

TYSOE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Pre-Submission Plan July 2018

Table of main public comments received and responses

(Note: the full, redacted texts of public comments can be read via the link contained in each entry. There are additional, amplified notes to some of the responses listed at the end of the document)

Abbreviations used: *NPG* – Neighbourhood Planning Group; *PC* – Parish Council; *SDC* – Stratford on Avon District Council; *NPPF* – National Planning Policy Framework; *LSV*- Local Service Village; *BUAB* – Built up Area Boundary

No	Type	MAIN COMMENTS RECEIVED	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP RESPONSE
2	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0ow2HmgS5kxSMnyjG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lower Tysoe to be included in LSV *Congratulates the group on work *Objects to Reserve Sites, especially Herberts Farm for various reasons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Agree, see Housing Policy 1, also Note 18. *Comment noted *Objection noted but disagree. The justification for including reserve sites in the Plan is explained in Housing Policy 3. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. After a process of assessment, the NPG together with the planning consultant, have identified Roses Farm and Herbert’s Farm as being suitable. That said, neither site is perfect, they both lie within conservation areas and they both present challenges for gaining suitable access. The NPG commissioned a Highways Authority report on the access issues on both sites which indicates that these problems could be mitigated. Contrary to some comments, Herbert’s Farm would

			continue to be a working farm even if development took place. The present outbuildings and byres could be moved further west thus ensuring that the village still possessed an active farm close to its centre. Notes 21 and 22
3	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nmAba-QZs6E4bw3b *Keep up the good work *Houses should be environmentally friendly	*Comment noted * Agree, see Built Environment Policies 2 and 3.
4	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nmEQ_Z3fZDiM-fcf *Positive, practical plan *Pleased to see good level of affordable housing	*Comment noted. *Agree, see Housing Policies 4 and 5
5	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nmIsNUwgUXTqgb0C *Good to see all factors (incl environment and views) considered; congratulates the group	*Comments noted, especially the retention of panoramic views which were a major concern of residents, see Natural Environment Policy 5
6	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nmO8Zpt435-osFhc *Likes the Plan *Wants to demolish Methodist Chapel in favour of affordable housing	*Comment noted *Comments noted. There are a small number of strong but opposing views in the village regarding the Methodist Church. While one side argues that it has been inexcusably omitted as a community asset (see comments 100 and 122 below), another sees it as being an ideal site for affordable housing, were it to be demolished. The Church lies inside the Built up Area Boundary and therefore the site is open to appropriate future redevelopment. That said, on reflection, the Group took the view that the building was indeed a Community Asset and should be defined as such (Community Assets Policy 1). Notes 25 and 26
7	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nmQn4B1n1jqewGT3 *Plan covers all relevant points	*Comments noted
8	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nmXJQCeq2McXT2uD *Methodist Chapel is in poor condition and would be	* Comments noted. The Church lies inside the Built up Area

		better used as housing for elderly	Boundary and therefore the site is open to appropriate future redevelopment. There are a small number of strong but opposing views in the village regarding the Methodist Church. While one side argues that it has been inexcusably omitted as a community asset (see comments 100 and 122 below), another, as here, sees it as being an ideal site for affordable housing, were it to be demolished. The Church lies inside the Built up Area Boundary and therefore the site is open to appropriate future redevelopment. That said, on reflection, the Group took the view that the building was indeed a Community Asset and should be defined as such (Community Assets Policy 1). Notes 25 and 26
9	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0ox5VrA8xhuRPK7ZN</p> <p>*Sees Lower Tysoe as part of the LSV</p> <p>*Sees need for bungalows or smaller/starter homes</p> <p>*Excellent document</p> <p>*Notes conflict between conservation and development</p> <p>*Sees little need for Strategic Gap</p>	<p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 1, also Note 18.</p> <p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 5.</p> <p>*Comment noted</p> <p>*Comment noted. The Plan takes serious account of the natural and historic built environment in its strategy (see, eg Natural Environment Policy 1 & Built Environment Policy 1).</p> <p>*Noted but disagree. The Strategic Gap is included to prevent coalescence of Middle and Upper Tysoe (Natural Environment Policy 6). The concept was highly valued in the draft Plan and received much positive feedback, although a small number of respondents wished to see ribbon development between Middle and Lower Tysoe. The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty only covers the east side of the road between Middle and Lower Tysoe and, although a significant designation, in itself is not a full</p>

		<p>*Feoffee would be good for affordable housing</p> <p>*How are green spaces chosen?</p> <p>*Objects to development in Area 3 for various reasons including newts</p>	<p>guarantee against future development. The NPG wished to enhance the protection of this gap on both sides of the road and this has been achieved by defining a Strategic Gap within the Plan. Note 28.</p> <p>* Agree but unfortunately not possible. The owner has ruled out the allocation of Feoffee Farm which is a small working farm (outbuildings and fields, but no dwelling) at the core of the village owned by the Tysoe Utility Trust which is a registered charity. Many respondents pointed out that part of this site would be an ideal location for a small number of affordable homes, particularly for the elderly. The Trustees have voted not to allow this to happen despite likely funding available to support such a venture. Sites can only be included in the plan if the owners agree. Note 24.</p> <p>*Local Green Spaces have been designated as being those areas which are local to the community and considered to be special or important on the basis of their beauty, history, recreational value or tranquillity (Natural Environment Policy 4). They should remain undeveloped in perpetuity in order to retain oases of open space and ‘green lungs’ within the village. The majority of these designations are in public ownership, but this is not essential. The ‘Local Green Space’ site assessments are referenced in the draft Plan. Note 29 and link to NPPF.</p> <p>*Objection noted but disagree. The Site assessment of Site 3 supports the allocation (Housing Policy 2). It was one of 16 possible sites looked at individually by the NPG and also independently by the Group’s planning consultant whose remit was to consider them strictly in planning terms. A number of criteria were used to assess each site including relevant planning history and constraints; the landscape and topography; drainage</p>
--	--	--	--

			and flooding; accessibility; the adjacent natural or historic built environment, and how any new build might fit into the existing settlement pattern and density. After due elimination, three sites were selected as appropriate locations, this being one, although there is no guarantee that planning permission would automatically be granted on any Allocated Site. The NPG is not aware of any new issue, but this would be picked up in any planning application. Notes 11 - 12.
10	Estate Agent	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nntRXztaQnUyDP81 *Complains of not being able to access minutes or receive information re. consultations	* Comment noted, but the NPG is not aware of any difficulty of this nature. All documents are available on the PC website. The NPG has made every effort to reach and listen to all elements of the community, publicising events with flyers, announcements and advertising. This comment is from an Oxford address outside the circulation area. The group has done its utmost to give residents and interested parties the opportunity to make comment and has considered public feedback carefully. Many of the comments made have felt that the Plan has been well put together and is clearly presented. See Consultation Statement Appendix 2 for timeline of meetings and consultations. Notes 8 - 9
11	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nwSs2WP_nAFC5hBI *Notes absence of data on housing density.	*Disagree. This resident cites Council for the Preservation of Rural England figures and argues that the Plan fails to take into account appropriate density of dwellings. Density is flagged up in the Plan in various places, notably Housing Policy 2 and Built Environment Policy 2 , as well as paras 4.1.0.5 and 4.2.0.1. One factor in determining the choice of Allocated Sites was the factor of density. The NPG believes this issue has been adequately taken into account. Notes 10 to 13.
12	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nwNFf0COGVEs8TGo *I like the draft in style and content	*Comment noted
13	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0ox9eG4JuABJ9SyMG *I think it would be a great pity if the three Tysoes were	*Agree, see Housing Policy 1

		split up	
14	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nwe3Zzg8SX5BtlQr</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Good spread of slow growth housing *The choice of reserve sites is appropriate *Strategic gap is essential *The NP is good and will ensure Tysoe is protected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Agree, see Housing Policy 2 *Agree, see Housing Policy 3 *Agree, see Natural Environment Policy 6 *Agree, the whole ethos of the Plan is to contain development, inhibit inappropriate development and retain those features of the natural and built environment that make Tysoe special.
15	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nwIFbU4yQPn6m9Ss</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *The two BUABS will send a clear message to developers *The plan reflects the views of residents for the future of the village, protection in some areas, small growth in others *Thoroughly researched and reflecting the historical, environmental and character 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Agree. The NPG anticipate this will inhibit uncontrolled and speculative development (Housing Policy 1) *Agree. One of the aims of the Plan is to ensure that any development is small scale and takes into account features of the natural and built environment (eg Housing Policy 2 and Built Environment Policy 1). *Comments noted, see Built Environment Policy 1 and Natural Environment Policy 1)
16	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nwEQg7yvi5bHmGrw</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *The inclusion of Lower Tysoe with its own BUAB is correct *Well balanced and clearly stated; a great plan *Absence of Feoffee is an opportunity missed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Agreed, see Housing Policy 1, also Note 15 *Comments noted * Agree, but unfortunately not possible. The owner has ruled out the allocation of Feoffee Farm which is a small working farm (outbuildings and fields, but no dwelling, at the core of the village) owned by the Tysoe Utility Trust which is a registered charity. Many respondents pointed out that part of this site would be an ideal location for a small number of affordable homes, particularly

			for the elderly. The Trustees have voted not to allow this to happen despite likely funding available to support such a venture. Sites can only be included in the plan if the owners agree. Note 24
17	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nwbUB3kxJTnL6eYI</p> <p>*Agree with smaller rather than larger development</p> <p>*Good to see three Tysoes together</p> <p>*Reflects the wishes of residents</p> <p>*Would like to see more grand designs and modern architecture</p>	<p>*Comment noted, see Housing Policy 2</p> <p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 1, also Note 18</p> <p>*Agree. A wide and comprehensive degree of consultation with residents has taken place over the five years. Notes 8 - 9</p> <p>*Agree, providing that such buildings are suited to the immediate built and natural environments. Apart from identifying Allocated Sites, the Plan can also specify construction materials according to a Village Design Statement and is open to support buildings which are of innovative design (Built Environment Policy 2). Note 4</p>
18	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nwiVFA-jGUx_mCsN</p> <p>*Agree that Lower Tysoe should be included</p> <p>*Congratulations on a great plan</p> <p>*Why is the prime site of Feoffee not used?</p>	<p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 1.</p> <p>*Comment noted.</p> <p>* Agree with sentiment, but unfortunately not possible. The owner has ruled out the allocation of Feoffee Farm which is a small working farm (outbuildings and fields, but no dwelling) at the core of the village) owned by the Tysoe Utility Trust which is a registered charity. Many respondents pointed out that part of this site would be an ideal location for a small number of affordable homes, particularly for the elderly. The Trustees have voted not to allow this to happen despite likely funding available to support such a venture. Sites can only be included in the plan if the owners agree. Note 24</p>
19	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nwBnkXTOgEzflpc9</p> <p>*A fantastic job</p>	<p>*Comment noted</p>

		<p>*Agree that Lower Tysoe should be seen as part of the whole</p> <p>*Agree need to avoid ‘Gladman-type’ developments. Agree need smaller houses with appropriate draining and build materials.</p>	<p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 1.</p> <p>*Agree. A focus on small-scale housing growth is a key feature of the Plan (Housing Policy 2) as is the need for smaller rather than larger ‘executive-style’ houses (Housing Policy 5). The Plan can identify those sites where development is to be resisted for historical, environmental or community reasons and specify construction materials according to a Village Design Statement (Built Environment Policy 2). Note 4.</p>
20	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nn9HhLESqPpcaonT</p> <p>*Agree need for affordable housing, not large executive types..</p> <p>*The village will die if it continues the way development is going</p>	<p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 5. Tysoe already has a greater proportion of larger houses than SDC’s Core Strategy defined housing mix. It is the intention of the Plan to rebalance this by recommending a preponderance of smaller dwellings. Numerous comments on the Plan express concern that there were no small or affordable housing schemes proposed in the Plan either for the elderly and young families. This now addressed in the Plan (Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6). From a commercial point of view small affordable houses are uneconomic to construct. The Group has pursued potential sites with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3 where the owner is now seriously considering an affordable scheme. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme. Note 22</p> <p>*Agree. The Plan aims to prevent this from happening by allowing the local community to decide the nature, density and specified number of new dwellings and their preferred locations within defined BUABS (Housing Policy 1 and 2). The Plan can also identify those sites where development is to be resisted for historical, environmental or community reasons and specify construction</p>

			materials according to a Village Design Statement (Built Environment Policy 1 and 2). This is the best way of avoiding the unplanned and speculative development that has already been seen in the village. Importantly, the Plan also includes a number of heritage, environment and community based policies covering a range of local issues. Note 4.
21	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oyASioW1q31m9Z0C *Extremely informative for Tysoe	*Comment noted
22	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nn3d2VsMJ46C3RN2 *The number of 4/5 bed houses should be restricted. *Affordable houses should be priority over Reserve Sites	*Agree. Tysoe already has a greater proportion of larger houses than SDC’s Core Strategy defined housing mix. It is the intention of the Plan to rebalance this by recommending a preponderance of smaller dwellings (Housing Policy 5). *Comment noted. Both are needed. The Group has pursued potential sites for affordable housing with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3. Affordable housing is unlikely to be created in the commercial market but para 6.3.0.6 of the Plan (Housing Policy 2) now sees affordable housing potentially being developed on one of these. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme. Reserve sites are also necessary; these sites are those identified as being a possible “safety valve” in the case where SDC cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Reserve sites would only be released for development in very specific circumstances (SDC Core Strategy CS16) or they may be released if a suitable Rural Exception Scheme were proposed on them. If the circumstances under which Reserve Sites would be released for development were triggered then, in the absence of a Reserve Site identified in the Plan, it is likely that SDC would allocate one through the Site Allocation Plan (currently being prepared); equally a developer might apply to build in a place unwelcome to the community. Hence whilst it is not prescribed

		<p>*6 months not long enough to be classed as a ‘resident’</p>	<p>that villages should identify Reserve Sites it is highly recommended that they do. The NPG believes it is better for the local community to be in control of where development should be located rather than to leave it to others. Notes 21-26.</p> <p>*Comment taken into account. This criterion (and others) has now been removed. They pertain to the Rural Exception Scheme (Housing Policy 4) and no longer apply. In these schemes allocation of housing depends on need and qualifying connection to the Parish but can also be made available more widely. Note 23</p>
23	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oyHWmdpQzufTY7dx *Queries the line of the BUAB across frontage of the respondent’s dwelling.</p>	<p>*This resident was concerned with the line of the new BUAB across the frontage of her dwelling. It transpired that the scale of the plan and the location of physical boundaries had caused some confusion. The resident was reassured after an on-site discussion with members of the Group and no changes were made. Note 16</p>
24	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oCLTbFtVKNgs553b *Strategic gap important</p> <p>*Agree that Roses Farm should be a reserve site.</p> <p>*Well presented and covers most of the issues. Time, effort and thought have gone into its preparation.</p> <p>*Access concern re sites 2 and 3</p>	<p>*Agree, see Natural Environment Policy 6.</p> <p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 3.</p> <p>*Comments noted</p> <p>*Concerns noted but these were two of the 16 possible sites chosen by the NPG and also by the Group’s independent planning consultant whose remit was to consider the 16 sites strictly in planning terms. (Housing Policy 2). A number of criteria were used to assess each site including relevant planning history and constraints; the landscape and topography; drainage, flooding and access. Any development on these sites would require progress through normal planning procedures in which issues of access would also be considered. Notes 11 and 12</p>

<p>25</p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oCNONTeNCw-DGoEz</p> <p>*The plan calls for small buildings but three sites are allocated which will end up having larger houses</p> <p>*Sites 2 and 3 will be combined into a mass development</p> <p>*Roses Farm is unsuitable for traffic reasons</p>	<p>* Disagree. Tysoe already has a greater proportion of larger houses than SDC’s Core Strategy defined housing mix. It is the intention of the Plan to rebalance this by recommending a preponderance of smaller dwellings (Housing Policy 5). The Plan cannot control what future planning applications may include regarding type of housing, but Housing Policy 5 indicates what the PC will support. Notes 11 to 13.</p> <p>*Disagree. The two sites are close to each other but are geographically distinct and can be accessed separately. The NPG agrees, however, that there will be a concentration on new dwellings in this area (see Plan Map 8) but this is one of the few places in the village where development is feasible. Moreover, site 3 has the potential for much-needed affordable housing (see Housing Policy 2 para 6.3.0.6). Note 22.</p> <p>*Disagree. There a number of comments on this particular topic which may result from a flyer distributed by an independent resident (see comment 77). The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the NPG believe it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the Built up Area Boundary. There are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access and traffic. Note 21</p>
-----------	-----------------	--	---

		*The Plan is not deliverable in any way	*Disagree. The Group believes there is every reason that the Plan is deliverable. It has developed from wide consultation and engagement over a period of five years (see Appendix 2).
26	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oCR8jgUAJUr-lik6 *The Group has no authority to include Reserve Sites. They should be removed.	*Disagree. The justification for including reserve sites in the Plan is explained in Housing Policy 3 and the NPG believes that it is prudent to include them. If the circumstances under which Reserve Sites would be released for development were triggered then, in the absence of a Reserve Site identified in the Plan, it is likely that SDC would allocate one through the Site Allocation Plan (currently being prepared); equally a developer might apply to build in a place unwelcome to the community. So, whilst it is not prescribed that villages should identify Reserve Sites it is highly recommended that they do. It is considered better for the local community to be in control of where development should be located rather than to leave it to others. It should be remembered that any development of a Reserve Site would (a) only occur in the event of the housing supply not being met, and (b) would always be subject to the normal planning rules which, if they were not met, would prevent permission being granted. Notes 20 - 21
27	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oCU5F-HfQ8rvHOTd *Roses farm is inappropriate. Access is dangerous and there are too many cars in the village	*Disagree. There a number of comments on this particular topic which may result from a flyer distributed by an independent resident (see comment 77). The Plan explains the rationale for Reserve Sites and the NPG believe it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the Built up Area Boundary; there are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council's Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated.

