Comment: Thank you for your letter dated 16th May 2017 in respect of the Neighbourhood Development Plan for the Parish of Tysoe. I confirm that I have spoken to Lord Northampton and he is willing to consider releasing the land at Roses Farm (4) and Smarts Lane (8) for housing development, should the Parish Council decide to allocate it in the Neighbourhood Plan. With regard to the formal consultation, I have already had preliminary discussions with David Roache where I outlined the Estate's approach and, therefore, I do not intend to make formal representations other than this email confirming the above but if you would like to discuss any more details in respect of how this land might be developed please do feel free to contact me.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Site owners

No: SO9

Comment: Thank you for your letter dated 16th May 2017 in respect of the local green space designations in the Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan. I confirm that Lord Northampton is the owner of the land coloured green identified on the plan attached to your letter. I have spoken to his Lordship and he has confirmed that he is happy for the land to the north of the plot – specifically labelled Allotment Gardens – to be included in the plan with the designation of local green space. This land has been allotments for many, many years and there is no intention for this use to change. The local green space designation is therefore highly appropriate for this parcel of land. Having said that, however, the southern area of land which is currently being used as a community orchard is a different matter. Lord Northampton kindly agreed to allow a ten year lease for a community orchard on this land recently but he does not wish to see this officially designated as a local green space. Whilst one would hope that the use of this land will continue as a community orchard well into the future, it is not considered that the local green space designation is appropriate on this occasion and therefore I shall be grateful if you will please refrain from designating it as such in the neighbourhood plan. If you wish to discuss this with me in any more detail, please feel free but I hope that the steering group leading the preparation of the plan will respect the position with regard to the southern section of this land.

Parish Council response: Comment noted

Feedback Type: Site owners

No: SO10

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM010pf0_KUuT2MNja8

Parish Council response: Comments noted

Feedback Type: Site owners

No: SO11

Support/Object/Comment: Object

Comment: Comments in file

Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM010smRWi2j8oUQG7t>

Parish Council response: This site is outside the proposed Development Boundary and therefore development on it will not be supported. Also, a previous planning application was refused after being examined by a Planning Inspector. The site has very little local support.

Feedback Type: Site owners
No: SO12
Support/Object/Comment: Object
Comment: Comments in file
Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM010wt5tZH7JmnMams>

Feedback Type: Site owners
No: SO13
Policy Number: H3
Support/Object/Comment: Support
Site: 13
Comment: Comments in file
Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0100ZmBjUK9TPRsRW>
Parish Council response: The provision of a Strategic Reserve site is being reviewed in the new Draft Plan and other potential sites are being considered.

Feedback Type: Site owners
No: SO14
Site: 5
Comment: Comments in file
Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0106QjHnAaa725b3X>
Parish Council response: The NPG consider the proposed site at Home Holdings to be suitable for the development of 3 houses in addition to the 2 already granted permission on the adjoining site.

Feedback Type: Businesses
No: B1
Page Number: 11
Support/Object/Comment: Comment
Comment: Comments in file
Redacted Link: https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM010_201jfVEFOuY6v
Parish Council response: Comments noted

Feedback Type: Businesses
No: B2
Page Number: 11
Support/Object/Comment: Comment
Comment: Comments in file
Redacted Link: <https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0mAsCIXqHPdd-iAjm>
Parish Council response: Title will be corrected in next draft Plan

Feedback Type: Businesses
No: B3
Support/Object/Comment: Comment
Comment: Paragraph 3 Tysoe social club (not sports and social club) Tysoe Childrens Group is an educational facility regulated by Ofsted (not a club or special interest group as described) Lunch Club - although the majority who attend are senior citizens there is no age restrictions as stated (over 60s). Tysoe Utility Estate is a registered charity managed by ten elected trustees. It was set up for the purpose of providing relief to parishioners in times of hardship and distress, offering grants for education and worthy causes in the village
Parish Council response: Noted, will be corrected and clarified in next draft Plan

Feedback Type: Corrections

Comment: I have received a letter dated 17th May 2017 stating Stratford-on-Avon District Council has listed our house as a property with some commercial or similar activity. This is not the case and I would be grateful if it could be confirmed that our house is purely a residential property with no commercial activities being undertaken. Please could you confirm this email has been received and will be acted upon.

Parish Council response: Noted.

Feedback Type: Corrections

Comment: We have just received a letter through our door from the Parish Council regarding the neighbourhood plan, stating we are a commercial property. We are not. Change of use from commercial to residential was granted to us about 7 years ago, just after we moved in. Stratford council's records must be very out of date to notify you incorrectly, as it is a residential property. By its name, it shows it used to be commercial but it is not now. Please include us in residential correspondence. but not commercial as they are not relevant to us

Parish Council response: Noted.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Contents Page

Page Ref: p.2

SDC Comment: It would be helpful to list all the individual policies under their section headings, including policy title and page number in the NDP.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Foreword

Page Ref: p.4

SDC Comment: Replace 'councils' with 'communities' and add 'them' after 'affecting' and delete 'their communities' in the first paragraph. Additionally, replace 'core strategies' with 'policies'; capital 'D' and 'C' for District Council and add 'through the Core Strategy' to the end of the second sentence.

Parish Council response: accept in part

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Foreword

Page Ref: p.4

SDC Comment: Second paragraph – there is no housing target to be met by individual settlements.