		<p>*The village is being spoiled</p>	<p>In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access and traffic. Note 21. The issue of too many cars in the village is an effect of too many houses and too great an emphasis on commuting. The Plan proposes to constrain new building growth to an acceptable organic level (Housing Policy 1) and to encourage working from home (Employment Policy 2).</p> <p>*Comments noted. The NPG is in agreement in ‘Keeping Tysoe Special’. The entire Plan and all its policies are focused to this end. The ‘spoiling’ is from inappropriate building. The Plan, through its policies, (eg Housing Policy 2 and Built Environment Policy 2) will provide the necessary constraints.</p>
28	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oCaUxIQVXuVKfSVH *The reserves sites are well chosen <i>contra</i> to the flyer that was distributed which contained misinformation *Well thought out and comprehensive</p>	<p>*Comments noted, see Housing Policy 3 *Comment noted</p>
29	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oCeLj5wCbL3LNDs *It makes sense to bring Lower Tysoe into the whole group *A well considered document which reflects hard work and thought</p>	<p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 1 . *Comment noted</p>
30	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oCgdn_ZHXsJt1WgN *Roses Farm is unsuitable for affordable houses. *Young families would need to travel across the village to school causing more traffic.</p>	<p>*Disagree. Roses Farm is especially suited to affordable housing. It has the benefit of a landowner (Compton Estates) who is prepared to construct a proportion of affordable housing and manage the rental arrangements in perpetuity. Note 21 *There a number of comments on this particular topic which may result from a flyer distributed by an independent resident (see comment 77). The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all</p>

			<p>options. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. Moreover, the Roses Farm owner (Compton Estates) also owns the surrounding properties and, if development were to be permitted, believe they could design vehicle access into the scheme which would meet Highways Authority’s requirements. Pedestrian access could also be obtained via the footpath (suitably upgraded) which currently runs through the orchard and allotments to Shenington Road where it would connect to a metalled pavement. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of vehicle access and traffic as well as safe pedestrian movement. Note 21</p>
31	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oCIXWTAislcqW2ps *Houses should not be built on Roses farm which is a conservation area. Also the roads are unsuitable.</p>	<p>*Disagree. There a number of comments on this particular topic which may result from a flyer distributed by an independent resident (see comment 77). The Plan explains the rationale for Reserve Sites and the NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB; there are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. The resident is correct in pointing out that Roses Farm falls within a Conservation Area. However, any development that might take place would need to conform to appropriate design and materials defined by the Plan (Built Environment Policies 1 and 2). The issue of traffic here has been raised on a number of occasions, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access and traffic (Note 21).</p>

		*Lack of infrastructure for new houses	*Comment noted. The Plan is a Parish-wide exercise and not confined to the main populated areas (Note 5). One aim of the Plan is to ensure that the level of new build is not detrimental to the existing community assets and infrastructure (Community Assets Policy 1). Limiting the number of new houses is a key element in preventing this from happening (Housing Policy 1).
32	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oCpLpMQgluB12cX *Roses Farm is wholly inappropriate	*Disagree. There a number of comments on this particular topic which may result from a flyer distributed by an independent resident (see comment 77). The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the NPG believe it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB; there are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Note 20 and 21
33	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oCutE1OvBJ-2In_Y *Roses farm development would cause undue traffic safety issues	*Disagree. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council's Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access and traffic. Moreover, the Roses Farm owner (Compton Estates) also owns the surrounding properties and, if development were to be permitted, believe they could design vehicle access into the scheme which would meet Highways Authority's requirements. Pedestrian access could also be obtained via the footpath (suitably upgraded) which currently runs through the orchard and allotments to Shenington Road where it would connect to a metalled pavement. Note 21
34	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oCyXuixV4zGdDG_Z *The promise of low cost housing for first time buyers just does not happen	*Agree. This is why the Plan makes every effort to find ways of addressing the problem through potential Rural Exception

			Schemes (Housing Policy 4) and the proposed market housing mix (Housing Policy 5). The Group has also pursued potential sites for affordable housing with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3. Affordable housing is unlikely to be created in the commercial market but para 6.3.0.6 of the Plan (Housing Policy 2) now sees affordable housing potentially being developed on one of these. Note 26
35	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oC3Q_6wKnM0DPvt3 *Poolgate, Windmill Way, Jeffs Close etc were all built on green fields. How hypocritical can it be to complain</p>	<p>*Comments noted. New build in the village is inevitable, not optional. SDC, which is the Local Planning Authority, has developed a Core Strategy which points to the need to create new homes throughout the District during the period 2011 - 2031. One of the ways it proposes to do this is to share development throughout its LSV of which Tysoe is one (Note 1). The developments cited by the resident were all of relatively substantial scale. One of the aims of the Plan is to prevent further developments on that scale and adopt a policy of supporting small organic infill development instead (Housing Policy 1).</p>
36	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oC5-B7ng_Yf4mV7E *I like the strong connection with agriculture in the plan</p> <p>*Thank you for the time and care that has gone into this plan</p> <p>*Traffic is such that new builds need to be kept to a minimum</p>	<p>*Agree. One of the aims of the Plan is to maintain the rural atmosphere of the village and ensure that its historic connection with the landscape is preserved and fostered (Natural Environment Policies 1 and 5; Built Environment Policy 1). In addition, a housing policy that can provide affordable housing for local agricultural workers and their families is seen as being essential (Housing Policies 4 and 5)</p> <p>*Comment noted</p> <p>*Agree. The issue of too many cars in the village is an effect of too many houses and too great an emphasis on commuting. The Plan proposes to constrain new building growth to an acceptable</p>

			organic level (Housing Policy 1) and to encourage working from home (Employment Policy 2).
37	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oC8mtahdhAhuXm6m *Roses Farm should not be developed for historic, environmental and Conservation Area reasons	*Disagree. There a number of comments on this particular topic which may result from a flyer distributed by an independent resident (see comment 77). The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB; there are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. The resident is correct in pointing out that Roses Farm falls within a Conservation Area. However, any development that might take place would need to conform to appropriate design and materials defined by the Plan (Built Environment Policies 1 and 2) as well as the Plan’s environmental requirements (eg Natural Environment Policy 1). Any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of these policies. Note 21
38	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oDAXH_1fTOFKHu-j *Roses Farm unsuitable on traffic grounds	* Disagree. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access and traffic. Moreover, the Roses Farm owner (Compton Estates) also owns the surrounding properties and, if development were to be permitted, believe they could design vehicle access into the scheme which would meet Highways Authority’s requirements. Pedestrian access could also be obtained via the footpath (suitably upgraded) which currently runs through the orchard and allotments to Shenington Road where it would connect to a

		<p>*Believes the strategic gap should be used for development</p>	<p>metalled pavement. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of vehicle access and traffic as well as safe pedestrian movement. Note 21</p> <p>*Noted but disagree. The Strategic Gap is included to prevent coalescence of Middle and Upper Tysoe (Natural Environment Policy 6). The concept was highly valued in the draft Plan and received much positive feedback, although a small number of respondents wished to see ribbon development between Middle and Lower Tysoe. The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty only covers the east side of the road between Middle and Lower Tysoe and, although a significant designation, in itself is not a full guarantee against future development. The NPG wished to enhance the protection of this gap on both sides of the road and this has been achieved by defining a Strategic Gap within the Plan. Note 28.</p>
39	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oDG9J8qxWpRVqbhG Development of Herberts Farm would spoil an architecturally pleasing area</p>	<p>* Disagree. The justification for including reserve sites in the Plan is explained in Housing Policy 3 and the NPG believe that it is prudent to include Reserve Sites. Housing Policy 3 explains that the development of Herbert’s Farm would not necessarily affect the operation of the farm and any planning application would have to take account of the listed buildings and Conservation Area concerns (Note 21). Moreover, the importance of retaining the integrity of the historic environment is flagged up in Built Environment Policy 1, and the requirement to build using appropriate materials and design in Built Environment Policy 2.</p>
40	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oDIsgdLBkqPtKXJl *Agrees that Lower Tysoe should take its share of the housing, being part of the same Parish as Middle and</p>	<p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 1</p>

		Upper Tysoe. *A good draft plan. Well done	*Comment noted
41	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oDNq04bFbUsM6P3j *Lower Tysoe should be see as part of the main village and take its share of building. *Congratulations to the NPG for a good draft plan *Feoffee should remain a farm and would be a good starter base for a young farming entrant.	*Agree, see Housing Policy 1 *Comment noted *Comment noted. This is a valid opinion and does much to support the concept of retaining a strong agricultural presence in the village (Employment Policy 1). There is also an argument to suggest that the site should be used for affordable housing for which there is a strong need (eg see comment from resident 9 and others), although this is now no longer an option (Note 24).
42	Resident	https://1drv.ms/w/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oEfl1kplk4ub7STO * Lower Tysoe should not be part of the LSV with its own BUAB	*Comments noted but disagree. Residents of Lower Tysoe enjoy easy access to the ‘central’ facilities located in Middle Tysoe via well maintained footpaths, a newly resurfaced pavement or by a short distance on the road (by cycle or car) (Note 18). The Group sees Lower Tysoe as much a part of the village as the other two settlements and this reflects the views of over 70% of the respondents in the 2014 survey (Appendix 3). Many other comments question why Lower Tysoe should remain outside the village and be treated in some ways differently from Middle and Upper Tysoe. The view that a BUAB in Lower Tysoe will be detrimental to planning there is unsupported. Whilst the principle of new development would be acceptable within the BUAB, the fact that the Boundary has been drawn in the way proposed would limit building opportunities to small infill or conversion schemes (Note 19). Currently, Lower Tysoe, being defined as a rural hamlet, enjoys a level of protection from new building afforded by a presumption against development except in well defined

		<p>*Lack of recognition of SDC communication (John Careford email)</p> <p>*Lack of clear and accurate consultation.</p>	<p>circumstances. It should be pointed out that this has not prevented some eleven dwellings being granted planning permission there since 2011. It is the opinion of the Group that drawing Lower Tysoe into the Local Service Village and providing it with its own BUAB will afford it greater protection than previously (Housing Policy 1). The Plan proposes that only three dwellings should be built there until 2031.</p> <p>*Disagree. The resident makes a partial and incomplete quote from an SDC email part of which, not cited by the resident, expresses an alternative viewpoint and outcome. Note 17</p> <p>*Disagree. The Timeline (Appendix 2) details the extent of the publicity, consultation, survey, advertising and information available over the last five years. Three draft Plans have been produced, each being informed by public comment as well as by meetings with local amenity groups and clubs, local landowners and local businesses. The Group meets formally on average monthly. These meetings have been open to the public and minutes are posted on the village notice board and on the Parish website. An update on the Plan has been delivered to the Parish Council at public meetings on a monthly basis since 2014 and a record covering consultations and meetings is held on a database. Many of the comments made have felt that the Plan has been well put together and is clearly presented. Notes 8 and 9</p>
43	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0ow6ugTAD7GPvW4Uj</p> <p>*Recognises need for affordable housing</p>	<p><i>This is an A-level project, as opposed to specific comments on the Plan, but presents an interesting and valuable view on the Plan's content nevertheless.</i></p> <p>*Agree. Numerous comments on the Plan express concern that there were no small or affordable housing schemes proposed in the Plan either for the elderly and young families. This now</p>

		<p>*Lack of public consultation using social media</p> <p>*Skewed demographic of those who attend meetings</p>	<p>addressed in the Plan (Housing Policy 2; para 6.3.0.6). From a commercial point of view small affordable houses are uneconomic to construct. The Group has pursued potential sites with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3 where the owner is seriously considering an affordable scheme. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme. Note 22</p> <p>*Only partly agree. On reflection the use of social media has probably been underplayed but may be a reflection of the older age profile of a community which tends to be unfamiliar with many common social media platforms. This age demographic was evident in the Parish Plan of 2010 (Appendix 1) and supported by the Housing Needs Survey (Appendix 5) where 72% of the respondent were 45 years of age or older. The importance of social media has since been recognised and will play a larger part in publicising the run up to the potential referendum.</p> <p>*Agree in part, although there are no objective figures to support this. The NPG believes this partly a product of the age demographic (see note above). Members of the public who regularly attend <i>evening</i> meetings tend to be those who find time to do so or who have a specific interest. That said, when consultations or presentations take place at weekends (as opposed to evenings) attendances are much greater and more varied in profile (see attendance figures in the timeline (Appendix 2)).</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>44</p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0ow-1FCXxn_2AVMYI</p> <p>*The Plan does not take into account landscape sensitivity with archaeological/historical implications</p> <p>*No evidence for Lower Tysoe to be part of the LSV or having its own BUAB</p>	<p>*Disagree. The Plan not only uses Warwickshire County Council Historic Environment Records (HER) data but also enhanced this record by undertaking its own field survey on both ridge and furrow quality throughout the Parish. The Plan updates areas of archaeological interest and also includes new geophysical survey data. The work underpins Maps 2 and 3 in the Plan. This supplements the existing HER record of archaeological sites and monuments which includes designated listed buildings and their settings, scheduled ancient monuments and Conservation Areas (Built Environment Policy 1)</p> <p>*Comments noted but disagree. Residents of Lower Tysoe enjoy easy access to the ‘central’ facilities located in Middle Tysoe via well maintained footpaths, a newly resurfaced pavement or by a short distance on the road (by cycle or car) (Note 18). The Group sees Lower Tysoe as much a part of the village as the other two settlements and this reflects the views of over 70% of the respondents in the 2014 survey (Appendix 3). Many other comments question why Lower Tysoe should remain outside the village and be treated in some ways differently from Middle and Upper Tysoe. The view that a BUAB in Lower Tysoe will be detrimental to planning there is unsupported. Whilst the principle of new development would be acceptable within the BUAB, the fact that the Boundary has been drawn in the way proposed would limit building opportunities to small infill or conversion schemes (Note 19). Currently, Lower Tysoe, being defined as a rural hamlet, enjoys a level of protection from new building afforded by a presumption against development except in well defined circumstances. It should be pointed out that this has not prevented some eleven dwellings being granted planning permission there since 2011. It is the opinion of the Group that drawing Lower Tysoe into the LSV and providing it with its own BUAB will afford it</p>
-----------	-----------------	--	--

		<p>*There should be no Allocated Site S of Orchards</p> <p>*Roses Farm should not be a reserved site</p> <p>*Community Orchard should not be a Green Space without owner’s approval</p>	<p>greater protection that previously (Housing Policy 1). The Plan proposes that only three dwellings should be built there until 2031.</p> <p>*Disagree. Sixteen possible sites were identified within the two BUABS as being available for development. They were assessed individually by the NPG and also independently by the Group’s planning consultant whose remit was to consider them strictly in planning terms. A number of criteria were used to assess each site including relevant planning history and constraints, the landscape and topography, drainage and flooding, accessibility, the adjacent natural or historic built environment, and how any new build might fit into the existing settlement pattern and density. As a result three sites were selected as appropriate locations for future development, this being one. Between them they provide capacity for approximately 18 dwellings. The full 16 site assessments are all in the public domain and are referenced in the Plan. Notes 10 – 13</p> <p>*Disagree. There are a number of comments on this particular topic which may result from a flyer distributed by an independent resident (see comment 77). The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the NPG/PC believe it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the Built up Area Boundary; there are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access and traffic, pedestrian movement and the fact that the site lies within a Conservation Area. Note 21.</p> <p>*Agree. This site was originally identified as a Local Green Space but, subsequent to discussions with the land owner (Compton</p>
--	--	---	--

			Estates), has been withdrawn as they were uncomfortable with it being designated as a Green Space in perpetuity. Note 29
45	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oxDmmeQ-ql1K91HN</p> <p>*Supportive of home offices and similar</p> <p>*Supportive of ‘dark skies’, valued landscapes and community assets</p> <p>*Housing Needs Survey needs to be revisited</p> <p>*Resists the suggestion that there should be an allocation of a certain number of houses</p> <p>*Thought should be given to affordable rental accommodation</p> <p>*Lower Tysoe should not be in the LSV</p>	<p>*Agree, see Employment Policy 2</p> <p>*Agree, see Natural Environment Policies 1, 2 and 5; Community Assets Policy 1 (now enhanced to include the Methodist Church and facilities).</p> <p>*Disagree. The Housing Needs Survey was undertaken in 2016 and has to be viewed as a snapshot in time. Review as such was carried out in 2019 on the basis of waiting lists (para 3.3.4) and incorporated in Housing Policy 5.</p> <p>*Comment noted. No allocation of a specific number of houses has been made. The Plan makes clear that the number of new dwellings proposed is a reflection of existing small scale organic growth as opposed to any specified or allocated ‘target’ (Housing Policy 2). Note 3</p> <p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 5. Numerous comments on the Plan express concern that there were no small or affordable housing schemes proposed in the Plan either for the elderly and young families. This now addressed in the Plan (Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6). Roses Farm is also especially suited to affordable housing. It has the benefit of a landowner (Compton Estates) who is prepared to construct a proportion of affordable housing and manage the rental arrangements in perpetuity. Note 21</p> <p>*Comments noted but disagree. Residents of Lower Tysoe enjoy easy access to the ‘central’ facilities located in Middle Tysoe via well maintained footpaths, a newly resurfaced pavement or by a short distance on the road (by cycle or car) (Note 18). The Group</p>

		<p>*There should be no BUABs anywhere</p> <p>*The NDP concept is flawed</p>	<p>sees Lower Tysoe as much a part of the village as the other two settlements and this reflects the views of over 70% of the respondents in the 2014 survey (Appendix 3). Many other comments question why Lower Tysoe should remain outside the village and be treated in some ways differently from Middle and Upper Tysoe.</p> <p>*Disagree. BUABs are an essential tool in limiting settlement expansion (Housing Policy 1). Without them the three Tysoes would lie exposed to speculative development of unwelcome size and density. This would be to the potential detriment of both the natural and built environment as well as to community infrastructure. Note 14</p> <p>*Disagree. The implementation of a Neighbourhood Plan provides an enhanced level of protection against unwanted development. It takes into account the values a community places on character and environment. Note 4</p>
46	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/x/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oEohuGtF8Kztnb_f</p> <p>*Lower Tysoe should be part of the LSV</p> <p>*Supports the need for smaller houses</p> <p>*Both Roses Farm and Herbert’s Farm are suitable for housing.</p> <p>*Excellent and well presented</p>	<p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 1, also Note 18.</p> <p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 5.</p> <p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 3. Although each site poses certain problems, these are not considered insurmountable and there are few other options in the village where Reserve Sites can be found. Notes 20 and 21.</p> <p>*Comment noted.</p>
47	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oxGe2dbZRvYfLpu8</p> <p>*Supports green space, limited development and strategic gap and other environmental factors; broadband development; historical environment</p>	<p>*Comments noted. The Plan is committed to supporting all aspects of the environment including green spaces (Natural Environment Policy 4), the strategic gap (Natural Environment Policy 6), and</p>

		<p>*Supports Roses farm, less so Herbert’s Farm. Using Herbert’s Farm as a reserve site does not chime with maintaining village farms</p> <p>*Lack of consultation; current NP group secretive; critical of ?PC’s responses to comments</p>	<p>preservation of the Historic Environment (Built Environment Policy 1). Improved internet connectivity will support home working and cut down commuting (Employment Policy 2).</p> <p>*Comments noted. The justification for including reserve sites in the Plan is explained in Housing Policy 3. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. The NPG, assisted by the planning consultant, have assessed that both these sites are suitable. Contrary to some comments, Herbert’s Farm would continue to be a working farm even if development took place. The present outbuildings and byres could be moved further west thus ensuring that the village still possessed an active farm close to its centre. Notes 21 and 22</p> <p>*Disagree. The Timeline (Appendix 2, also Consultation Statement section 5) details the extent of the publicity, consultation, survey, advertising and information available over the last five years. Three draft Plans have been produced, each being informed by public comment as well as by meetings with local amenity groups and clubs, local landowners and local businesses. The Group meets formally on average monthly. These meetings have been open to the public and minutes are posted on the village notice board and on the Parish website. An update on the Plan has been delivered to the Parish Council at public meetings on a monthly basis since 2014 and a record covering consultations and meetings is held on a database. Every effort has been made to ensure that feedback from consultations has been both accurate and adequate, although changes among the volunteers working on the Plan over the five years may have resulted in occasional discontinuity. Many of the comments made have felt that the Plan has been well put together and is clearly presented. Notes 6 to 9</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>*Issues of infrastructure</p> <p>*Why is Feoffee mentioned?</p> <p>*Critical of ridge and furrow definition</p> <p>*‘Wild life areas’ definition?</p> <p>*Objects to Lower Tysoe as part of LSV and with its own BUAB</p>	<p>*Comment noted. The Group believes that the matter is adequately covered in the various policies in the Plan. The Plan is a Parish-wide exercise and not confined to the main populated areas (Note 5). One aim of the Plan is to ensure that the level of new build does is not detrimental to existing community assets and infrastructure (Community Assets Policy 1). Limiting the number of new houses is a key element in preventing this from happening (Housing Policy 1).</p> <p>*Comment noted. Feoffee farm has been taken out of the Plan as the land owner (Tysoe Utility Trust) was unwilling to make it available for affordable housing. Note 24.</p> <p>*Comment noted. This field of exceptional ridge and furrow has subsequently been destroyed by the development mentioned by the resident. One of the aims of the Plan is to prevent this from happening in the future.</p> <p>*Comment noted. Map 6 in the Draft Plan illustrates features of the natural environment and its biodiversity. This map has been downloaded directly from Warwickshire County Council’s website and is the result of the work of the Warwickshire Wildlife Trust commencing in 1999. There are no ‘designations’ as such, statutory or otherwise. The places denoted are simply those which flag up areas or points of interest.</p> <p>*Comments noted but disagree. Residents of Lower Tysoe enjoy easy access to the ‘central’ facilities located in Middle Tysoe via well maintained footpaths, a newly resurfaced pavement or by a short distance on the road (by cycle or car) (Note 18). The Group sees Lower Tysoe as much a part of the village as the other two settlements and this reflects the views of over 70% of the respondents in the 2014 survey (Appendix 3). Many other</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>comments question why Lower Tysoe should remain outside the village and be treated in some ways differently from Middle and Upper Tysoe. The view that a BUAB in Lower Tysoe will be detrimental to planning there is unsupported. Whilst the principle of new development would be acceptable within the BUAB, the fact that the Boundary has been drawn in the way proposed would limit building opportunities to small infill or conversion schemes (Note 19). Currently, Lower Tysoe, being defined as a rural hamlet, enjoys a level of protection from new building afforded by a presumption against development except in well defined circumstances. It should be pointed out that this has not prevented some eleven dwellings being granted planning permission there since 2011. It is the opinion of the Group that drawing Lower Tysoe into the Local Service Village and providing it with its own Built up Area Boundary will afford it greater protection than previously (Housing Policy 1). The Plan proposes that only three dwellings should be built there until 2031.</p>
48		<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oE2GivARfym52J-j *Stratford-on-Avon's Core Strategy document (<i>Sustainable development</i>)</p>	<p>*Appendix to 51 below, noted.</p>
49		<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oE7s7rXrwaxGm2G7 *Stratford-on-Avon's Core Strategy document (<i>Distribution of development</i>)</p>	<p>*Appendix to 51 below, noted..</p>
50		<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oE8vK1I7RBM_rf-Z *Stratford-on-Avon's Core Strategy document (<i>Countryside and Villages</i>)</p>	<p>*Appendix to 51 below, noted.</p>
51	Resident Group (19 Names)	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oxLb4UFhEnWJAF77 9 Pages of objections by Lower Tysoe Local Environment Group (LTLEG), plus appendices (nos 48-50 above). They object to the following: *Development in Lower Tysoe is not sustainable</p>	<p>*Disagree. The facilities in Tysoe (shops, school, church etc.) are, in</p>

		<p>*Lack of consultation and evidence</p>	<p>practice, no more distant from the settlement of Lower Tysoe than they are from Upper Tysoe. Residents access them by well maintained footpaths, metalled pavements and by road. No such objections were raised when planning permission was granted for the 11 houses that have been built or granted permission in the last 7 years. Para 78 of the NPPF (Feb 2019) states that “housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”. The NPG considers that a small amount of development in Lower Tysoe would meet this aspiration as it would support the facilities in Tysoe. Site 1 is within easy walking distance of the school and shops in Middle Tysoe.</p> <p>* Disagree. Virtually the only objections raised against the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in the LSV have come from a small (circa 20) number of residents in Lower Tysoe who live adjacent to allocated Site 1. Their assertion that the conclusions of the NPG are not based on sound or robust evidence of consultation with the community is refuted by the NPG. All Parish residents have been given ample opportunity to discuss and comment on the Plan. The Timeline (Appendix 2) identifies all of the public meetings at which residents have had the opportunity to raise concerns. The contention that residents were not fully aware of what they were voting on in the 2014 Plan Questionnaire is misleading. Residents have consistently expressed the view that “Tysoe” comprises the three settlements – Upper, Middle and Lower Tysoe – see the many comments in this document supporting that view. The NPG maintains that this sentiment is best realised by the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in its own BUAB in the same way that Upper and Middle Tysoe are treated. The LTLEG rejected the offer by the NPG to meet them to discuss this matter and have consistently avoided open debate on the subject .</p>
52	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0vjUX1Q7KJdLrHLmo</p>	

	<p>This is a 25 page submission plus substantial appendices. The respondent objects to virtually every aspect of the Plan identifying only 1 of the 138 paragraphs and 5 of the 21 policies with which he has no significant objection. The submission is made on behalf of a number of residents of Lower Tysoe. The main themes of the respondent’s objections can be found on pages 2 and 3 of the submission and are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Lack of a “vision” for Tysoe *Large sections of the Plan contain inaccurate information and aims which cannot be delivered. *Much space in the Plan is devoted to the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in the LSV without any decision having apparently been made by the PC or NPG. *The evidence to support the proposal regarding Lower Tysoe is inaccurate or misleading and no attempt has been made to explain the arguments for and against the proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Disagree. The entire Plan is a statement of what the residents of the entire parish feel is important to them, what they value, how it should be protected and what kind of development might be supported in the period to 2031. *Disagree. The NPG does not recognise this characterisation of the Plan. After many reviews, often by experienced and qualified planning professionals the NPG are satisfied that the Plan is accurate and deliverable in all material respects. *Disagree. All of the policies in the Plan are proposals which will eventually be voted on by the residents of the parish at a referendum. Therefore, whilst the proposed policies have been decided upon by the NPG and PC the ultimate decision will be made by the residents. Given the importance of this matter (the proposed change in planning status of Lower Tysoe) the NPG do not believe that too much space is taken in the Plan. *Disagree. The matter of the inclusion of Lower Tysoe is extensively discussed in both the Plan itself and in the Consultation Statement and has been included in both pre-submission Plans before that. The majority of parish residents support the inclusion of Lower Tysoe (see results of the 2014 village questionnaire, Appendix 3.3). The matter is covered in the Plan in paragraphs
--	---	---

		<p>*The Housing Policy within the Plan, to deliver approximately 18 new houses and to have reserve sites for 21 more houses, is dependent on Lower Tysoe being part of the LSV. This development is not sustainable.</p> <p>*The change of planning status for Lower Tysoe is contrary to the NPPF and to SDC’s Planning Policies. SDC regard this as a fundamental change.</p> <p>*The change in planning status of Lower Tysoe would lead to it becoming “eligible for housing developments on a scale and number not currently possible”. Respondent cites recent applications for 12 houses asserting that they may have been approved if Lower Tysoe’s status had been changed.</p>	<p>3.3.1.2 and 4.1.0.1 to 4.1.0.6 and in the Consultation Statement, section 5.5. The NPG has carefully considered the matter of the inclusion of Lower Tysoe and the proposed change in planning status that this would mean. The protection afforded to Lower Tysoe by having its own BUAB are well argued and supported in the Plan. A very significant amount of discussion about this subject has taken place during public consultations and meetings.</p> <p>*Disagree. The only contribution expected from Lower Tysoe, other than from planning permissions already granted, comes from Site 1 which is identified as having capacity for approximately 3 houses. There is no reserve site identified in Lower Tysoe.</p> <p>*Disagree. Whilst the change in status may be regarded as fundamental SDC have, in their comments to the proposal in the pre-submission Plan, expressed satisfaction with the rationale for including Lower Tysoe in the LSV. Also, the NPG believe that small-scale development in Lower Tysoe meets the objectives of NPPF (Feb 2019) para 78 which states that “housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”.</p> <p>*Disagree. With the proposed BUAB only development within the BUAB should be considered for approval (except for Rural Exception schemes). The NPG maintains that the BUAB does not allow for other than very limited in-fill or conversion schemes other than on Site 1 which is identified for approximately 3 houses. The planning applications cited do not support the respondent’s argument – an application for 7 houses on Site 1 was refused (now at appeal) largely on the grounds of over-development, an objection that would probably be sustained even if it were within a BUAB. The application for 5 houses was on a site outside the proposed BUAB and was rejected (also now at appeal) on grounds</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>*Lower Tysoe would become eligible for a Rural Exception scheme if its status were changed.</p> <p>*Lower Tysoe could face development of 50 houses under the Plan’s current proposals.</p> <p>*The Plan’s explanations for its policies are misleading</p> <p>*It is not clear how the Plan’s aims and policies reflect the comments made on the first draft (May 2017)</p> <p>*There has been no valid consultation with Lower Tysoe residents about the proposed change to its status.</p>	<p>which are likely to have prevailed were Lower Tysoe to be included in the proposed BUAB.</p> <p>*Agree. An application for a Rural Exception scheme could be presented. Any scheme would be subject to normal planning review and would have to conform to the Plan’s policies regarding local characteristics. The parish’s affordable housing requirement will be partially met by Site 3 and it is not clear that a development on the edge of Lower Tysoe would be attractive to a developer. It is not clear why the respondent believes that a Rural Exception scheme would be damaging to Lower Tysoe or the parish as a whole.</p> <p>*Disagree. It is not at all clear where the respondent has found evidence to support this assertion. Any such developments would be subject to planning regulations and would need to comply with the Plan’s policies on maintaining character etc.</p> <p>*Disagree. The policies and their explanations have been included in the Plan through 2 pre-submission versions both of which have been extensively reviewed by qualified planning professionals and they reflect any suggested changes made by those reviews.</p> <p>*The Submission Plan reflects the cumulative adoption of all appropriate suggested drafting points made by consultees to both pre-submission Plans (May 2017, July 2018).</p> <p>*Disagree. The Timeline (Appendix 2) identifies 138 occasions (PC meetings, NPG meetings, village consultations, drop-in sessions etc.) since the beginning of 2014 when residents have been given the opportunity to make their concerns known, ask questions and discuss the policies in the emerging Plan. In addition residents have taken the opportunity to submit comments on 2 pre-submission</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>*Inaccurate and misleading information was given to residents in November 2016.</p> <p>*Since November 2016 no properly conducted consultations have been held. NPG meetings have restricted questions and comments.</p> <p>*Decisions taken by the NPG about the inclusion of Lower Tysoe have been pre-determined.</p> <p>*The process of preparing the Plan has not followed government guidelines</p> <p>*The NPG have not always complied with the Terms of Reference as agreed with the Parish Council</p> <p>*Attempts by residents to gain NPG and PC support to ensure that residents are properly informed about matters relevant to the preparation of the Plan have been refused or ignored.</p>	<p>Plans (May 2017 and July 2018).</p> <p>*Disagree. The NPG is not aware of any misleading or inaccurate information having been given to residents at any meeting.</p> <p>*Disagree. The Timeline (Appendix 2) identifies village consultation meetings / drop-in sessions in June 2017 (two on the May 2017 Plan during the 6 week public consultation period) and in July, Aug and Sept 2018 during the 10 week consultation period on the July 2018 Plan. 280 residents attended these open meetings. At public meetings questions have necessarily been limited, although not unduly, to prevent meetings being dominated by single issues or by particularly persistent residents. All parish residents have been treated equally in these consultations.</p> <p>*Disagree. Decisions regarding the proposals made in the Plan have been made with due regard and respect for the views of the majority of parish residents. The respondent does not appear to have any evidence for this assertion.</p> <p>*Disagree. The Statement of Basic Conditions demonstrates that the Plan complies with all relevant government guidelines.</p> <p>*Disagree. The NPG maintains that in all material matters they have complied with the Terms of Reference. The NPG have had no notice of non-compliance from the PC.</p> <p>*Disagree. Residents have been kept regularly informed about the progress of the Plan, its preparation and timing (see Appendix 2).</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p><i>The respondent then goes on to raise objections to individual paragraphs in the July 2018 pre-submission Plan:</i></p> <p>*1.0.0.2. Why look out to 2031?</p> <p>*1.1.0.2. Former drafts of the Plan are irrelevant and do not provide evidence for the current draft</p> <p>*1.1.0.4 objects to lack of notice of consultation</p> <p>*2.0.0.4 questions why 16 sites were identified.</p> <p>*2.0.0.5 questions why NPG believe that a rate of 3 houses per annum would be appropriate or sustainable</p> <p>*2.0.0.6 no evidence for the statement that the SDC housing numbers could “possibly...come under pressure”</p> <p>*2.0.0.7 the Plan does not meet the need for affordable</p>	<p>*12 years is the life of the Plan therefore it is relevant to look that far forward.</p> <p>*The previous incarnations of the Plan are referred to give context and background in order that any comments can be accommodated in future versions.</p> <p>*Exhaustive detail of the consultations and other engagements with residents is given in the Consultation Statement (see Appendices 1, 5, 8 and 9). The NPG and PC believe that these have been more than adequate and meet the requirements of the NPPF – see Statement of Basic Conditions.</p> <p>*Sites were those originally proposed through SDC’s Strategic Housing Land Allocation Assessment and from a ‘Call for Sites’ by the NPG. Assessments were made public.</p> <p>*The rate of development was considered sustainable as it is similar to the rate achieved over the previous 7 years without undue disruption to the village (Housing Policy 2).</p> <p>*This statement reflects the widely held belief that housing numbers will come under pressure. Reserve Sites, by definition, have to be outside the BUAB and development on them will only be supported if the criteria for their release are met (Housing Policy 3). Feeoffee Farm site now excluded from the Plan.</p> <p>*There is now the high likelihood that a number of affordable</p>
--	---	---

	<p>housing. Also objects to the mention of the Utility Trust</p> <p>*2.0.0.12 Asserts that there has been inadequate consultation</p> <p>*2.0.0.12 questions why the Plan may affect the way that residents interact with the PC</p> <p>*2.0.0.13 Questions why there is no “vision”</p> <p>*3.2.0.1 asserts that the use of selective resident quotes is inadequate and demonstrates the absence of evidence</p> <p>*3.2.0.6 objects to the statement regarding Lower Tysoe</p> <p>*3.2.1.1 questions how the comments on the previous pre-submission draft have been taken into account. Also alleges a breach of Terms of Reference</p>	<p>houses will be built on Site 3. Mention of the Trust has now been removed.</p> <p>* Disagree. The Timeline in Appendix 2 identifies 138 occasions (PC meetings, NPG meetings, village consultations, drop-in sessions etc.) since the beginning of 2014 when residents have been given the opportunity to make their concerns known, ask questions and discuss the policies in the emerging Plan. The Timeline also identifies village consultation meetings /drop-in sessions in June 2017 (two on the May 2017 Plan during the 6 week public consultation period) and in July, Aug and Sept 2018 during the 10 week consultation period on the July 2018 Plan. 280 residents attended these open meetings</p> <p>* This paragraph describes how the creation of the Plan may affect the way that the PC interacts with residents. The NPG refute the assertion that it is “unclear” or “inappropriate”.</p> <p>* The Plan embodies vision throughout. That is what the Plan is about. The NPG refute this assertion. The entire Plan is a statement of what the residents of the entire parish feel is important to them, what they value, how it should be protected and what kind of development might be supported in the period to 2031.</p> <p>*Disagree.This statement by the contributor is opinion not a statement of fact.</p> <p>*Disagree. This is a statement of opinion not fact.</p> <p>*Disagree. See Consultation Statement for details of consultation process. It is the job of the NPG to take account the comments received from residents and others – that is their authority. The</p>
--	--	--