Parish Council response: accept

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: 1.1 Progressing the Plan

Page Ref: p.4

SDC Comment: Insert 'Neighbourhood' before 'Plan' on second line of the first paragraph. Also replace 'parish' with 'Neighbourhood Plan' and add 'and comprises the whole of the Parish' to the sentence on the third line.

Parish Council response: accept

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: 1.1 Progressing the Plan

Page Ref: p.4

SDC Comment: Third paragraph – capital 'P' and 'C' for 'parish councils'. Insert 'exercise' between sites' and 'and' on second line of fourth paragraph.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 2

Page Ref: p.6

SDC Comment: – First paragraph, replace ‘involves dispersing’ with ‘included the dispersal of some’.
Second paragraph – 84 homes is not a target for the settlement it is more an indicative guide.

Parish Council response: semantics

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 2

Page Ref: p.6

SDC Comment: Third paragraph – Replace third sentence with: ‘If this Plan does not identify reserve sites, the District Council may identify sites through the Site Allocations Plan (SAP)’.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 2

Page Ref: p.6

SDC Comment: Fourth paragraph – there is no housing target to be met it is more an indicative guide.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 2

Page Ref: p.6

SDC Comment: Fifth paragraph – replace ‘parish’ with ‘community’. Bullet point 4, delete ‘(for example... going elsewhere’. Bullet point 6 – replace ‘contain’ with ‘influence’.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 2

Page Ref: p.6

SDC Comment: Sixth paragraph – insert ‘and Core Strategy’ after ‘Framework’ on the final line on p.6. Additionally, delete ‘rather than...decision makers’ as it is unnecessary.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 2

Page Ref: p.6

SDC Comment: Eighth paragraph (p.7) – insert ‘as well as’ between ‘place’ and managing’ on third line. Insert line space between this paragraph and the following one.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 2

Page Ref: p.6

SDC Comment: Ninth paragraph – replace ‘contacts’ with ‘individuals’.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: 3.2 – A special Place to Live

Page Ref: p.11

SDC Comment: Insert 'including' between 'environment' and '(the Area...)' as it is not an exclusive list.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: 3.3 – Shaping the Future

Page Ref: p.13

SDC Comment: Paragraph 2 refers to 'the boundary of the LSV'. However, the proposals map has different boundary lines with (potentially) different meanings. This issue needs to be sorted out for consistency.

Parish Council response: will be revised

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Scale and design of development

Page Ref: p.14

SDC Comment: Reference to 'within the village boundary'. Not precise wording...same issue as point above re: 2 separate 'boundaries' on the map.

Parish Council response: will be revised

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 4

Page Ref: p.15

SDC Comment: First paragraph – there is no development target it is more an indicative guide.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 4

Page Ref: p.15

SDC Comment: Second paragraph – how would potential in-fill development achieve the requirement to 'respect the existing building lines'?

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 4

Page Ref: p.15

SDC Comment: Third paragraph – suggests there is more than one reserve site, but there is only one on the proposals map.

Parish Council response: redrafted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 4

Page Ref: p.15

SDC Comment: Fourth paragraph – The penultimate sentence talks about a vision for a small, Parish sponsored development...what is this? Where is it? Is it one of the allocated sites? Which policy sets this out...this needs referencing, for clarification purposes.

Parish Council response: sentence deleted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Local Businesses

Page Ref: p.16

SDC Comment: first paragraph talks about encouraging start-up businesses and seeking opportunities for locals on business parks which is in line with the Core Strategy but I cannot find a policy in the NDP that

does this.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Local Businesses

Page Ref: p.16

SDC Comment: Second paragraph – what does ‘limited conversions for business use’ mean and where is the policy ‘hook’ for this?

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: The built environment

Page Ref: p.16

SDC Comment: States that the local ridge and furrow fields will be protected. This may be difficult to achieve unless there are other material planning factors that are present such as heritage setting assessments. This will have to be assessed on a case by case basis and therefore policy wording should be softened.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Infrastructure and community facilities

Page Ref: p.17

SDC Comment: First paragraph – How is the NDP going to ensure that infrastructure is ‘easier to maintain’? Additionally, capacity of infrastructure is the responsibility of statutory undertakers, not the Parish Council via a NDP.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 5

Page Ref: p.18

SDC Comment: Change the heading to ‘Summary of Policy and project Outcomes’

Parish Council response: not accept

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 5

Page Ref: p.18

SDC Comment: 1st bullet under Housing: suggest the wording could be strengthened to read along the lines of ‘identify where new homes should be located’

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 5

Page Ref: p.18

SDC Comment: Under sub-heading ‘Protected areas’, bullet point 4 refers to the defining of LSV and development boundaries. What is the difference and why are they both required? (This is referred to in more detail later when considering the proposals map).

Parish Council response: They are required because SDC does not currently recognise Lower Tysoe as part of the LSV

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 5

Page Ref: p.18

SDC Comment: 5th bullet under Protected Areas: This is a responsibility of the District Council and will

depend on resources available to facilitate this. This is not a matter that can be pursued through a NDP.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 5

Page Ref: p.18

SDC Comment: 1st bullet under Infrastructure: need to be more precise about what roles s106 and CIL will have in future.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 6 – Housing

Page Ref: p.19-25

SDC Comment: Strategic Objective – replace ‘hamlets’ with ‘village’ (would not describe Middle and Upper Tysoe as hamlets; Lower Tysoe maybe).