		<p>*3.3.1.2 objects to the word “decision” and questions the evidence including the use of the 2014 survey.</p> <p>*3.3.2.1 to 3.3.3.2 objects to all of these paragraphs</p> <p>*4.1.0.1 asserts that this misrepresents the nature of the change in planning status to Lower Tysoe</p> <p>*4.1.0.2 questions the statement that Lower Tysoe was the centre of the village and also questions the statement that the presumption against development applies unless supported by the PC.</p> <p>*4.1.0.3 objects to statement that a tightly drawn BUAB</p>	<p>Plan reflects the cumulative adoption of all appropriate suggested drafting points made by consultees to both pre-submission Plans (May 2017, July 2018). The NPG maintains that in all material matters they have complied with the Terms of Reference. The NPG have had no notice of non-compliance from the PC.</p> <p>*Disagree. This is semantics. It is clear from the text that the “decision” to propose has been made after careful consideration of residents’ responses. There is no reason to believe that the evidence gained from the 2014 survey is in any way invalid (Appendix 3.3). Circumstances in the village remain much as they were in 2014.</p> <p>*Disagree. It is not at all clear why the contributor is making these assertions. They are matters of opinion and are not shared by the NPG.</p> <p>*Disagree. Again, semantics around the words “proposal” and “decision” – the meaning is clear to the reader. The use of the word “may” indicates that support [by the PC] would be forthcoming depending on the exact nature of any planning application. It would have to comply with the policies in the Plan for support to be given. The purpose and nature of the Strategic Gap are clear and further explained in Natural Environment Policy 6.</p> <p>*Disagree. Lower Tysoe is the historic site of the village market. Significant development has been allowed in Lower Tysoe over the last 5 years or so largely because the planning applications have been supported by the PC, Where they were not supported the applications were refused by SDC.</p> <p>*Disagree. The evidence (see the proposed BUAB around Lower</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>will restrict development in Lower Tysoe</p> <p>*4.1.0.4 to 4.1.0.6 questions the sustainability of development in Lower Tysoe and partially quotes from correspondence with SDC</p> <p>*4.2.0.1 & 4.2.0.3 makes confusing comments about Housing Needs Survey and statements in the Plan about housing growth etc.</p> <p>*4.3.0.1. No evidence of consultation with local businesses.</p> <p>*4.4.0.1. No evidence that residents value farms and those who manage them.</p>	<p>Tysoe) is that there is very little room for other than very limited in-fill and conversion development within the proposed Lower Tysoe BUAB, therefore the statement is justified. Whilst there may be a presumption in favour of development, if there is no land on which to develop (apart from the allocated Site 1) such development is unlikely to happen.</p> <p>*Disagree. These paragraphs contain the “justification” put forward by the NPG for the proposed inclusion of Lower Tysoe in the LSV with its own BUAB. Many of the comments received from residents support this proposal and it is only opposed by a minority of residents in Lower Tysoe. The NPG believes that there is wide support for this proposal in the village and SDC’s comments on the July pre-submission Plan also indicate support for the proposal. The selected quote from Careford’s (SDC Planning Policy Officer) email does not include the statement he concluded with to the effect that it was up to the residents of Tysoe to decide whether Lower Tysoe should be included in the LSV with its own BUAB.</p> <p>*Disagree. It is not clear what point the contributor is making here.</p> <p>*Disagree. A list of all local businesses consulted appears in Appendix 8 of the Plan. The fact that “services flourish” is self evident to the users of the village facilities.</p> <p>*Disagree. Evidence is in the responses to the consultation open days held on the May 2017 Plan and the July 2018 Plan where residents expressed a high level of support and pleasure at having a farming based community within the village. It is ridiculous to suggest that the Plan only values the farming community as a source of land for development. This is an opinion not borne out</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>*4.5.0.1 asserts that the statement lacks credibility</p> <p>*6.2.0.1/2 again objects to the inclusion of Lower Tysoe</p> <p>*Housing Policy 2 – objects comprehensively to this policy</p> <p>*Housing Policy 3 – objects comprehensively to this policy</p> <p>*6.5.0.1 objects to wording and also objects to policy regarding Rural Exception schemes.</p> <p>*Employment Policies 1 & 2. Asserts that the objectives are unclear, vague etc.</p>	<p>by the evidence.</p> <p>*Disagree. See Plan Appendix 2 (the Village Design Statement) for credibility, also Built Environment Policies 1 and 2.</p> <p>*Disagree. See above for comments on the proposed Lower Tysoe BUAB.</p> <p>*Disagree. The land to the south of The Orchards is not outside the proposed BUAB so it is quite legitimate to include it. Any development on the site would be subject to a planning application. A recent application on the site for 7 houses was rejected on the grounds of over development and inappropriate design. As far as the land to the west of Sandpits Road is concerned, the respondent’s objections are opinion. Again, any development would be subject to a planning application being granted permission. The contributor is attempting to pre-empt determination by planners if an application were made.</p> <p>*Disagree. Again, the contributor appears to be anticipating matters that may well come up if planning applications were to be submitted for the two Reserve Sites – this would be a matter for the planners at that time. There is no evidence that either of the two sites is undeliverable.</p> <p>*Partially agree. Paragraph now amended to exclude comment about the current SDC policy. No Rural Exception site has been identified because none has come forward. The Policy simply states that such a scheme would be supported if it came forward.</p> <p>*Disagree. The NPG believe that the objective of the Employment Policy is quite clear. The Employment Policies support the objective by protecting home-based offices and places of work</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>*Natural Environment Policy 1. Asserts no link between Objective and Policy 1</p> <p>*8.2.0.1 and 8.3.0.1 objects to the use of the word “tranquillity”</p> <p>*Natural Environment Policy 5 . Points out lack of views towards the village</p> <p>*8.6.0.1 to 8.6.0.4 objects to lack of narrative</p> <p>*Natural Environment Policy 7 – respondent is not clear how this will be delivered</p> <p>*9.1.0.1 questions the authority of the Village Design Statement</p>	<p>from being converted to housing or other use wherever possible and by encouraging the building of homes that have space for home working. The contributor goes to lengths to criticise what is a straightforward and easily understood policy. The Plan cannot pretend to create employment opportunity, it can only protect and support what is there.</p> <p>*Disagree. The objective is clear and is supported by the wide range of comments received in consultations on both versions of the pre-submission Plan. The link to Natural Environment Policy 1 is quite clear.</p> <p>*Reference is now made in the Plan to the Cotswold AONB Board’s statement on tranquillity and dark skies by way of explaining what this policy is endeavouring to achieve.</p> <p>*Agree. Wording now includes views towards the village.</p> <p>*Disagree. These paragraphs explain why it is that the protection of the views and landscapes are important to residents of the village. There is no lack of narrative. There is a map and images of each of the selected views with a description of the landscape being viewed – the NPG believe that is sufficient to explain the Policy.</p> <p>*Disagree. The Policy provides the tool that the PC or SDC planners would use to ensure that future developments would need to protect hedges and trees and incorporate such planting in their design.</p> <p>*Disagree. The objective and the Village Design Statement reflect the comments received from residents and also from SDC in their</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>*Built Environment Policy 1 – asserts that assets are not identified and asserts that the policy contradicts other policies in the Plan</p> <p>*9.2.0.1 asserts that there is no explanation to Policy1</p> <p>*9.2.0.2 questions reference to ridge & furrow</p> <p>*9.2.0.3 questions why the paragraph is included</p> <p>*Built Environment Policy 2. Asserts that the policy is in direct conflict with the inclusion of Lower Tysoe within its own BUAB</p> <p>*Built Environment Policy 3. Questions why the impact of car emissions is omitted.</p>	<p>comments on the pre-submission Plan. Comments from residents have overwhelmingly supported the use of local materials and the protection of the rural aspect of the village.</p> <p>*Disagree. The NPG can see no contradiction between this policy and the site allocation policy. The sentence starting “Development which fails to.....” does not preclude any development in or adjacent to Conservation Areas. It does, however, state that if such development fails to conserve or enhance etc. it will not be supported – this is not a contradiction. Historic assets are identified on Maps 2 - 5 in the Plan, also in Built Environment Policy 1.</p> <p>*Disagree. There is an explanation of the Policy contrary to the contributor’s assertion.</p> <p>*Agree. The Policy now includes non-Designated Heritage Assets which include ridge & furrow land (Built Environment Policy 1).</p> <p>*Disagree. This statement is aspirational. The extension of the Conservation Areas is a matter that goes beyond the scope of the Plan.</p> <p>*Disagree. This does not contradict the proposal to draw a BUAB around Lower Tysoe. The effect of a BUAB would be to restrict any development to within the proposed boundary which is co-incident with the current envelope of that settlement. Other policies, including this one, would continue to protect Lower Tysoe’s character.</p> <p>*Comment noted. This policy is about the Built Environment and as such does not address vehicle use. To the extent that the Plan can influence the use of car transport (and given the relatively isolated</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>*9.4.0.1 asserts that the BUAB around Lower Tysoe will increase carbon emissions</p> <p>*Built Environment Policy 4. Questions whether comments on previous drafts have been taken into account</p>	<p>nature of the village it can only be slight) it is included in the Policies on Employment – para 7.1.0.1, and on limiting the increase in number of new dwellings (Housing :Policy 2) which in turn will limit the increase in commuter vehicle emissions .</p> <p>*Disagree. The drawing of a BUAB around Lower Tysoe has no impact on carbon emissions. Indeed, without a BUAB Lower Tysoe has had proportionately more development than the rest of Tysoe over the last 7 years.</p> <p>*Comment noted. This policy reflects comments received on both pre-submission Plans and is in line with SDC’s Core Strategy</p>
53	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oxRIIZOzBmCw-z5f</p> <p>*Insufficient evidence for number of dwellings and density in allocated sites</p> <p>*Number of dwellings can be increased thereafter</p>	<p>*Disagree. The number of dwellings and their density are flagged up in the Plan in various places, notably Housing Policy 2 and Built Environment Policy 2. One factor in determining the choice of Allocated Sites was the factor of density. The NPG believes this issue has been adequately taken into account.</p> <p>*The Plan cannot control what future planning applications may include regarding type of housing, but Housing Policy 5 indicates what the Parish Council will support. Once adopted, the Plan will carry statutory weight being part of the Development Plan. All stakeholders, including developers and the District Council will therefore have to have pay due regard to the Village Design Statement contained within the Plan in terms of character, style and construction materials etc. In short, the Plan gives added reassurance that the development would respect the local density and style of buildings. Note 13</p>
54	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oxVGeRVxjCtB2Uwy</p> <p>*More transparency and consultation needed</p>	<p>*Comment noted. Much of the criticism here pertains to email exchanges between the resident(s) and the PC to which the NPG</p>

		<p>*Terms of reference not adhered to</p>	<p>has not been party and are tangential to the work of the Group. The Timeline (Appendix 2) details the extent of the publicity, consultation, survey, advertising and information available over the last five years. Three draft Plans have been produced, each being informed by public comment as well as by meetings with local amenity groups and clubs, local landowners and local businesses. The Group meets formally on average monthly. These meetings have been open to the public and minutes are posted on the village notice board and on the Parish website. An update on the Plan has been delivered to the Parish Council at public meetings on a monthly basis since 2014 and a record covering consultations and meetings is held on a database.</p> <p>*Disagree. The terms of reference cited have been adhered to fully. That the process has been ‘wholly inclusive and transparent’ and that the Group has worked for the benefit of the community is manifestly evident from the Timeline (Appendix 2). The NPG maintains that in all material matters they have complied with the Terms of Reference. The NPG have had no notice of non-compliance from the PC.</p>
55	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oxYrQsmuG3MmgAJW *Discussion of the Lower Tysoe issue, including a table of advantages/disadvantages.</p>	<p>*Comments noted. An interesting and valuable contribution to the debate which looks at many parameters but assumes they are all equally weighted. It unjustifiably complains that the residents of Lower Tysoe have not been given the opportunity to voice their views. Reference to the Timeline (Appendix 2) would suggest otherwise. It also makes the point (implicitly) that much of the debate is about opinion rather than fact. The Neighbourhood Planning Group’s opinion sees Lower Tysoe as much a part of the village as the other two settlements and this also reflects the views of over 70% of the respondents in the 2014 survey (Appendix 3). The Built up Area Boundary in Lower Tysoe has been drawn in such as ay as to limit building opportunities to small infill or conversion</p>

			<p>schemes (Note 19). Currently, Lower Tysoe, being defined as a rural hamlet, enjoys a level of protection from new building afforded by a presumption against development except in well defined circumstances. It should be pointed out that this has not prevented some eleven dwellings being granted planning permission there since 2011. It is the opinion of the Group that drawing Lower Tysoe into the Local Service Village and providing it with its own Built up Area Boundary will afford it greater protection that previously (Housing Policy 1). The Plan proposes that only three dwellings should be built there until 2031. The resident makes a partial and incomplete quote from an SDC email part of which (not cited by the resident), expresses an alternative viewpoint and outcome. Note 17</p>
56	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oxfCDeDggLLO_vBl *Lack of transparency and consultation; lack of detail and explanation;</p> <p>*Unbalanced evidence to support assertions</p>	<p>*Disagree. The resident argues that there is insufficient information in the Plan for residents to fully understand the implications. The Timeline (Appendix 2) details the extent of the publicity, consultation, survey, advertising and information available over the last five years. Three draft Plans have been produced, each being informed by public comment as well as by meetings with local amenity groups and clubs, local landowners and local businesses. The Group meets formally on average monthly. These meetings have been open to the public and minutes are posted on the village notice board and on the Parish website. An update on the Plan has been delivered to the Parish Council at public meetings on a monthly basis since 2014 and a record covering consultations and meetings is held on a database. Many of the comments made have felt that the Plan has been well put together and is clearly presented. Notes 8 and 9</p> <p>*Comment noted. It is difficult to respond to this as no examples are given. That said, many of the issues are open to opinion.</p>

		<p>*Lower Tysoe a particular bone of contention and includes a table showing history of planning applications.</p>	<p>*Comments noted. The resident produces an interesting table of planning application and outcomes between Lower and Middle/Upper Tysoe, but nowhere cites the reasons for any planning refusal. His argument that the Parish Council and the residents will have little or no influence in planning decisions if there is a BUAB there seems misinformed. Under the present system (no BUAB) eleven dwellings have been given permission since 2011. The Plan proposes that only three dwellings, beyond those already given planning approval but not yet built, should be built there until 2031 giving it greater protection than previously (Housing Policy 1). The resident makes a partial and incomplete quote from an SDC email part of which (not cited by the resident), expresses an alternative viewpoint and outcome. Notes 15 – 19</p>
57	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oxhfR6nCdRsVpp4t *Issues with regard to BUAB in Lower Tysoe (cites Walnut Cottage, Kineton as example).</p>	<p>*Comments noted. A BUAB is a key element of a Local Service Village. It is a virtual boundary drawn tightly around the existing built form of a settlement (and any proposed allocations) to define the area within which development will be supported in principal. Outside the BUAB only development of a few very specific types will be supported. Within the boundary development will be supported in principle by the PC but would have to be subject to the normal planning rules and constraints. Because the existing properties in Lower Tysoe are generally larger and sit on large plots, the Boundary necessarily dissects some plots in a very few places as the placing of large gardens inside the boundary would otherwise offer the potential for inappropriate medium-scale development. This will provide a better future safeguard against unwanted or speculative building than at present. BUABs otherwise follow, as far as possible, physical demarcations such as building lines, fences, hedges, streams or other physical boundaries. Site 1 to which the resident specifically alludes is a relatively large plot. It is the number of houses on the plot that is important here (in this case three houses) not the size of the plot.</p>

			Application for a greater number of houses has already been turned down. The Plan cannot control what future planning applications may include regarding type of housing, but Housing Policy 5 indicates what the Parish Council will support (ie three houses). Once adopted, the Neighbourhood Development Plan will carry statutory weight being part of the Development Plan. Notes 13 – 19
58	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oFiEiMUWlU_uBnfd *Objects to possible conservation area in Lower Tysoe on grounds of no information	*Comments noted. Archaeological fieldwork throughout the whole Parish was undertaken by a competent group of local volunteers and the results entered into the public domain via Warwickshire County Council’s Historic Environment Record (HER). Work took place in the early years of the Plan. It was presented as part of the evidence base at public meetings and displays and underpins Maps 2 and 3 in the Plan. The notion of a new Conservation Area is aspirational only (Built Environment Policy 1) and looks to the future rather than being an integral part of the Plan itself. Note 31
59	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oFedBQyQ7Xl3wAJJ *Believes all of Lower Tysoe will become a conservation area and therefore free from building	*Comment noted. There is no intention of turning the whole of Lower Tysoe into a Conservation Area, merely the aspiration to have an appropriate part of it considered for Conservation Area status in the future. This results from the findings from recent fieldwork (see Built Environment Policy 1). Note 31
60	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oFY9SJ6H29sSzoXX *Agrees with BUAB in Lower Tysoe *Objects to BUAB’s new line through garden	*Comment noted, see Housing Policy 1 . *Because the existing properties in Lower Tysoe are generally larger and sit on large plots, the BUAB there necessarily dissects some plots in a very few locations as the placing of large gardens inside the boundary would otherwise offer the potential for inappropriate medium-scale development. BUABs otherwise follow, as far as possible, physical demarcations such as building lines, fences, hedges, streams or other physical boundaries. This

			has been explained to the resident who is now satisfied with the rationale for the route of the boundary around their property. Notes 15 – 16
61	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/w/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oFng7Tn_v2v1JJRq Member of LTLEG objecting to BUAB in Lower Tysoe and to inclusion in LSV</p> <p>*There should be no BUAB around Lower Tysoe</p> <p>*The respondent asks whether the Plan is needed as SDC have reached their housing numbers.</p>	<p>*Disagree. The NPG/PC has considered this matter with great care and has been very mindful of the concerns of residents of the whole parish rather than just those of Lower Tysoe. The arguments for the inclusion of Lower Tysoe are included in the Plan in paragraphs 3.3.1.2 and 4.1.0.1 to 4.1.0.6. and in the Consultation Statement in section 5.5. Much of the concern raised by the respondent involves the change in planning status that would arise by including Lower Tysoe within the LSV with its own BUAB. This would change the planning status from a presumption against development to one of a presumption for development. On its own this could be seen as detrimental to Lower Tysoe. However, with a BUAB drawn in such a way as to preclude any development other than very small in-fill schemes or development on the one allocated site in Lower Tysoe (Site 1), the NPG/PC believes that protection will be more secure than reliance on the willingness or otherwise of a PC to support development in Lower Tysoe. Notes 14 to 19</p> <p>* The Plan identifies sites where approximately 18 houses could be built in addition to 20 already granted permission but not yet built. These 38 houses, built in the period to 2031 would provide an average of 3 per year, a similar number to those built in the last 7 years. It also provides, on Site 3, for the provision of affordable housing much needed by the village. The Plan is about much more than housing numbers as it contains policies to preserve and protect those aspects of the village that residents have identified</p>

			as important. Notes 1,3 - 4
62	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/w/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oFp9qOjTcO6IZvYw Member of LTLEG objecting to BUAB in Lower Tysoe and to inclusion in LSV</p> <p>*Further development in Lower Tysoe would be unsustainable</p> <p>*There should be no BUAB around Lower Tysoe</p>	<p>*Disagree. The facilities in Tysoe (shops, school, church etc.) are, in practice, no more distant from the settlement of Lower Tysoe than they are from Upper Tysoe. Residents access them by well maintained footpaths, metalled pavements and by road. No such objections were raised when planning permission was granted for the 11 houses that have been built or granted permission in the last 7 years. Para 78 of the NPPF (Feb 2019) states that “housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”. The NPG consider that a small amount of development in Lower Tysoe would meet this aspiration as it would support the facilities in Tysoe. Site 1 is within easy walking distance of the school and shops in Middle Tysoe.</p> <p>*Disagree. The NPG has considered this matter with great care and has been very mindful of the concerns of residents of the whole parish rather than just those of Lower Tysoe. The arguments for the inclusion of Lower Tysoe are included in the Plan in paragraphs 3.3.1.2 and 4.1.0.1 to 4.1.0.6. and in the Consultation Statement in section 5.5. Much of the concern raised by the respondent involves the change in planning status that would arise by including Lower Tysoe within the LSV with its own BUAB. This would change the planning status from a presumption against development to one of a presumption for development. On its own this could be seen as detrimental to Lower Tysoe. However, with a BUAB drawn in such a way as to preclude any development other than very small in-fill schemes or development on the one allocated site in Lower Tysoe (Site 1), the NPG believes that protection will be more secure than reliance on the willingness or otherwise of a Parish Council to</p>

			support development in Lower Tysoe. Notes 14 – 19
63	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/w/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oFvzYKtvE4PWrcax</p> <p>*Objects to the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in the LSV and the BUAB around Lower Tysoe</p> <p>*States that inclusion is contrary to Core Strategy citing correspondence with John Careford of SDC</p> <p>*States that Site 1 is not within the envelope of the built environment</p> <p>*Faults the process, evidence and consultation for incorporating Lower Tysoe</p>	<p>* The NPG has considered this matter with great care and has been very mindful of the concerns of residents of the whole parish rather than just those of Lower Tysoe. The arguments for the inclusion of Lower Tysoe are included in the Plan in paragraphs 3.3.1.2 and 4.1.0.1 to 4.1.0.6. and in the Consultation Statement in section 5.5. Much of the concern raised by the respondent involves the change in planning status that would arise by including Lower Tysoe within the LSV with its own BUAB. This would change the planning status from a presumption against development to one of a presumption for development. On its own this could be seen as detrimental to Lower Tysoe. However, with a BUAB drawn in such a way as to preclude any development other than very small in-fill schemes or development on the one allocated site in Lower Tysoe (Site 1), the NPG believes that protection will be more secure than reliance on the willingness or otherwise of a Parish Council to support development in Lower Tysoe. Notes 14 - 19</p> <p>*Disagree. The email in question is only partly cited. In the correspondence referred to the officer goes on to say that the determination of Lower Tysoe should ultimately be left to residents of the parish. In SDC’s comments on the pre-submission Plan they express satisfaction with the rationale for including Lower Tysoe (Appendix 7.5)</p> <p>*Disagree. Site 1 is within the proposed BUAB and is opposite a linear development of approximately 6 houses. The NPG maintain that a development of 3 houses on Site 1 would not “drastically change the nature and characteristics of Lower Tysoe.</p> <p>* Disagree. Virtually the only objections raised against the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in the LSV have come from a small (circa</p>

		<p>*The respondent refers to misleading information provided at a meeting in October 2016</p> <p>*The respondent asserts that there is no explanatory text in the Plan to support the inclusion of Lower Tysoe</p>	<p>20) number of residents in Lower Tysoe who live adjacent to allocated Site 1. Their assertion that the conclusions of the NPG are not based on sound or robust evidence of consultation with the community is refuted by the NPG. All Parish residents have been given ample opportunity to discuss and comment on the Plan. The Timeline (Appendix 2) identifies all of the public meetings at which residents have had the opportunity to raise concerns. The contention that residents were not fully aware of what they were voting on in the 2014 Plan Questionnaire is misleading. Residents have consistently expressed the view that “Tysoe” comprises the three settlements – Upper, Middle and Lower Tysoe – see the many comments in this document supporting that view. The NPG maintains that this sentiment is best realised by the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in its own BUAB in the same way that Upper and Middle Tysoe are treated. The LTLEG rejected the offer by the NPG to meet them to discuss this matter and have consistently avoided open debate on the subject .</p> <p>*At this meeting the NPG stated that development in Lower Tysoe would be restricted to 3 or fewer houses on any site. It was later admitted by the NPG that this was an error as they had no capacity to restrict numbers in this way. However, the NPG maintain that the statement had no practical impact on the matter as the only allocated site in Lower Tysoe is recommended for 3 houses and the NPG maintain that the proposed BUAB allows for only limited in-fill or conversion development within the BUAB other than on that site. In all village consultations the majority view of parish residents has demonstrated support for the inclusion of Lower Tysoe.</p> <p>*Disagree. See the arguments for and against the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in paragraphs 3.3.1.2 and 4.1.0.1 to 4.1.0.6. of the Plan and in the Consultation Statement in section 5.5.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>64</p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>https://1drv.ms/x/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oFxFK0ltCrtSexJbF *Why have the most popular sites for houses been ignored and others added. What’s the point of consultation if you do this?</p>	<p>*Comment noted. Residents were offered the opportunity to put pins on a map indicating their views as to where new development might/might not be. The exercise was purely indicative and residents who attended were given free rein to place pins where they wanted, the locations being defined by an existing SDC strategic housing assessment and a more recent call for sites. The 16 sites listed were subsequently assessed for suitability on planning grounds (Note 11). Three sites were ultimately selected (Housing Policy 2)</p>
<p>65</p>	<p>Resident and developer</p>	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oxmGv5f5_EefVFD *Objects to changes of recommendation. *Housing supply *Seems to think the BUAB is a straitjacket *Lists problems associated with allocated sites 1, 3, 4 and 5; also the Reserve Sites</p>	<p>*Comments noted. Any change of recommendation between Plan drafts will have resulted from consultation and, as would appear in this case, by assessment of the original 16 sites for suitability on planning grounds (Note 11). Three sites were ultimately selected (Housing Policy 2)</p> <p>*Comment noted. There is no fixed or ‘target’ figure for new builds in Tysoe. The Group has taken the safe option of opting for a figure (Housing Policy 1) which reflects recent annual growth and which largely reflects a equitable share of new dwellings required by the District Council. Note 3</p> <p>*Agree, but for different reasons. The whole purpose of a BUAB is to contain future development and inhibit unwanted building spread.</p> <p>*Comments noted. Each of the 16 possible sites was assessed individually by the Neighbourhood Planning Group and also by the Group’s independent planning consultant whose remit was to consider them strictly in planning terms. A number of criteria were used to assess each site including relevant planning history and constraints; the landscape and topography; drainage and flooding;</p>

		<p>*View 6 taken from his land without permission</p> <p>*Wants to build on Shennington Road site</p> <p>*Appears to want housing in strategic gap?</p> <p>*Vastly inferior to previous version</p>	<p>accessibility; the adjacent natural or historic built environment, and how any new build might fit into the existing settlement pattern and density. As a result three sites were selected as appropriate locations for future development, and two as Reserve Sites. The resident may not have used the same criteria .</p> <p>*Comment noted. As the NPG is aware the photograph was taken from a public footpath.</p> <p>*Comments noted. The resident advocates the allocation of a substantial site within the AONB (Shennington Road) which is contrary to a large majority of public opinion in the village as evidenced in consultation meetings and contrary to Natural Environment Policy 1 as well as to the Plan’s policy of small scale organic growth (Housing Policy 2).</p> <p>*The resident also advocate developing a site within the Strategic Gap (Lower Grounds) contrary to Natural Environment Policy 6 and to the opinion of residents. Note 28</p> <p>*Disagree. This is a matter of opinion. The Plan has evolved from the previous version on the basis of advice, consultation and public engagement.</p>
66	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/w/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oF5qJMt03kENHsVg</p> <p>*Believes Lower Tysoe should not be included in the LSV on the grounds of sustainability</p>	<p>*Disagree. The facilities in Tysoe (shops, school, church etc.) are, in practice, no more distant from the settlement of Lower Tysoe than they are from Upper Tysoe. Residents access them by well maintained footpaths, metalled pavements and by road. No such objections were raised when planning permission was granted for the 11 houses that have been built or granted permission in the last 7 years. Para 78 of the NPPF (Feb 2019) states that “housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”. The NPG consider that a small amount of</p>

		<p>*Cites determination of planning application 17/03730/FUL as grounds for excluding Lower Tysoe</p> <p>*Respondent refers to lack of consultation</p>	<p>development in Lower Tysoe would meet this aspiration as it would support the facilities in Tysoe. Site 1 is within easy walking distance of the school and shops in Middle Tysoe.</p> <p>*Disagree. This application was for a site that is outside the proposed BUAB for Lower Tysoe and the refusal was supported by the NPG.</p> <p>*Disagree. Virtually the only objections raised against the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in the LSV have come from a small (circa 20 residents) number of residents in Lower Tysoe. Parish residents have been given ample opportunity to discuss and comment on the Plan (See Appendix 2 – Timeline) which identifies all of the public meetings at which residents have had the opportunity to raise concerns. The contention that residents were not fully aware of what they were voting on in the 2014 Plan Questionnaire is misleading. Residents have consistently expressed the view that “Tysoe” comprises the three settlements – Upper, Middle and Lower Tysoe – see the many comments in this document supporting that view. The NPG maintain that this sentiment is best realised by the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in its own BUAB in the same way that Upper and Middle Tysoe are treated. The LTLEG rejected the offer by the NPG to meet them to discuss this matter and have consistently avoided open debate on the subject. The assertion that the conclusions of the NPG are not based on sound or robust evidence of consultation with the community is therefore refuted by the NPG. Notes 14 to 19</p>
67	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oxpNeYpGICoBBgNm</p> <p>This submission raises numerous concerns:</p> <p>*2 houses granted planning permission at Home Holdings in Lower Tysoe not shown on Map 8</p>	<p>*Comment noted. This now corrected in Submission version</p>

		<p>*Lower Tysoe not categorised as an LSV in Core Strategy</p> <p>*Process has not been consultative</p> <p>*It is not possible to decide on the number of houses to be built on a particular site</p> <p>*Is the collaboration to be with the current NPG?</p> <p>*Questions about the source of information on Map 6</p> <p>*Argues that more development in Lower Tysoe would be unsustainable.</p>	<p>*Comment is correct – the Plan does not say that it is, it states that “Tysoe is designated as a Cat 2 LSV”</p> <p>* Disagree - see Appendix 2 which identifies the very significant number of open meetings that have taken place over 5 years at which residents have had the opportunity to voice their concerns and comments.</p> <p>*Comment noted and while strictly speaking is correct, it is not correct to say that developers are able to build without safeguards. Any development will be subject to normal planning regulations and review.</p> <p>*The process will continue to be led by the NPG whose membership may change from time to time but it will continue to be governed by the Terms of Reference agreed with the Parish Council. Residents will continue to have the right to comment on the Plan through to the Referendum. All consultation will remain in the public domain. The NPG will have no “power” over elected Councillors.</p> <p>*The information on Map 6 came largely from a detailed field by field survey of the entire parish. It is included as a guide to the bio-diversity and the sensitivity of the landscape within the parish undertaken through Warwickshire County Council. The map is in the public domain.</p> <p>*Disagree. The facilities in Tysoe (shops, school, church etc.) are, in practice, no more distant from the settlement of Lower Tysoe than they are from Upper Tysoe. Residents access them by well maintained footpaths, metalled pavements and by road. No such objections were raised when planning permission was granted for the 11 houses that have been built or granted permission in the</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>*A number of objections to “wishful thinking” in the wording of Housing policy</p> <p>*Objections to the wording in Section 4.3 Local Businesses</p> <p>*Objections to wording in Section 4.4 Natural Environment</p> <p>*Objections to Section 4.5 Built Environment</p>	<p>evidence to suggest that it would be better not to designate the open land between Middle and Lower Tysoe as Strategic Gap. It is a policy of the Plan (Natural Environment Policy 6) to maintain this gap in order to protect the character and setting of both Middle and Lower Tysoe.</p> <p>*Comments noted. The NPG has included policy wording which is deemed to be appropriate. It has sought to avoid policies which may be impossible to enforce through the use of too restrictive language. The Plan provides a tool for the PC and planners to use to ensure that any future planning applications may comply with the policies that residents find acceptable.</p> <p>*Disagree. It is beyond the power of the Plan to ensure that businesses will flourish, however, it is within the remit of the Plan to propose policies that will create an environment in which business is likely to flourish. The Plan also states that start-ups will be encouraged and local businesses will be supported – this is a statement of intent by the PC to the effect that wherever they can they will do whatever is in their power to encourage and support. This may include supporting applications to convert redundant buildings to business premises, support start-ups seeking advice etc. See Employment Policy 1 and 2, Community Assets Policy 1</p> <p>*Disagree. The Plan proposes policies which will help to protect the natural environment. These have had the widespread support of parish residents. See Natural Environment Policies 1,2,3,4,5,6</p> <p>*Disagree. The Plan will give the PC and SDC planners a tool to prevent inappropriate development which may spoil the existing built environment. See Built Environment Policies 1,2,4,5,6 and Village Design Statement (Appendix 2 in Plan).</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>*Numerous other objections to policy wording characterised as “wishful thinking”</p> <p>*Objection to approximate numbers of dwellings being applied to allocated sites</p> <p>*Comment on Site Assessment 2 (Site 1)</p> <p>*Comment on Housing Policy 4 – Rural Exception housing</p> <p>*Comment on Housing Policy 5 – Market Mix</p>	<p>*Disagree. The respondent misses the point that the Plan is an expression of what the parish residents consider to be valuable. By articulating this in the Plan the Plan becomes a statement of intent by the PC and, when adopted, by the District Council that when these aspects of the parish (the facilities, built and natural environment, protected areas, infrastructure etc.) come under threat they will be protected by whatever measures may be available. This is not wishful thinking, it is a clear statement of intent to protect what the residents find valuable.</p> <p>*Disagree. If no indication were given of what the NPG believe to be appropriate numbers of dwellings per site then the PC and planners would have little defence against over development of a site. The indicative numbers of dwellings have been given taking into account the size and nature of the sites and an appropriate density of build (Housing Policy 2).</p> <p>*Comment noted. Any application submitted on this site (or any other) will be subject to the normal review by planners who will consider traffic access as well as other planning considerations.</p> <p>*Comment noted. No Rural Exception application has come forward but the Policy anticipates that such an application could be made for a site outside the BUAB (Housing Policy 4). Any such application would be subject to normal planning review and would have to comply with the policies in the Plan. This would include Policies applying to the proposed Strategic Gap, AONB etc. all of which would be taken into consideration when determining such application.</p> <p>*Comment noted. The proposed mix of housing would be a factor taken into consideration by the PC and by planners when considering any new planning application in the parish.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>*Comment on Natural Environment Policy 4 – Local Green Space</p> <p>*Comment on Natural Environment Policy 7</p> <p>*Comment on Built Environment policies</p> <p>*Comment on Built Environment Policy 1</p> <p>*Comment on Built Environment Policy 2</p>	<p>*The NPG have discussed the Community Orchard with the owner and, having received assurances that no development is planned on this site and that the lease will be renewed, have now excluded the site from the list of designated Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>*Again, the Plan provides a policy framework against which future planning applications can be reviewed. Those not complying with the policy proposals will not be supported and developers will be encouraged to amend applications so that they do comply.</p> <p>*Comment noted. The NPG sees no contradiction between the statement that urbanisation of the village will not be supported and those policies supporting limited development. Built Environment Policy 2 defines how planning applications should demonstrate sympathy with local character, Environment Policy 4 encourages the provision of off-street parking and the Village Design Statement defines standards of design which should maintain the existing rural, non-urban nature of the built environment</p> <p>*Disagree. Land owners are not at liberty to do whatever they want on their land, planning law prevents them from doing certain things. However, the respondent makes a valid point concerning ridge & furrow. There is no protection in law from owners eradicating ridge & furrow, however, by stating its importance in the Plan it is hoped that owners might be encouraged to preserve the feature. Regarding the matter of reviewing Conservation Areas this is, admittedly, aspirational but it does reflect the comments made by a number of residents. The survey work referred to was carried out by qualified members of the NPG.</p> <p>*Disagree. The NPG supported by the independent assessment of</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>*Comment on Built Environment Policy 4 – Car parking</p>	<p>Site 1 does not believe that limited development of the site (Site 1) would impact unduly on the view from the AONB. Existing houses on the east side of the road would shield the view of a new development on the site and any application would be subject to review for compliance with the Core Strategy and with the policies proposed in the Plan (eg Natural Environment Policy 1). Point (e) has been taken out of the Submission Plan as being unenforceable.</p> <p>*Noted. The policy gives the PC and planners the ability to insist that any new development should include provision for off-road parking. However, provision of such does not guarantee that cars would not be parked on verges. Enforcement of a parking policy will continue to be a Parish Council responsibility.</p>
68	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oGDjh08QLd2EPSfW *The Tennis Club wants any further play areas moved away from the Club</p>	<p>*Comment noted. The whole area in question (the recreation ground and the sports ground) is designated as a Local Green Space within the Plan (Natural Environment Policy 4). It is, however, the remit of the PC, not the NPG to determine any changes to its infrastructure.</p>
69	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/x/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oGFkWsCNiw8wXOo7 *In favour of Lower Tysoe in the LSV *In favour of Roses Farm as a reserve site *Thoughtful and detailed plan *Feoffee Farm should be utilised *Market housing mix confusing</p>	<p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 1. *Agree, see Housing Policy 3. *Comment noted *Agree, but unfortunately not possible. The owner (Trustees of the Tysoe Utility Trust) has ruled this out despite likely funding available to support affordable housing there. Note 24. *Comment noted. In essence, Housing Policy 5 maps the type of new dwellings against need. The District Council has a recommended 'mix' of house sizes to which settlements are</p>