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 6 – Housing

Page Ref: p.19-25

SDC Comment: Policy H1 – Housing Growth: Would this policy be clearer if it was bullet pointed as there are several issues covered?

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 6 – Housing

Page Ref: p.19-25

SDC Comment: Re-word policy as follows: “Within Tysoe’s defined built-up area boundary, new housing will be supported in principle. Outside the designated built-up area boundary, the remainder...[to end]”

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 6 – Housing

Page Ref: p.19-25

SDC Comment: Cannot have two ‘village boundaries’. It is confusing and unnecessary. The built-up (or settlement) boundary is the village boundary... Reference to a ‘village boundary’ should be removed from the Plan.

Parish Council response: Dont agree. We have 2 development boundaries within the LSV

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 6 – Housing

Page Ref: p.19-25

SDC Comment: Explanation – First paragraph – change second sentence to read “Within the built-up area boundary of the village, ...”. The Core Strategy does not set a target for development (fourth line). Therefore, it is not correct to state that 84 houses will be required. This is more of an indicative guide rather than a firm target.

Parish Council response: We are saying approximately

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 6 – Housing

Page Ref: p.19-25

SDC Comment: Second paragraph – final sentence – change to read: “The built-up area boundary of the village is therefore...”

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Map 2 – The Proposals Map

Page Ref: p.20

SDC Comment: · The Conservation Areas are not shown

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Map 2 – The Proposals Map

Page Ref: p.20

SDC Comment: · Allocated site 6 in Lower Tysoe goes beyond the ‘development boundary’ (as described in the legend)

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Map 2 – The Proposals Map

Page Ref: p.20

SDC Comment: · Why is the ‘development boundary’ different to a LSV boundary? What is the purpose of the LSV boundary and what does it denote? Which policies does it relate to? How was it assessed? This ‘loose’ type of boundary could be seen by developers as an ‘in principle’ acceptance for development.

Parish Council response: The LSV contrary to SDC’s current definition, includes Lower Tysoe. However we are defining 2 BUABs within that LSV definition. These 2 BUABs are separated by a ‘Strategic Gap’.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Map 2 – The Proposals Map

Page Ref: p.20

SDC Comment: · The LSV boundary includes a large proportion of the ‘strategic gap’. Why?

Parish Council response: see above

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Map 2 – The Proposals Map

Page Ref: p.20

SDC Comment: · The areas of proposed Local Green Space (LGS) need to be numbered or labelled in order to cross reference to associated NDP policy

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Map 2 – The Proposals Map

Page Ref: p.20

SDC Comment: · A large number of the promoted LGS sites are large – concern that they would not meet the assessment criteria set out in para. 77 of the NPPF. How are these areas of land ‘demonstrably special’ to the community? We need sight of the assessment criteria to understand and comment fully.

Parish Council response: will review

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Map 2 – The Proposals Map

Page Ref: p.20

SDC Comment: · By attempting to put all designations on one map at this scale, it is difficult to differentiate between certain lines which intersect or overlap. It may be more helpful to create a ‘suite’ of

maps concentrating on specific topic areas/polices or 'inset' maps to sit alongside the relevant policy

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Map 2 – The Proposals Map

Page Ref: p.20

SDC Comment: · There is a site situated to the western edge of the settlement boundary, between allocated sites 6 and 7 which seems to be outlined...what is this site, as there is no other reference to it in the Plan?

Parish Council response: This was an error

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2 – Site Allocations:

SDC Comment: The basis for identifying these site allocations and rejecting other potential sites will need to be rigorous in order to stand up to scrutiny at Examination, ie. they will need to be suitable, available and achievable - and preferable to other sites that have been put forward.

Parish Council response: noted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2 – Site Allocations:

SDC Comment: Site 1 – why this site in particular, when there will be a large number just like it in the village – is it purely due to availability?

Parish Council response: now excluded

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2 – Site Allocations:

SDC Comment: Site 2 – this site is already occupied by a number of buildings. Is this conversion, or new build?

Parish Council response: Site now has PP no longer an allocated site

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2 – Site Allocations:

SDC Comment: Site 3 – is this conversion, or new build?

Parish Council response: Site now excluded

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2 – Site Allocations:

SDC Comment: Site 5 – a large area of land for only 3 dwellings

Parish Council response: will be reviewed on receipt of Planning Application

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2 – Site Allocations:

SDC Comment: Site 7 – this site has already had a number of planning applications refused for residential development. An application in 2013 for 9 dwellings was refused and the Parish Council objected to this proposal for a number of reasons, one being unacceptable harm on heritage (Conservation Area), another being over-development of the site. Other reasons related to infrastructure operating at over capacity. (N.B. This is in contradiction to the statement in the Associated 'Volume 2 – The Evidence' document submitted with the NDP, which states in the table on p.3 that in the case of this site, "Planning permission had previous parish council approval". This is incorrect in 2 ways: the application was refused, not approved; the Parish Council objected, it did not support. What is different now?

Parish Council response: now excluded

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2 – Site Allocations:

SDC Comment: Explanation – Second paragraph – there is not a target for the village set out in the Core Strategy.

Parish Council response: `Will meet the requirement set out in the CS`

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H3 – Strategic Reserve:

SDC Comment: Policy H3: identification of this strategic reserve site needs to be rigorous in order to stand up to scrutiny at Examination, i.e. sites need to be suitable, available and achievable - and preferable to other sites that have been put forward. There are constraints of developing Herberts Farm bearing in mind it is partially in a Conservation Area and has listed buildings on site. The text from the 3rd sentence to the end would appear more applicable to Policy H2 and perhaps should be repositioned there?