			required to comply. Tysoe has more larger houses than recommended and needs to ‘rebalance’ by building smaller ones.
70	Resident and Chair of LTEAG	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oGJettgabJklbm5B</p> <p>*The respondent, the Chair of the LTLEG, objects to the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in the LSV with broad objections on the grounds of sustainability/ contrary to NPPF/ contrary to Core Strategy/ determination of application 17/03730/FUL</p> <p>*Objects to the process regarding the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in the LSV.</p>	<p>*Disagree. The facilities in Tysoe (shops, school, church etc.) are, in practice, no more distant from the settlement of Lower Tysoe than they are from Upper Tysoe. Residents access them by well maintained footpaths, metalled pavements and by road. No such objections were raised when planning permission was granted for the 11 houses that have been built or granted permission in the last 7 years. Para 78 of the NPPF (Feb 2019) states that “housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”. The NPG considers that a small amount of development in Lower Tysoe would meet this aspiration as it would support the facilities in Tysoe. Site 1 is within easy walking distance of the school and shops in Middle Tysoe. In SDC’s comments on the pre-submission Plan they express satisfaction with the rationale for including Lower Tysoe (Appendix 7.3). Application 17/03730/FUL was for a site that is outside the proposed BUAB for Lower Tysoe and the refusal was supported by the NPG.</p> <p>*Disagree. Virtually the only objections raised against the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in the LSV have come from a small (circa 20 residents) number of residents in Lower Tysoe. Parish residents have been given ample opportunity to discuss and comment on the Plan (See Appendix 2 – Timeline) which identifies all of the public meetings at which residents have had the opportunity to raise concerns. The contention that residents were not fully aware of what they were voting on in the 2014 Plan Questionnaire is misleading. Residents have consistently expressed the view that “Tysoe” comprises the three settlements – Upper, Middle and Lower Tysoe – see the many comments in this document supporting that view. The NPG maintains that this sentiment is</p>

		<p>* Refers to meeting in October 2016</p> <p>*Refers to correspondence with SDC officer John Careford</p> <p>*In para 4.7 respondent refers to objections to planning</p>	<p>best realised by the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in its own BUAB in the same way that Upper and Middle Tysoe are treated. The LTLEG rejected the offer by the NPG to meet them to discuss this matter and have consistently avoided open debate on the subject. The conclusion that the NPG has drawn from the many consultations made and from the comments addressed in this document is that the main objections to the inclusion of Lower Tysoe come only from a small number of residents of Lower Tysoe a significant number of who live adjacent to allocated Site 1 and that their comments and concerns are not representative of parish residents as a whole.</p> <p>*At this meeting the NPG stated that development in Lower Tysoe would be restricted to 3 or fewer houses on any site. It was later admitted by the NPG that this was an error as they had no capacity to restrict numbers in this way. However, the NPG maintain that the statement had no practical impact on the matter as the only allocated site in Lower Tysoe is recommended for 3 houses and the NPG maintain that the proposed BUAB allows for only limited in-fill or conversion development within the BUAB other than on that site. In all village consultations the majority view of parish residents has demonstrated support for the inclusion of Lower Tysoe.</p> <p>*Disagree. In the correspondence referred to the officer goes on to say that the determination of Lower Tysoe should ultimately be left to residents of the parish. In SDC's comments on the pre-submission Plan they express satisfaction with the rationale for including Lower Tysoe (Appendix 7.3). This correspondence is now referred to in para 4.1.0.6 of the submission Plan and is included in full by reference [9] on page 58 of the submission Plan.</p> <p>*The application for 7 houses was on Site 1 which the Plan</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>application for 7 houses and for 5 houses in Lower Tysoe</p> <p>*In para 4.8 the respondent questions why the determination of Lower Tysoe should be subject to a referendum including all parish residents.</p> <p>*In paras 4.9 to 6 the respondent repeats the assertions that the inclusion of Lower Tysoe has not been subject to sufficient consultation, that residents are unaware of the implications of the change in planning status, that the inclusion would reduce the protection currently enjoyed by Lower Tysoe</p> <p>*In para 5.7 the respondent asks how development in Lower Tysoe might be limited and; in para 5.9 asks how development might be restricted to 3 houses on Site 1.</p>	<p>identifies for approximately 3 houses – the NPG supports the objections to this application which is now in appeal. The application for 7 houses was on a site which is outside the proposed BUAB around Lower Tysoe and, as such, the objections were supported by the NPG.</p> <p>*The Plan is for the entire parish including Lower Tysoe, and as such any referendum can only be held including all residents of the Parish. To do otherwise would be undemocratic.</p> <p>*Disagree. See reasons above. Also regarding reduced protection - much of the concern raised by the respondent involves the change in planning status that would arise by including Lower Tysoe within the LSV with its own BUAB. This would change the planning status from a presumption against development to one of a presumption for development. On its own this could be seen as detrimental to Lower Tysoe. However, with a BUAB drawn in such a way as to preclude any development other than very small in-fill schemes or development on the one allocated site in Lower Tysoe (Site 1), the NPG/PC believes that protection will be more secure than reliance on the willingness or otherwise of a Parish Council to support development in Lower Tysoe.</p> <p>*The BUAB is drawn in such a way as to preclude any development beyond very small in-fill schemes (at most 2 houses), conversions or development on Site 1. Therefore, whilst there would be a presumption for development within the BUAB, in practice this would be limited by the availability of space. It should be noted that in the last 7 years 11 houses have been granted planning permission in Lower Tysoe, proportionately more than in the rest of the village, whilst there has been a presumption against development. A tightly drawn BUAB would limit the opportunity to continue development at this pace. Whilst the PC has no power to</p>
--	--	--	--

			restrict the number of houses in any application the fact that the Plan identifies the appropriate capacity of Site 1 as three houses gives the PC and planners the reason to reject any application which fails to conform. A previous application for 7 houses on the site has been rejected largely on the grounds of over-development (this is now in appeal). Notes 14 to 19
71	Estate Agent	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oyJTYNMeWDtWaxZw</p> <p>*Map 6 is incorrect in showing a wildlife area south of Oxhill Road.</p> <p>*Affordable housing not addressed and contra to SDC’s policy</p> <p>*Reserve Sites of Roses Farm and Herbert’s Farm are not deliverable. The site at Oxhill Road is a better Reserve Site</p>	<p>* This is a map produced by Warwickshire County Council and the result of the work of the Warwickshire Wildlife Trust commencing in 1999. There are no ‘designations’ as such, statutory or otherwise. The places denoted are simply those which flag up areas or points of interest. Note 27</p> <p>*Comment noted. Numerous comments on the Plan expressed concern that there were no small or affordable housing schemes proposed in the Plan either for the elderly and young families. This is now addressed in the Plan (Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6). From a commercial point of view small affordable houses are uneconomic to construct. The Group has pursued potential sites with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3 where the owner is now seriously considering an affordable scheme. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme. Note 22</p> <p>*Comment noted but disagree. The justification for including reserve sites in the Plan is explained in Housing Policy 3. The NPG believe that it is prudent to include reserve sites which need to be able to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing should SDC experience a shortfall in housing stock. They also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. There are not many sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. The NPG, assisted by the planning consultant, have assessed that the two sites</p>

			<p>identified in the Plan – Roses Farm and Herbert’s Farm – are suitable. That said, neither site is perfect, they both lie within Conservation Areas and they both present challenges for gaining suitable access. However, the Group has commissioned a Highways Authority report on the access issues on both sites which indicates that any traffic problems could be mitigated. Contrary to some comments, Herbert’s Farm would continue to be a working farm even if development took place. The present outbuildings and byres could be moved further west thus ensuring that the village still possessed an active farm close to its centre. Notes 21 and 22. The Oxhill Road site to which the resident alludes was one of the original 16 sites considered but was rejected after the site assessments of all 16. In addition, the site had been turned down in two previous planning applications.</p>
72	Utility Trust	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oyPiBVvOqe5U0SUR *Tysoe Utility Trust wants reference to itself removing</p>	<p>*Comment noted and reference now excluded. Note 24</p>
73	Resident /Developer	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oyTk7r2tBEHskRIw *Site assessment is wrong; gives argument as to why Home Holdings site should be developed</p>	<p>*Disagree. This was one of the 16 possible sites assessed individually by the NPG and by the Group’s independent planning consultant whose remit was to consider them strictly in planning terms (Housing Policy 2). A number of consistent criteria were used to assess each site including relevant planning history and constraints; the landscape and topography; drainage and flooding; accessibility; the adjacent natural or historic built environment, and how any new build might fit into the existing settlement pattern and density. Any changes in the wording of the NPPF were also taken into account. This site was not included in the final choice of Allocated Sites (for assessments see link in Plan). The site already has planning permission for three dwelling and an application for additional dwellings has been rejected and is currently under appeal. Note 4</p>
74		Duplicate of 65	Duplicate entry (see 65 above)
75	Interested	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oyVrAX6ti43oPatv</p>	

	party/Developer	*Unhappy with the site assessments of Site 14 and Site 19 and believes they would be of more value to the village than the Allocated Sites selected.	*Disagree. This interested party believes that Site 14 (adjacent to church and school) had been inaccurately assessed. Firstly, the proposed access through a new development (not yet been built) may be viable but has not been agreed. Secondly, the view that little in the way of archaeological remains are likely to be found adjacent to a medieval church at the core of a medieval village is unrealistic as is, thirdly, any development's lack of impact on the setting of the local listed buildings. Fourthly, and most fundamental, is the fact that the Plan is specific in supporting small-scale organic growth (Housing Policy 2), not a large scale development of this kind. Note 11 . With reference to Site 19, this field lies within the area defined by the Plan as a Strategic Gap between Middle and Lower Tysoe (Natural Environment Policy 6). The NPG wishes to enhance the protection of this gap on both sides of the road and the Plan would not support any development that might impinge on this. Note 28
76	District Council	https://1drv.ms/w/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oGqvtYg9XcJkO95E *Preliminary comments from Stratford District Council on first part of Plan.	* These comments were subsequently incorporated into SDC's final list of comments. The full comments and responses are too lengthy to list here and appear as Appendix 7.3 of the Consultation Statement.
77	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oyaSdb3F3g_QmdJ5 Objections to Roses Farm (distributed flyer)	*Disagree. This flyer which contains much misinformation was distributed by an independent resident (for contrary view see comment 28). The flyer states that the site has been 'earmarked for development' when actually the site will be protected from development unless the conditions for releasing Reserve Sites are met. The flyer talks about 'affordable housing' but the Plan does not propose this as being a primary site for affordable houses. It says that a 'damning' report from Highways has been received – whilst the report does identify difficulties with the site it also points out that they can be mitigated. Many of the objections to this Reserve Site use very similar language which may indicate a

			<p>concerted attempt to undermine the legitimate case for this as a Reserve Site. The Plan explains the rationale for Reserve Sites and the NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. There are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic, pedestrian movement and the issue of Conservation Areas. Note 21</p>
78	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oydKqOKiQPXnd6wJ *A fair appraisal with some disagreements *Concerned with Site Allocation 1 and traffic</p>	<p>*Comments noted. The NPG is in agreement in our views of the inappropriate development at the entrance to the village. It can only be hoped that SDC will exercise tighter control over the current building in the adjacent field. *Comment noted, but unclear as to where these 12 access points lie. This Allocated Site has been earmarked for three dwellings (Housing Policy 2). Whether access to them is via a single or three entries will be a planning matter. Permission will only be granted if there is appropriate safety of access and traffic movement.</p>
79	Solicitor representing resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0ox1ltyD48kCAvgG *Errors and confusion in draft plan *Wants the site to be included for development? *Wants 'wildlife' designation to be lifted</p>	<p>*Comments noted and have been discussed with the resident with some level of agreement reached. *Comment noted. The site in question (Housing Policy 2) is not an Allocated Site. It lies outside Lower Tysoe's proposed BUAB and outside the existing building line. A planning application there was rejected before the BUAB was mooted. Notes 11, 15 and 19 *Comment noted. The map showing the 'wildlife' site has been downloaded directly from Warwickshire County Council's website</p>

			and is the result of the work of the Warwickshire Wildlife Trust commencing in 1999. There are no ‘designations’ as such, statutory or otherwise. The places denoted are simply those which flag up areas or points of interest. Note 27
80	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oyjOfBhWHDIXLrLs *General approval with comments; congratulations. The whole village should be grateful	*Comments noted.
81	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oSChxEvbrY6vUmDU *Upper Tysoe is not suitable for more development	*Disagree, but sympathetic. Several residents commented that Tysoe should have no more development. Unfortunately SDC requires us to build more houses, hence development stagnation is not a viable option. The Plan’s policies of limiting areas for development (Housing Policy 1) and in keeping new housing numbers low (Housing :Policy 2) at least allows the community a strong voice in where new building takes place and how it might fit best into the local environment (Built Environment :Policy 2).
82	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oR2BZXOtc-4mySoT *Roses Farm should not be developed *Objects to executive developments	*Disagree. There a number of comments on this particular topic which may result from a flyer distributed by an independent resident (see comment 77). The Plan explains the rationale for Reserve Sites and the NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB; there are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of other points that have been raised (eg traffic, pedestrian safety and Conservation Areas). Note 21. *Agree. A focus on small-scale housing growth is a key feature of the Plan (Housing Policy 2) as is the need for smaller rather than larger ‘executive-style’ houses (Housing Policy 5). The Parish

			Council will have the authority of the Plan to support proposals for homes the village needs: that is, smaller homes rather than large executive dwellings (Notes 4 and 30). The Plan can identify those sites where development is to be resisted for historical, environmental or community reasons and specify construction materials according to a Village Design Statement (Built Environment Policy 2).
83	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oR7Llkm74l75wpEz *Disappointed that Feoffee Farm not included	* Agree, but unfortunately not possible. The owner has ruled out the allocation of Feoffee Farm. Many respondents pointed out that part of this site would be an ideal location for a small number of affordable homes, particularly for the elderly. The Trustees of the charity that owns the farm have voted not to allow this to happen despite likely funding available to support such a venture. Sites can only be included in the plan if the owners agree. Note 24
84	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oSG04Ortj6_1brmy *Likes BUABS *Need to avoid large developments *Excellent plan reflecting needs of the parish	*Comments noted. Built up Areas Boundaries are key to the Plan’s need to restrict new building to within certain defined places (Housing policy 1) , *Agree. A focus on small-scale housing growth over time is seen as essential to the Plan and would retain the character of the village (Housing Policy 2). This view was supported by over 90% of the respondents to a survey (Consultation Statement Appendix 3.3). *Comment noted.
85	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oRuOw1ihD9Omrkhu *Does not want Lower Tysoe in the LSV and having its own BUAB	*Comments noted but disagree. The NPG sees Lower Tysoe as much a part of the village as the other two settlements and this reflects the views of over 70% of the respondents in the 2014 survey (Appendix 3). Residents of Lower Tysoe enjoy easy access to the ‘central’ facilities located in Middle Tysoe via well maintained footpaths, a newly resurfaced pavement or by a short