Parish Council response: Herberts Farm now not identified as a Strategic Reserve Site. New site will be identified

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H3 – Strategic Reserve:

SDC Comment: Is this still a working farm? If so, is it the farm mentioned on p.9 of the NDP where it indicates that it is at the heart of the village? The re-development of this site would presumably lead to the closure and loss of the farm, which would no longer form 'the heart of the village'... If it is a functioning farm, what are the reasons for promoting it for such alternative development? How does this re-development stack up against landscape protection policies and employment/business protection policies?

Parish Council response: see above

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H3 – Strategic Reserve:

SDC Comment: Replace 'their' with 'its' on fourth line of policy. The sentence beginning 'The sites in this category...' is a note and should not form part of the policy itself. Additionally, it is a single site, not multiple sites. Second paragraph should begin: 'Development on this allocated site...'. Criterion c) should read: 'Safe access and egress from the local highway network, plus adequate parking arrangements; and'.

Parish Council response: see above

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H4 – Rural Exception Housing:

SDC Comment: Would a more appropriate policy title be: 'Affordable Housing'? The first paragraph should be replaced, to read: 'Small-scale community-led housing schemes on sites beyond, but adjacent to, the defined built-up area boundary of the village will be supported where the following is demonstrated:...'.
Parish Council response: We believe Rural Exception Housing is the technically correct term for this Policy. Accept wording change.

Parish Council response: We believe Rural Exception Housing is the technically correct term for this Policy. Accept wording change.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H4 – Rural Exception Housing:

SDC Comment: In criterion b) replace '...Tysoe's Local Service Village...' with '...the built-up area boundary...'. Second paragraph – what is 'an open book development appraisal'?

Parish Council response: First accepted. Second para, a financial appraisal of the viability of the scheme with and without market housing included.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H4 – Rural Exception Housing:

SDC Comment: Explanation (p.24) – in paragraph beginning ‘Analysis of the 2011...’ on the second line, replace ‘District Council’ with ‘the wider District’.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H5 – Market Housing Mix:

SDC Comment: Replace ‘will’ with ‘should’ in first line of the policy as the original term is too restrictive. The second sentence, beginning ‘In this way...’ is Explanation, not policy and should be removed from the policy text. The %’s are not listed as a range as in the Core Strategy and as such will be almost impossible to achieve if the development is an odd number.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H5 – Market Housing Mix:

SDC Comment: Explanation – The first paragraph is duplication of the penultimate paragraph on p.24 (which is part of explanatory text for Policy H4). Paragraph 4 of the explanation indicates that the NDP ‘will be at odds with the District Council’s Core Strategy’. I assume this relates specifically to the 4+ bed market housing? Local evidence will be essential if the PC consider the policy is not in conformity with other Development Plan policies.

Parish Council response: noted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy E1 – Protecting and Enhancing Local Employment Opportunities:

Page Ref: p.26 to 27

SDC Comment: The word ‘not’ should be deleted from 2nd line?

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy E1 – Protecting and Enhancing Local Employment Opportunities:

Page Ref: p.26 to 27

SDC Comment: ‘Resisted’ in the first paragraph of the policy should read ‘supported’? Criterion b) delete the word ‘where’. Replace text in criterion d) with ‘development of the site for other appropriate uses will remove existing unacceptable environmental problems associated with the current use’.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy E1 – Protecting and Enhancing Local Employment Opportunities:

Page Ref: p.26 to 27

SDC Comment: Explanation: Insert ‘area’ between ‘neighbourhood’ and ‘is’ in the first line.

Parish Council response: village

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy E2 – Home Working:

SDC Comment: In relation to live-work units, it would seem appropriate to state that the location of new build units should be in accordance with Policies H1 and H2.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy E2 – Home Working:

SDC Comment: The policy has two parts, but the policy title only covers one part – suggest new title reads ‘Home Working and Live-Work Units’. Delete ‘in accordance with Policy ECON3’ from first paragraph –

there is no policy ECON 3 in this NDP...

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy E2 – Home Working:

SDC Comment: Explanation: Final paragraph – what is meant by the phrase ‘although this should not create a license for additional rooms to be built by developers’? This requires re-drafting or further explanation.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy E2 – Home Working:

SDC Comment: Live-work units c) layout and design ensures that residential and work uses can operate without conflict – need to clarify if this relates to internal arrangements or the wider neighbouring amenity

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy E2 – Home Working:

SDC Comment: ‘Home Quality Mark’ requires more explanation, particularly if it is being used to ratify policy compliance. It cannot be imposed but policy can encourage.

Parish Council response: taken out

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 8 – Natural Environment

Page Ref: p.28 to 35

SDC Comment: Strategic Objective – The strategic objective is looking to protect and extend ‘green spaces’, but goes on to talk about ‘cherished views’ which are a different issue. It looks to protect ancient ridge and furrow fields, but it is not clear how this can be achieved, given they are not a protected entity in the planning system. However, it may be that other planning considerations are identified which mean that a ridge and furrow field may be protected such as, for example, during the course of a heritage setting assessment a ridge and furrow field maybe identified as a relevant factor in the assessment that should be protected. Alternatively it is possible that a ridge and furrow field may be found within an area identified as a local green space.

Parish Council response: Unsure what this comment is hoping to achieve.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE1 – The Cotswolds AONB:

SDC Comment: Suggest start new sentence at ‘Particular’?.

Parish Council response: Accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE1 – The Cotswolds AONB:

SDC Comment: Not sure that this policy provides added value to policies within the NPPF and Core Strategy.

Parish Council response: But we want to include it.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE2 – Tranquillity and Dark Skies:

SDC Comment: Insert new second paragraph: ‘Applications for new development should demonstrate how the dark skies environment will be protected through the submission of appropriate supporting documentation to demonstrate accordance with current professional guidance’. Final sentence of policy – replace ‘be resisted’ with ‘not be supported’.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE3 – Flooding and Drainage:

SDC Comment: This policy seems very restrictive as drafted. Where has the 50 sq.m threshold figure come from? What is the justification for this figure? Is the policy compliant with associated policies set out within the NPPF and Core Strategy? This policy will need to show evidence to back up this stance. Equivalent policies in other NDPs ask for SuDS in new developments of more than 10 dwellings and major commercial development...

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE3 – Flooding and Drainage:

SDC Comment: Policy CS.4 supports the use of small scale SUDS (such as rain gardens, green roofs, water butts) where there isn't enough land to include larger scale SUDS measures; i.e ponds and swales.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE3 – Flooding and Drainage:

SDC Comment: Recommend that the third paragraph in the explanation is amended to read ' .. SuDS is designed to control surface water run off close to where it falls and to mimic natural drainage as closely as possible. They are intended to slow down the rate and volume of water before it enters streams, rivers and other watercourses'. Please note that SuDS are not intended to slow water down to sewage treatment works.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE3 – Flooding and Drainage:

SDC Comment: Explanation – The final sentence in paragraph 2 on p.30 – what is this forecast and how is it part of the evidence base?

Parish Council response: ammended

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE4 – Designated Local Green Space:

SDC Comment: Delete 'CO' in policy title. First line, delete 'the following' and add 'at the following locations:' following 'Proposals Map'. The letters indicating each of the land parcels need to be added to the Proposals Map for cross-reference purposes. SDC have a concern that a number of the proposed LGS designations do not meet the criteria as set out in paragraph 77 of the NPPF and should be removed from the Plan. However, the associated evidence set out within 'Volume 2 – The Evidence' (p.42) is incomplete and is not sufficiently detailed to make a detailed assessment.

Parish Council response: will review

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE4 – Designated Local Green Space:

SDC Comment: Explanation – Final bullet point re: evidence – The LGS site assessments at p.42 of Volume 2 is incomplete. The title is missing the word 'Local'. The assessments are incomplete (the rationale and comments are missing from a number of the sites) and does not even mention as to whether the sites have been assessed against the criteria set out in para. 77 of the NPPF. Although there are 10 sites listed in Policy NE4 and Volume 2, they have different location addresses/descriptions and as such it is difficult to cross-reference with certainty.

Parish Council response: will review

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE5 – Valued Landscapes:

SDC Comment: The policy refers to both landscape character and views...these are two separate policy issues and as such the policy as worded is muddled and conflating policy issues. These need separating out into separate and distinct policies. Is there a landscape assessment as evidence for this policy? What landscape features is the policy looking to protect? The final paragraph of the policy is too onerous.

Parish Council response: will review

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE5 – Valued Landscapes:

SDC Comment: Explanation – The explanatory text is insufficient for this policy. Parts of the explanation referring to land on the fringes of the village would be more appropriate to LGS designation. Views/vistas; landscape; skylines are all separate matters with distinct and separate evidence base requirements.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE5 – Valued Landscapes:

SDC Comment: Map 3 – Valued Landscapes – The map as produced in the NDP is of very poor quality and wholly illegible. As such, it is impossible to comment on the validity or appropriateness of the map and its contents. One specific concern that can be raised is the ‘Local Service Village’ boundary as shown on this map. This boundary does not correspond with any other boundaries as shown on the Proposals map and raises more confusion as to what the proposed LSV boundary actually is.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy NE6 – Protected Strategic Gap:

SDC Comment: Strategic gaps are used to prevent coalescence of two or more settlements and is particularly useful when the ‘gap’ to be protected is narrow and further erosion could lead to the settlements merging. The ‘strategic’ gap indicated on the Proposals Map is extensive. Has any evidence been produced to ascertain why this gap needs to be of this magnitude? It also includes a large area of the Costwolds AONB to the east of the road connecting Middle and Lower Tysoe, which has its own protection. The policy as written would not allow the possibility of a rural exception scheme within the area highlighted, is this deliberate, or an oversight?

Parish Council response: Deliberate and the Strategic Gap Boundary will be redrawn to follow existing field boundaries, streams or other existing natural boundaries.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 9 – Built Environment

Page Ref: p.36 to 39

SDC Comment: Strategic Objective – Fourth line, replace ‘be resisted’ with ‘not be supported’ in both instances.

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE1 – Designated Heritage Assets:

SDC Comment: This policy should perhaps refer to guidance produced by Historic England on The Setting of Heritage Assets- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE1 – Designated Heritage Assets:

SDC Comment: This policy replicates the Core Strategy and therefore whether it adds value is questionable?

Parish Council response: We want to include it.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE1 – Designated Heritage Assets:

SDC Comment: The first paragraph quotes from para. 128 of the NPPF but does not go on to consider the potential impact/harm to the significance of the asset and its setting. You need to know this in order to understand whether a proposal is acceptable. The third and fourth paragraphs of the policy quote from para's 133 and 134 of the NPPF, respectively. Does this policy add value to the NPPF and Core Strategy?