		<p>*Lack of consultation</p>	<p>distance on the road (by cycle or car) (Note 18). Many other comments question why Lower Tysoe should remain outside the village and be treated in some ways differently from Middle and Upper Tysoe. The view that a BUAB in Lower Tysoe will be detrimental to planning there is unsupported. Whilst the principle of new development would be acceptable within the BUAB, the fact that the Boundary has been drawn in the way proposed would limit building opportunities to small infill or conversion schemes (Note 19). Currently, Lower Tysoe, being defined as a rural hamlet, enjoys a level of protection from new building afforded by a presumption against development except in well defined circumstances. It should be pointed out that this has not prevented some eleven dwellings being granted planning permission there since 2011. It is the opinion of the Group that drawing Lower Tysoe into the LSV and providing it with its own BUAB will afford it greater protection than previously (Housing Policy 1). The Plan proposes that only three dwellings should be built there until 2031; it also complies with the NPPF and SDC's Core Strategy.</p> <p>*Disagree. The Timeline (Appendix 2) details the extent of the publicity, consultation, survey, advertising and information available over the last five years. Three draft Plans have been produced, each being informed by public comment as well as by meetings with local amenity groups and clubs, local landowners and local businesses. The Group meets formally on average monthly. These meetings have been open to the public and minutes are posted on the village notice board and on the Parish website. An update on the Plan has been delivered to the Parish Council at public meetings on a monthly basis since 2014 and a record covering consultations and meetings is held on a database. Many of the comments made have felt that the Plan has been well put together and is clearly presented. Notes 8 and 9</p>
--	--	------------------------------	--

86	Resident	Duplicate of 54	
87	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oSizGnlO3EX1Psbp *Objects to Lower Tysoe BUAB and the rationale behind it.	*Comments noted but disagree. The Group sees Lower Tysoe as much a part of the village as the other two settlements and this reflects the views of over 70% of the respondents in the 2014 survey (Appendix 3). Residents of Lower Tysoe enjoy easy access to the ‘central’ facilities located in Middle Tysoe via well maintained footpaths, a newly resurfaced pavement or by a short distance on the road (by cycle or car) (Note 18). Many other comments question why Lower Tysoe should remain outside the village and be treated in some ways differently from Middle and Upper Tysoe. The view that a BUAB in Lower Tysoe will be detrimental to planning there is unsupported. Whilst the principle of new development would be acceptable within the BUAB, the fact that the Boundary has been drawn in the way proposed would limit building opportunities to small infill or conversion schemes (Note 19). Currently, Lower Tysoe, being defined as a rural hamlet, enjoys a level of protection from new building afforded by a presumption against development except in well defined circumstances. It should be pointed out that this has not prevented some eleven dwellings being granted planning permission there since 2011. It is the opinion of the Group that drawing Lower Tysoe into the Local Service Village and providing it with its own BUAB will afford it greater protection than previously (Housing Policy 1). The Plan proposes that only three dwellings should be built there until 2031; it also complies with the NPPF and SDC's Core Strategy.
88	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oRgTEhbNBQrMe9c3 *Does not like the strategic gap as it pushes houses elsewhere	*Comment noted. The Strategic Gap was highly valued in the draft Plan and received much positive feedback (Natural Environment Policy 6) although a small number of respondents wished to see (as here) ribbon development between Middle and Lower Tysoe. The Neighbourhood Planning Group believe it is important to

		<p>*Lack of affordable housing</p> <p>*No development should be allowed in Conservation Areas</p>	<p>preserve this visual break between Lower and Middle Tysoe in order to preserve their character and setting. The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty only covers the east side of the road between Middle and Lower Tysoe but, although a significant designation, in itself is not a full guarantee against future development.</p> <p>*Comment noted. Numerous comments on the Plan expressed concern that there were no small or affordable housing schemes proposed in the Plan either for the elderly and young families. This is now addressed in the Plan (Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6). From a commercial point of view small affordable houses are uneconomic to construct. The Group has pursued potential sites with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3 where the owner is now seriously considering an affordable scheme. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme. Note 22</p> <p>*Comments noted. Although the Neighbourhood Planning Group would wish to avoid building in Conservation Areas, there is no planning reason why development should not take place there. However, any development that might take place would need to conform to appropriate design and materials defined by the Plan and be appropriate to the character of the built and natural environment (Built Environment Policies 1 and 2).</p>
89	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oRcAaDNLPMUaQkJy</p> <p>*Thanks to everyone</p> <p>*A pity Feoffee has not been used for affordable housing</p>	<p>*Comment noted.</p> <p>*Agree but unfortunately not possible. The owner has ruled out the allocation of Feoffee Farm which is a small working farm. Many respondents pointed out that part of this site would be an ideal location for a small number of affordable homes, particularly for</p>

			the elderly. The Trustees of the charity that owns the farm have voted not to allow this to happen despite likely funding available to support such a venture. Sites can only be included in the plan if the owners agree. Note 24. However, it now seems likely that affordable housing might be available on one of the other allocated sites (Housing Policy 2 , para 6.3.0.6). Note 22
90	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oRnxuy-vdpyd2yFX</p> <p>*Good that Lower Tysoe is part of the LSV</p> <p>*Generally supportive</p>	<p>*Comment noted, see Housing Policy 1.</p> <p>*Comment noted</p>
91	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oRUAfjG3L62fXCrn</p> <p>*Generally supportive</p> <p>*Thinks that Green Space (Lock’s Paddock) would be better as bungalow housing</p> <p>*Are Reserve Sites really necessary?</p>	<p>*Comment noted</p> <p>*Comment noted. ‘Local Green spaces’ have been designated as being those areas which are local to the community and considered to be special or important on the basis of their beauty, history, recreational value or tranquillity (Natural Environment Policy 4). They should remain undeveloped in perpetuity in order to retain oases of open space and ‘green lungs’ within the village. This site was not put forward as a possible site for development whereas sites on the other side of the road were. The Neighbourhood Planning Group felt it appropriate to maintain this as green space in order to balance the new development. Note 29</p> <p>* Reserve sites are necessary as being a possible “safety valve” in the case where SDC cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Reserve sites would only be released for development in very specific circumstances (SDC’s Core Strategy CS16) or they may be released if a suitable Rural Exception Scheme was proposed on them. If the circumstances under which Reserve Sites would be released for development were triggered then, in the absence of a Reserve Site identified in the Plan, it is likely that the District Council would allocate one through the Site Allocation Plan</p>

			(currently being prepared); equally a developer might apply to build in a place unwelcome to the community. So, whilst it is not prescribed that villages should identify Reserve Sites it is highly recommended that they do. The NPG believes it is better for the local community to be in control of where development should be located rather than to leave it to others. Notes 20 - 21
92	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oRbchhCMNt0eg312</p> <p>*Queries consultation system and sees whole process being, undemocratic and full of vested interests.</p>	<p>*Disagree. The Timeline (Appendix 2) details the extent of the publicity, consultation, survey, advertising and information available over the last five years. Three draft Plans have been produced, each being informed by public comment as well as by meetings with local amenity groups and clubs, local landowners and local businesses. The Group meets formally on average monthly. These meetings have been open to the public and minutes are posted on the village notice board and on the Parish website. Some residents may have been more vocal than others but everyone has had the opportunity to engage throughout the process. The choice of Allocated Sites has been made according to defined criteria (Housing Policy 2) not as the result of ‘Nimbyism’ as the comment suggests. Notes 8 and 9</p>
93	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oRRgnyZPpttggdWa</p> <p>*All the allocated houses should be in Upper and Lower Tysoe</p> <p>*There should be houses for young and elderly</p>	<p>*Comment noted. The Plan views the three Tysoes as a single entity (Housing Policy 1) and the ‘longlist’ of 16 possible allocated sites for development were spread between the three. The final choice of sites was made on the basis of applying a set of consistent criteria for suitability (Housing Policy 2). Whether they were in Upper, Middle or Lower Tysoe was not part of the equation. To have removed Middle Tysoe from the process would have been undemocratic and socially divisive. Notes 10 - 13</p> <p>*Agreed, and the Plan does its best to support small and/or affordable properties. The need for smaller homes is recognised in the proposed housing mix (Housing Policy 5) and the need for</p>

			affordable homes is now addressed in the Plan (Housing Policy 2 , para 6.3.0.6). From a commercial point of view small affordable houses are uneconomic to construct. The Group has pursued potential sites with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3 where the owner is now seriously considering an affordable scheme. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme. Note 22
94	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oRowdT7ShciErg67</p> <p>*Good that Lower Tysoe is part of the LSV</p> <p>*Why does Lower Tysoe need its own BUAB?</p> <p>*The NPG contains too many Lower Tysoe people</p>	<p>*Comment noted, see Housing Policy 2.</p> <p>* A BUAB is a key element of a Local Service Village. It is a virtual boundary drawn tightly around the existing built form of a settlement (and any proposed allocations) to define the area within which development will be supported in principal. This boundary has been drawn quite tightly around Lower Tysoe in order to inhibit any unwanted or speculative development. Outside the Built up Area Boundary only development of a few very specific types will be supported. Notes 15 - 19</p> <p>*Disagree. Currently one of the seven members of the Group is from Lower Tysoe</p>
95	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oRM4pNkPYRGqaAiv</p> <p>*Plan takes into account comments made by residents</p> <p>*Lower Tysoe should be seen as part of the whole</p> <p>*Private land as green space is untenable</p>	<p>*Agreed. The Timeline (Appendix 2) shows the extent of public consultation and engagement over the five years and the way in which the final Plan has evolved.</p> <p>*Agree. This is a key element of the Plan (Housing Policy 1)</p> <p>*Disagree. Local Green Spaces have been designated as being those areas which are local to the community and considered to be special or important on the basis of their beauty, history, recreational value or tranquillity (Natural Environment Policy 4).</p>

			The idea is that they should remain undeveloped in perpetuity in order to retain oases of open space and ‘green lungs’ within the village. The majority of these designations are in public ownership, but this is not essential. The ‘Local Green Space’ site assessments are referenced in the draft Plan. Note 29 and link to NPPF.
96	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oRljL0osCPrUupWL</p> <p>*I appreciate the time and effort</p> <p>*Lower Tysoe should not be separate</p> <p>*Affordable housing needed</p>	<p>*Comments noted</p> <p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 1, also Note 18</p> <p>* Agree. The need for smaller and/or affordable homes is recognised in the proposed housing mix (Housing Policy 5) and in Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6). From a commercial point of view small affordable houses are uneconomic to construct. The Group has pursued potential sites with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3 where the owner is now seriously considering an affordable scheme. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme. Note 22</p>
97	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQ---UC_r3v0TGEG</p> <p>*Leave as written</p>	<p>*Comment noted</p>
98	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oREN_Xvxmnw9ORRv</p> <p>*Objects to Roses Farm as potential site on conservation and historical grounds</p>	<p>*Comment noted. The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the Neighbourhood Planning Group believe it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the Built up Area Boundary; there are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Any development would need to take into account the Plan’s policy on the value of heritage assets (Built Environment Policy 1). In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would require</p>

			consideration of these assets. Note 21.
99	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQ08YTzDNdiSe6E Objects to Roses Farm as potential site on traffic and views grounds</p>	<p>*Comment noted. The Plan explains the rationale for Reserve Sites and the NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB; there are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Any development would also need to take into account the Plan’s policy on the value of landscapes and views (Natural Environmental Policy 5). Traffic and access issues have been voiced in a number of comments, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access and traffic. Note 21</p>
100	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oR-w2WdTqP3OGGFP *Impressive piece of work</p> <p>*Failure to find space for affordable houses</p> <p>*Methodist Chapel should be seen as a community asset</p>	<p>*Comment noted</p> <p>*Comment noted. The need for smaller and/or affordable homes is recognised in the proposed housing mix (Housing Policy 5) and in Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6). From a commercial point of view small affordable houses are uneconomic to construct. The Group has pursued potential sites with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3 where the owner is now seriously considering an affordable scheme. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme. Note 22</p> <p>*Agree. There were varying opinions about this (eg see comment 8) but the building has now been listed as a community asset in the Plan (Community Assets Policy 1)</p>

		<p>*Some confusion about Feoffee</p> <p>*Queries the BUAB in Lower Tysoe</p>	<p>*Comment noted. The farm was originally in the list of potential sites, but the owner, the Tysoe Utility Trust, has asked for it to be removed. Many respondents pointed out that part of this site would be an ideal location for a small number of affordable homes, particularly for the elderly. The Trustees have voted not to allow this to happen despite likely funding available to support such a venture. Sites can only be included in the plan if the owners agree. Note 24.</p> <p>* Comment noted. A BUAB is a key element of a Local Service Village. It is a virtual boundary drawn tightly around the existing built form of a settlement (and any proposed allocations) to define the area within which development will be supported in principal. This boundary has been drawn quite tightly around Lower Tysoe in order to inhibit any unwanted or speculative development. Outside the BUAB only development of a few very specific types will be supported. Notes 15 to 19</p>
101	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQ5cGECvaFwFsKM7</p> <p>* Roses Farm is unsuitable on grounds of traffic and safety</p>	<p>*Disagree. The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. There are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. Note 21</p>
102	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oylIOFiWYlKlImXb</p> <p>* Roses Farm is unsuitable on grounds of traffic, safety and</p>	<p>*Disagree. The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the</p>

		conservation	NPG believe it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. There are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. It would also need to take into account the Plan’s policy on the value of heritage assets (Built Environment Policy 1). Note 21
103	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQsHRuoGhW7vF6mL *Objects to Roses Farm on various grounds	*Disagree. The Plan explains the rationale for Reserve Sites and the NPG believe it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. There are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. . It would also need to take into account the Plan’s policy on the value of heritage assets (Built Environment Policy 1) and other issues such as views, particularly from the adjacent AONB (Natural Environment Policy 1) . Note 21
104	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oRA1rFNq_d1UFxSk *Prefers infill development to extending boundaries	*Agree in the sense that the BUABs are intended to limit new

		<p>*Too many 4+ bedroom type houses</p> <p>* Roses Farm is unsuitable</p>	<p>development to appropriate locations and inhibit speculative or unwanted development outside the current settlements. ‘Windfall’ development would also be acceptable in principle. (Housing Policy 1 and 2). Notes 11 and 14</p> <p>*Agree, see Housing Policy 5. Tysoe already has a greater proportion of larger houses than the District Council’s Core Strategy defined housing mix. It is the intention of the Plan to rebalance this by recommending a preponderance of smaller dwellings. In addition, numerous comments on the Plan express concern that there were no small or affordable housing schemes proposed in the Plan either for the elderly and young families. This is now addressed in the Plan (Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6).</p> <p>*Disagree. The Plan explains the rationale for Reserve Sites and the NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. Any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. It would also need to take into account the Plan’s policy on the value of heritage assets (Built Environment Policy 1) and on the local environment (Natural Environment Policy 1).Note 21</p>
105	Non-resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQkLKKcaVrLn4A1w</p> <p>*The village is being ruined by too many houses and too many vehicles.</p>	<p>*Agreed. New dwellings are inevitable but the Plan enables the village to develop in a controlled way (Housing Policy 2) in order to minimise excessive traffic volumes and maintain the character of the existing settlement (Built Environment Policy 1 and 2). Note 1</p>
106	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQo-csl7GDLJnUY</p> <p>Roses Farm is unsuitable on grounds of traffic, safety and conservation</p>	<p>*Disagree. The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of</p>

			<p>Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the Built up Area Boundary. There are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. It would also need to take into account the Plan’s policy on the value of heritage assets (Built Environment Policy 1). Note 21</p>
107	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQgj1EujiUstGmQa * Roses Farm is unsuitable on grounds of traffic, safety and conservation</p>	<p>*Disagree. The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the NPG believe it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. There are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. It would also need to take into account the Plan’s policy on the value of heritage assets (Built Environment Policy 1). Note 21</p>
108	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQSy62jtnO9Cpa_P *Roses Farm is unsuitable on grounds of traffic and safety</p>	<p>*Disagree. The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after</p>

			careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. There are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. Note 21
109	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQMFCRhGwwRbK6f2 *Leave the middle of Tysoe alone and put more houses in Lower Tysoe	*Comment noted. Lower Tysoe has already taken proportionately more houses than the rest of the village in the last 7 years. The Plan has used a consistent set of criteria to identify sites suitable for new development irrespective of which of the three hamlets they lie in (Housing Policy 2). To do otherwise would be seen as divisive. Note 11
110	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQeVKRW1qWr4p22o *Please no houses in Conservation Areas	*Comments noted. Although the Neighbourhood Planning Group would wish to avoid building in Conservation Areas, there is no planning reason why development should not take place there. However, any development that might take place would need to conform to appropriate design and materials defined by the Plan and be appropriate to the character of the built and natural environment (Built Environment Policies 1 and 2).
111	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQIBGMkO0ddcV4py *Sees no need for development. Plan is inappropriate especially for Conservation Areas	*Disagree. Unfortunately, new dwellings are inevitable but the Plan enables the village to develop in a controlled way (Housing Policy 2) in order to maintain the character of the existing settlements (Built Environment Policy 1 and 2) and to minimise excessive traffic volumes. Although the NPG would wish to avoid building in Conservation Areas, there is no planning reason why development should not take place there, subject to the criteria

			above.
112	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQB8kp54uA1-xr5</p> <p>*Small developments only please</p>	<p>*Agree. A focus on small-scale housing growth is a key feature of the Plan (Housing Policy 2) as is the need for smaller rather than larger ‘executive-style’ houses (Housing Policy 5). The Plan can identify those sites where development is to be resisted for historical, environmental or community reasons and specify construction materials according to a Village Design Statement (Built Environment Policy 2). Note 4.</p>
113	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQFOn2DsANqhXh-A</p> <p>*Priority development should be in Lower Tysoe</p> <p>*Not enough on traffic danger and congestion</p>	<p>*Disagree. Lower Tysoe has already taken proportionately more houses than the rest of the village in the last 7 years. The Plan has used a consistent set of criteria to identify sites suitable for new development irrespective of which of the three hamlets they lie in (Housing Policy 2). To do otherwise would be seen as divisive. Note 11</p> <p>*Comment noted. This is effectively outside the remit of the Group. However, the Plan’s emphasis on limiting new development to a small scale growth in a controlled way (Housing Policy 2) will also have an impact on limiting the growth of associated traffic.</p>
114	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oH6h8eXk7uw4PSUv</p> <p>*Too much traffic/congestion in Middle/Upper Tysoe.</p> <p>*New development should be focused on Lower Tysoe</p>	<p>*Comment noted. This issue of traffic is effectively outside the remit of the Group. However, the Plan’s emphasis on limiting new development to a small scale growth in a controlled way (Housing Policy 2) will also have an impact on limiting the growth of associated traffic.</p> <p>*Disagree. Lower Tysoe has already taken proportionately more houses than the rest of the village in the last 7 years. The Plan has used a consistent set of criteria to identify sites suitable for new development irrespective of which of the three hamlets they lie in (Housing Policy 2). To do otherwise would be seen as divisive.</p>