Parish Council response: Now re-worded

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE1 – Designated Heritage Assets:

SDC Comment: Taking site 7 of Policy H2 of the NDP as an example, given the planning history and refusal reasons for residential development of the site, including unacceptable harm to the heritage asset (Conservation Area), would a similar scale of development on this site (as promoted through the NDP) meet the criteria of this policy?

Parish Council response: Site 7 now excluded

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE1 – Designated Heritage Assets:

SDC Comment: Delete first sentence of final paragraph of the policy beginning 'Development with and...'. Add 's' to 'Area' on penultimate line.

Parish Council response: First not accepted, second accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE1 – Designated Heritage Assets:

SDC Comment: Explanation – There is insufficient justification for this policy. The second paragraph relates to the ridge and furrow landscape specifically, which is not listed as a specific 'heritage asset' like a listed building or Conservation Area. It is unclear how protection of ridge and furrow is to be/can be enhanced by landowners. The final paragraph talks about a 'need' to extend the Conservation Areas. A Conservation Area review is the responsibility of the Local Planning Authority and cannot be carried out through a NDP.

Parish Council response: We want to include these as they are particularly important to the village, recognising that Ridge and Furrow are not protected and that any Conservation Area review will need SDC's support.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE1 – Designated Heritage Assets:

SDC Comment: The penultimate paragraph refers to Scheduled Ancient Monuments- are there any in the plan area? Please note these are now referred to as Scheduled Monuments by Historic England, on the basis that not all monuments are ancient.

Parish Council response: Scheduled Ancient Monuments removed- there are none.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE2 – Responding to Local Character:

SDC Comment: Delete 'All' at the start of the policy, since this is too onerous. Replace 'must' with 'should' for the same reason. In criterion b) add 'and scale' between 'density' and 'that'. Criterion c) replace 'sustain' with 'conserve'. Is this criterion actually needed as it is covered by legislation? Criterion e) delete 'sweeping views across' since this term is far too general in nature. Criterion f) relating to fear of crime should be removed from this policy, since it relates to a different planning issue to assessing local character. Should it be deemed appropriate to include a policy on 'designing out crime', a separate policy similar to Policy D5 in the Kington NDP may be appropriate.

Parish Council response: Partial acceptance. Criterion f deleted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE3 – Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy:

SDC Comment: The policy to support energy efficiency and renewable energy is welcomed. NPPF Paragraph 97 supports for community led initiatives and low carbon energy through NDPs. However, it should be noted that following the outcome of the Government’s Housing Standards Review (March 2015) LPAs are no longer able to set a requirement for higher levels of energy efficiency than Building Regulations. Consequently, it is recommended that the policy is reworded to replace ‘require’ to ‘encourage’ Home Quality Mark principles.

Parish Council response: Agreed

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE3 – Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy:

SDC Comment: Similar to policy NE3 in terms of restrictive/onerous nature of the wording as drafted in relation to compliance. What is the reasoning and justification for the 50 sq.m figure?

Parish Council response: re-worded

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE3 – Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy:

SDC Comment: Explanation – Page 38 includes a table on the costs of a range of fuels which is not labelled or explained. This should be amended and/or is it necessary?

Parish Council response: Agreed

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE4 – Local Parking Standards:

SDC Comment: Replace ‘buildings must’ with ‘development should’ in the first sentence. Begin the second sentence with ‘New...’ . Is this an appropriate parking standard, based on number of bedrooms? For eg 5 car parking spaces for a 5 bed roomed house?

Parish Council response: accepted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE5 – Replacement Dwellings:

SDC Comment: BE5 replacement dwellings - existing homes in a Conservation Area and affecting a listed building are protected by the Core Strategy and the issue of replacement dwellings is covered CS.20 part C.

Parish Council response: We want to include this.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE5 – Replacement Dwellings:

SDC Comment: Second line – make ‘Conservation Area’ plural. Criterion a) is too restrictive (particularly the reference to ‘no more than 30% larger’) and not compliant with NPPF or Core Strategy – this is a Green Belt policy copied over from the previous Local Plan which is not appropriate and should be deleted. Criterion b) should also be deleted. There is nothing in NPPF or CS policy to indicate that re-siting cannot be a purely personal choice, as long as there are no adverse impacts on neighbouring amenity etc . Criterion c) talks about scale being ‘too dominant’ but this is not a precise term, as it does not state what is might be too dominant in relation to. Criterion d) takes away a freedom of choice and I do not consider this would meet the basic conditions test. It is considered this policy requires further thought and re-drafting.

Parish Council response: redrafted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE5 – Replacement Dwellings:

SDC Comment: Explanation – The second sentence states the policy is ‘...not intended to overly restrict people’s freedom and expression of interest...’ but that is exactly what it does do and for that reason is

inappropriate, as currently drafted.
Parish Council response: redrafted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE6 – Empty Homes and Spaces:

SDC Comment: The policy also refers to ‘redundant agricultural buildings’. Are these traditional agricultural buildings (i.e. brick built) that may be appropriate for conversion to dwellings? If so, it is considered this should be a separate policy, as these buildings are not currently empty dwellings. See Policy D6 of Kineton NDP for an example of a suitably worded policy. As such, the words ‘...including the re-use of redundant agricultural buildings’ should be removed from policy BE6.

Parish Council response: We will give the policy a new title "Empty homes and redundant agricultural buildings" then the words will match the title.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy BE6 – Empty Homes and Spaces:

SDC Comment: Consideration should be given to the issue of Permitted development rights (PD) for the conversion of agricultural buildings to residential use.

Parish Council response: Agreed

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Section 10 – Community Assets

Page Ref: p.40

SDC Comment: Strategic Objective – Remove the words ‘Urbanisation of the village environment will be resisted and’ as it is not a relevant assessment criteria for this section of the NDP.

Parish Council response: redrafted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy CA1 – Community Assets:

SDC Comment: It is not clear whether Tysoe has formally registered the assets identified as being of community value - doing this would bolster the basis of them being identified in this policy.

Parish Council response: We haven't but will consider doing so.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy CA1 – Community Assets:

SDC Comment: Replace ‘be resisted’ with ‘not be supported’ in the first line of the policy. The policy lists 10 community assets. It would be very helpful if these could be added to a map for clarity and cross-reference purposes. It is not clear what the final paragraph of the policy means. Is it stating that CIL monies will be spent on retaining and/or upgrading the community buildings listed in the policy? If so, this should be made clear. These community assets are not detailed on the 123 list of the CIL which is in an advanced stage of preparation by the District Council and is awaiting the Examiners report before adoption later this year.

Parish Council response: Will add to a map. The final paragraph seems to be self explanatory.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy CA1 – Community Assets:

SDC Comment: Explanation – Second paragraph – refers to the creation of a ‘community interest company’ to take over the running of a community asset under threat. This needs to be expanded upon and would need to be listed as a project or community aspiration in an appendix to the NDP.

Parish Council response: redrafted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy CA1 – Community Assets:

SDC Comment: The loss of facilities will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer in active use, it may be useful to specify a time period that it has been vacant for

Parish Council response: redrafted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Hardstanding – Second sentence re: use of iron stone is different issue. It is understood that the figure of 25 units come from the previous Parish Plan. However evidence would now needed to justify this figure.

Parish Council response: Re-drafted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Building Materials –This policy is considered to be too prescriptive in terms of bricks to be used and when they should be used. It provides no possible alternatives.

Parish Council response: These reflect the very strong views of the village and the vernacular materials in the village and are designed to protect from the use of sub-standard material.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Style – Why should layouts reflect a courtyard style? What about sites where this is physically not possible or inappropriate due to other design factors? It is far too specific.

Parish Council response: Will add the words "wherever possible"

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Roof coverings – Far too specific in terms of materials and tile sizes.

Parish Council response: This is what we want.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Windows – Cannot be controlled outside the Conservation Area unless the District Council has specifically removed permitted development rights by way of an Article 4 direction.

Parish Council response: With all of these specific design requirements we are trying to maintain the integrity of the built environment and as such we are very specific.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Build height – Where has figure of 5.5 metres to eaves come from and why this height?

Parish Council response: redrafted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Street Lighting – WCC responsibility. Can't be controlled via NDP.

Parish Council response: redrafted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Storage Space – The Planning system cannot control how occupants use their internal spaces re: storage associated with the residential use of the building.

Parish Council response: Policy taken out

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Parking – Why is tandem parking not acceptable? It would be ‘off-road’ and as such would comply with Policy BE4, in principle.

Parish Council response: redrafted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Should read ‘Secured by Design’ and unclear what ‘32’ refers to?

Parish Council response: Changed

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Reusing Grey Water – This section does not make sense as drafted.

Parish Council response: Re-drafted

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: Good Examples – States ‘the plan’ should reference examples of new developments which fit these guidelines. What plan? If it is the NDP, where are the ‘good examples’?

Parish Council response: Taken out of the draft

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: General points – what and where is the reasoning and justification for such a tightly drawn list of requirements?

Parish Council response: Because our experience tells us that without such tightly drawn specifications developers are allowed free rein with materials and design that are inappropriate for the village.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Appendix 2 – Village Design Statement

Page Ref: p.43

SDC Comment: It may help to reorder this list in alphabetical order or under subject headings.

Parish Council response: Will consider whether this makes it more understandable to the reader

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Volume 2 – The Evidence

SDC Comment: Introduction – The housing figure is not a target.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Volume 2 – The Evidence

SDC Comment: Site Allocations Table – Incorrect comments inserted for site 7. The scheme does not have planning permission, it was withdrawn due to it being earmarked for refusal by LPA. The PC did not approve, it objected to the proposal.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Volume 2 – The Evidence

SDC Comment: Rejected Sites Table – Where are sites 14 and 23 in the list, as they appear to be missing? Where is a map showing all the assessed sites (including the rejected sites), without this there is no way of understanding how decisions have been made by the PC? Are the site assessments listed later in the document in the same order as the list set out on pages 3 and 4 of this document and are they the same numbers as those listed on the Proposals Map?

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Volume 2 – The Evidence

SDC Comment: Site Assessment Matrix – There appear to be inconsistencies in quoted landscape sensitivity land parcels (e.g. site 6 is TY03, not TY04 as quoted and this changes the sensitivity from ‘high/medium’ to ‘medium’). Could this change affect the outcome of each land parcel assessment? This all needs re-checking.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Volume 2 – The Evidence

SDC Comment: Local Green Spaces – Site Assessments – Assessments are not complete and no assessment against para 77 of NPPF

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Volume 2 – The Evidence

SDC Comment: Does not contain any evidence to support the policies and none of the Core Strategy evidence base has been referred to.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H1

Page Ref: p.9

SDC Comment: From a practical point of view Policy H1 is confusing in that it refers to both “two development boundaries” and “the Local Service Village” boundary. Those boundaries are different, and are shown as such on the Proposals Map. This makes the Policy unworkable.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H1

Page Ref: p.9

SDC Comment: Policy H1 and the Proposals Map should be amended to remove the confusing references to different policy boundaries.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2

Page Ref: p.21

SDC Comment: (a) There does not appear to be any specific recognition that further supply, over and above the 66 homes on the sites allocated in Policy H2, may be forthcoming from unallocated “windfall” sites within the development boundaries for the village identified in Policy H1.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2

Page Ref: p.21

SDC Comment: (b) Supply from both allocated and “windfall” sites will be contributing towards meeting District-wide housing requirements, as well as requirements originating within the parish. In this respect, it would be desirable to attempt to maximise the affordable housing yield within this overall supply envelope.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2

Page Ref: p.21

SDC Comment: (c) Of the 12 allocated sites, only one – Site 4, Roses Farm – is of sufficient size to attract a requirement for on-site affordable housing provision. As the estimated capacity of this site is 19 dwellings, this would indicate a yield on 6 affordable homes.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2

Page Ref: p.21

SDC Comment: (d) The overall yield of affordable housing from the allocated sites is therefore only likely to be in the order of 9%.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2

Page Ref: p.21

SDC Comment: (e) A further three sites – those with estimated capacities of between 6 and 10 dwellings – would be of sufficient size to attract requirements for financial contributions towards off-site provision of affordable housing

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H2

Page Ref: p.21

SDC Comment: (f) As noted above, whilst supply from Site 4 is likely to mop-up the majority of need identified in the 2016 Housing Needs Survey, the need arising from that figure (8 housing association and 3 private market properties) this is only a headline figure and does not take into account the type and mix of units likely on the site. It may therefore be the case that the type of community-led housing scheme envisaged by Policy H4 would need to be relied upon to remedy any shortfall in supply specifically to meet any unmet local housing need – particularly in terms of affordable housing. However, the Parish Council will need to be pro-active in promoting any such scheme if it is serious about ensuring its local needs are fully met. One possible means of doing so might be to extend the scope of Policy H3 to enable its earlier release in the event of a community-led housing scheme emerging: see further below. Consideration should be given to the quantum of affordable housing likely to be delivered from the application of Policy H2 and, if appropriate, either a lower threshold for on-site affordable housing provision is imposed (this will require justification by reference to local circumstances) or a smaller number of larger sites are allocated

"

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H3

Page Ref: p.22

SDC Comment: The identification of a ‘reserve site’ at Herberts Farm (Site 13) in Policy H3 is welcome. However, on the basis of an estimated capacity of only 10 dwellings, it is unlikely that there will be any on-

site affordable housing yield meaning that off site provision would be sought. However, it may be possible to expand the scope of that Policy to allow its earlier release for a community-led housing scheme specifically to meet the needs identified in the 2016 Survey if viable.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H3

Page Ref: p.22

SDC Comment: The role of Policy H3 could be expanded to allow for the earlier release of Herbert's Farm for a community-led housing scheme if feasible.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H4

Page Ref: p.23

SDC Comment: This policy includes criteria for determining a "local connection". Whilst there is no objection to those criteria, these criteria do differ slightly from those currently used in respect of affordable housing provided within mainstream market-led schemes elsewhere within the District. Briefly, this may indicate a need to allow for "off list" nominations by the developing housing association. Also, it is unclear whether those criteria would apply only in the case of a scheme or schemes brought forward under Policy H4, or on all qualifying sites (such as those released under Policies H2 or H3). If two different sets of allocation criteria were to apply on different sites within the same village, this could create significant practical difficulty and questions of equitability.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H4

Page Ref: p.23

SDC Comment: The final two paragraphs of Policy H4 (concerning local connection criteria) should be relocated either to a reconfigured Policy H5 or a new freestanding policy, and that the Application of those criteria are clarified.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H5

Page Ref: p.25

SDC Comment: Although titled 'Market Housing Mix' actually encompasses the mix of both affordable and market housing. There are two main concerns:

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H5

Page Ref: p.25

SDC Comment: (a) It is unclear whether the provisions concerning tenure are meant to apply equally to the market housing as well as the affordable housing: this is assumed not to be the case, but clarification is essential.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H5

Page Ref: p.25

SDC Comment: (b) The stock mix is described in terms of fixed-point percentages. Such an approach would be very difficult, if not impossible to apply on smaller sites – as is the case in Tysoe. It would be better to express the percentages as a range, or as "not exceeding" or "not less than" a specified percentage. Also it is difficult to see how the stated percentages would assist in delivery against the needs identified by the 2016 Survey.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Policy H5

Page Ref: p.25

SDC Comment: Policy should be modified to better reflect the practical issues surrounding the development of a larger number of smaller sites, and the position concerning the tenure of homes is clarified. For affordable homes, a tenure profile of about 75% Social Rent and 25% Shared Ownership would be justified by the findings of the 2016 Survey.

Feedback Type: SDC Comments

Section: Proposals map

SDC Comment: It would help if the Legend on the Proposals Map was cross-referenced to policies in the Plan, and also if existing housing commitments were shown.