			Note 11
115	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQb4BDolJtQBVVA0 Too many houses at Roses Farm on grounds of parking, traffic and safety. Would prefer smaller number of houses</p>	<p>*Comment Noted. The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites (Housing Policy 3). The actual number of any potential dwellings has not been defined but the owner (Compton Estates) considers that there would be sufficient to enable there to be a proportion of affordable houses. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection to the site, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. Note 21</p>
116	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oHyRvxYPe-sJWeBM *Would like to complement the team and thank them; *Lower Tysoe should be in the LSV *Excellent document *Supports Roses Farm; objects to Herberts Farm</p>	<p>*Comments noted *Agreed, see Housing Policy 1. *Comments noted. *Comments noted. The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites (Housing Policy 3). Both sites were assessed by the Group, and independently by the planning consultant, as having suitable characteristics to be identified as Reserve Sites. Herbert’s Farm would continue to be a working farm even if development took place. The present outbuildings and byres could be moved further west thus ensuring that the village still possessed an active farm close to its centre. Issues of access have been considered by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority and indicate that any problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. Note 21</p>

117	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oQVCgov1oLulWRJx</p> <p>*Objects to development in the middle of the village, especially allocated site 3</p>	<p>*Comments noted. Unfortunately, new dwellings are inevitable but the Plan enables the village to develop in a controlled way (Housing Policy 2) in order to maintain the character of the existing settlements (Built Environment Policy 1 and 2). The sites have been selected using a consistent set of criteria by both the Group and an independent planning consultant. Site 3 was one of the three sites selected and also has the benefit of offering the potential of much need affordable housing. Contrary to the respondent’s comments, Middle Tysoe contains a number of designated Local Green Spaces (Natural Environment Policy 4) one of which lies almost opposite the site in question. Notes 10 - 13</p>
118	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oH_ihYZ2NolGig32</p> <p>*Roses farm is unsuitable on traffic and conservation grounds</p>	<p>*Disagree. The Plan explains the rationale for Reserve Sites and the NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. There are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. It would also need to take into account the Plan’s policy on the value of heritage assets (Built Environment Policy 1). Note 21</p>
119	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oHuNOu-b1f-S5QSW</p> <p>*Herbert’s Farm is unsuitable as a Reserve Site (ie removes farming from the village).</p>	<p>*Comments noted. The Plan explains the rationale for the two Reserve Sites (Housing Policy 3). Both sites were assessed by the Group, and independently by the planning consultant, as being</p>

			<p>suitable. Herbert’s Farm would continue to be a working farm even if development took place and the respondent’s fears unwarranted. The present outbuildings and byres could be moved further west thus ensuring that the village still possessed an active farm close to its centre. Any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. Another working farm in the village (Feoffee) is not among the list of sites and would be ideal as a ‘starter farm’ for a young person to maintain the farming tradition as the respondent might hope. Note 21</p>
120	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oH3esRJxGAqvEg0J *Agrees with all suggested sites *Lower Tysoe should be part of the whole. *Does not tackle affordable housing sufficiently *Needs to emphasise use of local stone</p>	<p>*Comments noted, see Housing Policy 2. *Agree, see Housing Policy 1 *Comment noted. Numerous comments on the Plan express concern that there were no small or affordable housing schemes proposed in the Plan either for the elderly and young families. This is now addressed in the Plan (Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6). From a commercial point of view small affordable houses are uneconomic to construct. The Group has pursued potential sites with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3 where the owner is seriously considering an affordable scheme. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme. Note 22 *Agree. This is important in retaining the character of the village and is embedded in Built Environment Policy 2. Note 22</p>
121	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oHhp2RR9pN2B_oFj *Agree with development sites *More affordable housing needed</p>	<p>Comments noted, see Housing Policy 2 *Comment noted. Numerous comments on the Plan express</p>

			<p>concern that there were no small or affordable housing schemes proposed in the Plan either for the elderly and young families. This is now addressed in the Plan (Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6). From a commercial point of view small affordable houses are uneconomic to construct. The Group has pursued potential sites with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3 where the owner is seriously considering an affordable scheme. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme. Note 22</p>
122	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oHkZM_m4Wz3r1CDN *The Methodist Church is a village amenity *Affordable housing should be a priority *More building needed in Lower Tysoe</p>	<p>*Agree. The Methodist Church has now been included as a community asset (Community Assets Policy 1).</p> <p>*Agree. Numerous comments on the Plan express concern that there were no small or affordable housing schemes proposed in the Plan either for the elderly and young families. This now addressed in the Plan (Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6). From a commercial point of view small affordable houses are uneconomic to construct. The Group has pursued potential sites with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm, Roses Farm as well as Sites 2 and 3 where the owner is seriously considering an affordable scheme. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme. Note 22</p> <p>*Disagree. Lower Tysoe has taken proportionately more houses than rest of village in the last 7 years. The Plan has used a consistent set of criteria to identify sites suitable for new development irrespective of which of the three hamlets they lie in (Housing Policy 2). To do otherwise would be seen as divisive. Note 11</p>
123	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oHorPzGJTTr1lupp * Roses Farm is unsuitable on traffic and safety grounds</p>	<p>*Disagree. The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the</p>

			<p>NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. There are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. Note 21</p>
124	Resident	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oHdNfYcHfZBhBaHt *Number of new houses too great for size of village</p> <p>*Affordable homes should be in roughcast or brick; ironstone is too expensive.</p> <p>*Objects to Rural Exception scheme</p>	<p>*Comments noted. Unfortunately, new dwellings are inevitable and the village is required to accommodate them. However, the Plan enables the village to develop in a controlled way (Housing Policy 2) and in a manner which will maintain the character and environment of the existing settlements (Built Environment Policy 1 and 2).</p> <p>*Disagree. The Plan requires all buildings to be of appropriate character and materials irrespective of their affordability (Built Environment Policy 2). It would be divisive to do otherwise and be to the detriment of the character of the village. The Plan anticipates that the majority of affordable homes will be for rent rather than purchase and discussions have taken place with owners of both the Roses Farm site and of Site 3 and with a housing association to this effect. Note 22</p> <p>*Comment noted. The Group accepts that an element of market housing may be drawn into a Rural Exception Scheme (Housing Policy 4), but these schemes are exceptional and in any event the recommendation of the Plan in terms of housing types, materials</p>

			and density will be a pertinent part of the planning process (Built Environment Policy 2).
125	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oypTafkUtRRtdhnf * Herbert’s Farm is unsuitable on traffic grounds	*Comments noted. The Plan explains the rationale for Reserve Sites (Housing Policy 3). Herbert’s farm was assessed by the Group, and independently by the planning consultant, as being suitable.. Issues of access have been considered by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority and indicate that any problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. Note 21
126	Resident	https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oHXmMjSuiIDcsCgL *Roses Farm is unsuitable on traffic, safety and conservation grounds.	*Comments noted. The Plan explains the rationale for reserve sites and the NPG believes it is prudent to include them. The actual choice of Roses Farm as a Reserve Site (Housing Policy 3) was made after careful deliberation of all options. Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the BUAB. There are few sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. Several comments raised the issue of traffic/access as an objection, but a study by Warwickshire County Council’s Highways Authority indicates that the problems can be mitigated. In any event, any potential development would require normal planning permission which would include consideration of access, traffic and pedestrian movement. It would also need to take into account the Plan’s policy on the value of heritage assets (Built Environment Policy 1). Note 21
127		Inadvertent duplicate of 52	See response for comment 52
128		Inadvertent duplicate of 56	See response for comment 56
129		Inadvertent duplicate of 55	See response for comment 55
130		Inadvertent duplicate of 53	See response for comment 53
131		Inadvertent duplicate of 70	See response for comment 70

<p>132</p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oShCZSeol-IPMiqc</p> <p>*Fully supports quality building materials, small developments, green spaces, ridge and furrow</p> <p>*Objects to the need for Reserve Sites</p> <p>*Feoffee is ideal site for much needed affordable housing</p>	<p>*Comments noted, see Built Environment Policy 2, Housing Policy 2, Natural Environment Policy 4 and Built Environment Policy 1 respectively.</p> <p>*Noted but disagree. Reserve sites necessary and are justified in Housing Policy 3. These sites are those identified as being a possible “safety valve” in the case where SDC cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Reserve sites would only be released for development in very specific circumstances (SDC’s Core Strategy CS16) or they may be released if a suitable Rural Exception Scheme was proposed on them. If the circumstances under which Reserve Sites would be released for development were triggered then, in the absence of a Reserve Site identified in the Plan, it is likely that the District Council would allocate one through the Site Allocation Plan (currently being prepared); equally a developer might apply to build in a place unwelcome to the community. Whilst it is not prescribed that villages should identify Reserve Sites it is highly recommended that they do. The NPG believes it is better for the local community to be in control of where development should be located rather than to leave it to others. Notes 21-26.</p> <p>*Agree but unfortunately not possible. The owner has ruled out the allocation of Feoffee Farm which is a small working farm at the core of the village owned by the Tysoe Utility Trust which is a registered charity. Many respondents pointed out that part of this site would be an ideal location for a small number of affordable homes, particularly for the elderly. The Trustees have voted not to allow this to happen despite likely funding available to support such a venture. Sites can only be included in the plan if the owners agree. Note 24. The issue of affordable housing has now been addressed on Site 3 (Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6. Note 22</p>
------------	-----------------	---	---

<p>133</p>	<p>Supports affordable housing, green spaces, historic landscapes and small developments</p> <p>*Sees no need for Reserve Sites</p> <p>*Feoffee is ideal site for much needed affordable housing</p>	<p>https://1drv.ms/b/s!ArddfdNv8IM0oSmYCICPrSxLS1VE</p>	<p>Comments noted, see Housing Policy 5, Natural Environment Policy 4, Built Environment Policy 1 and Housing Policy 2 respectively. Affordable housing is also now addressed in Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6; also Notes 22 - 26</p> <p>*Disagree. Reserve Sites necessary and are justified in Housing Policy 3. These sites are those identified as being a possible “safety valve” in the case where SDC cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Reserve Sites would only be released for development in very specific circumstances (SDC’s Core Strategy CS16) or they may be released if a suitable Rural Exception Scheme was proposed on them. If the circumstances under which Reserve Sites would be released for development were triggered then, in the absence of a Reserve Site identified in the Plan, it is likely that the District Council would allocate one through the Site Allocation Plan (currently being prepared); equally a developer might apply to build in a place unwelcome to the community. Whilst it is not prescribed that villages should identify Reserve Sites it is highly recommended that they do. The NPG believes it is better for the local community to be in control of where development should be located rather than to leave it to others. Notes 21-26.</p> <p>*Agree but unfortunately not possible. The owner has ruled out the allocation of Feoffee Farm which is a small working farm at the core of the village owned by the Tysoe Utility Trust which is a registered charity. Many respondents pointed out that part of this site would be an ideal location for a small number of affordable homes, particularly for the elderly. The Trustees have voted not to allow this to happen despite likely funding available to support such a venture. Sites can only be included in the plan if the owners agree. Note 24. The issue of affordable housing has now been addressed on Site 3 (Housing Policy 2, para 6.3.0.6. Note 22</p>
------------	--	--	---

		*Not enough consultation for such major issues	*Disagree. The Timeline (Appendix 2) details the extent of the publicity, consultation, survey, advertising and information available over the last five years. Three draft Plans have been produced, each being informed by public comment as well as by meetings with local amenity groups and clubs, local landowners and local businesses. The Group meets formally on average monthly. These meetings have been open to the public and minutes are posted on the village notice board and on the Parish website. An update on the Plan has been delivered to the Parish Council at public meetings on a monthly basis since 2014 and a record covering consultations and meetings is held on a database. Many of the comments made have felt that the Plan has been well put together and is clearly presented. Notes 8 and 9
134		Inadvertent duplicate of 51	See response for comment 51

Amplification Notes to Responses

Note 1. Why do we have to have new development in Tysoe?

Stratford District Council, which is the Local Planning Authority, has developed a *Core Strategy* which points to the need to create new homes throughout the District during the period 2011 - 2031. One of the ways it proposes to do this is to share development throughout its Local Service Villages of which Tysoe is one (see Note 2). Several residents commented that Tysoe should have no more development at all but although the District Council may already have met their requirement from the Local Service Villages it is not felt that development stagnation is a viable option.

Note 2. What is a Local Service Village (or LSV)?

This is a definition applied by Stratford District Council to a village on the basis of being of a certain size with a defined set of amenities and facilities. These include the presence of public transport, shop, school etc. Tysoe is defined as a Local Service Village on these criteria and is

thus required by the District Council to take its share of new housing. The Local Services Villages are broken down into 4 categories, 1 being the most sustainable, and 4 being the least sustainable. Tysoe is classed as a category 2 Local Service Village.

Note 3. How many new homes do we have to have?

This is a moot point. Stratford District Council needs to deliver some 700 dwellings among category 2 Local Services Villages like Tysoe during the period 2011 – 2031. This figure is not a ceiling. Since 2011, 20 new houses have already been built in Upper, Middle and Lower Tysoe and a further 25 have been given planning permission. The Plan proposes a further 18 houses should be built in the Plan period. This average rate of build of slightly more than three per year, plus any windfall permissions, continues the steady rate of development that the village has found acceptable in the past. In addition to this there may be scope for much-needed ‘affordable’ housing (see Note 22) and Rural Exception Housing (see Note 23).

In theory, if Tysoe has not offered sufficient numbers to satisfy the District Council, the village may have reduced defence against opportunistic and unsympathetic development. The District Council has not questioned the proposed market housing numbers in the Plan.

Note 4. What is a Neighbourhood Development Plan?

A Neighbourhood Development Plan allows the local community to decide the nature, density and specified number of new dwellings (subject to windfall) and their preferred locations (see Notes 10 - 13, ‘Allocated Sites’) within a defined Built up Area Boundary (see Note 14). The Plan can also identify those sites where development is to be resisted for historical, environmental or community reasons and specify construction materials according to a Village Design Statement. This is the best way of avoiding the unplanned and speculative development (other than windfall development) that has already been seen in the village. Importantly, the Plan also includes a number of heritage, environment and community based policies covering a range of local issues.

The recently updated National Planning Policy Framework (2019) makes it clear that villages without a Neighbourhood Development Plan will be a great deal more vulnerable than those with one. Although a Neighbourhood Development Plan is not a legal document as such, it carries statutory weight in planning matters once passed at a local referendum and made part of the Development Plan for the area.

Note 5. What area is covered by the Neighbourhood Development Plan?

The whole Parish is covered by the Plan, but the three populated areas of Upper, Middle and Lower Tysoe are those likely to be most affected because this is where the majority of planning applications are focussed. The Plan is not only about development but also about the Parish’s historic and natural environment, the demographics, its amenities and its infrastructure.

Note 6. Who is responsible for the Neighbourhood Development Plan and its drafting?

The Parish Council is ultimately responsible for the Plan as the 'qualifying body', and the Neighbourhood Planning Group is accountable to the Parish Council. The Group was formed of local volunteers in 2014 and has been active ever since. Since 2014 over 20 different volunteers have given their time, and the current group consists of eight individuals from the Parish. Two are also Parish Councillors. The Group is supported by an independent planning consultant (funded by the Parish Council and Government grants) who attends meetings, gives professional advice and is actively involved in the whole process.

Note 7. Is there a defined process that has to be adopted?

The Neighbourhood Development Plan is a Government initiative (*The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012*) and there are rules as to how it should be prepared, what it should cover, and the extent to which consultation and engagement should take place with the community (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#contents>). Although the Plan has to be in conformity with the strategic policies in the District Council's *Core Strategy* and any statutory designations (eg the National Planning Policy Framework), it can be flexible to reflect local concerns such as the environment, the character of the Parish and the wishes of the community. The District Council checks the Plan at certain stages during its progress. If the Plan was seen to be significantly deficient or have shortcomings it would not have been allowed to reach its present stage.

Note 8. What is the nature of the consultation/engagement process?

The Neighbourhood Planning Group has followed the defined guidelines and adhered to the prescribed process for producing a Neighbourhood Development Plan (see Note 7). This has required keeping the community informed, encouraging the community to be actively involved, and making the community aware of how their views are informing the Plan. A Parish-wide survey/questionnaire was conducted in 2014 (40% response), there have been three major drafts of the Plan since then (both hard copy and digital) each of which has involved a series of consultation evenings and open events. The Plan is evolutionary, each draft being informed by comments from the previous draft, by meetings with local amenity groups and clubs, local landowners, local businesses and by a Housing Needs Survey. The Group meets formally on average monthly. These meetings have been open to the public and minutes are posted on the village notice board and on the Parish website. An update on the Plan has been delivered to the Parish Council at public meetings on a monthly basis since 2014 and a record covering consultations and meetings is held on a database.

Note 9. Has there been sufficient community engagement during the process?

Several of the comments received made claims that this has not been the case. However, the Group has made every effort to reach and listen to all elements of the community (see Notes 7 and 8), publicising events with flyers, announcements and advertising. The group has done its utmost to give residents the opportunity to make comment and has considered public feedback carefully. Many of the comments made have felt that the Plan has been well put together and is clearly presented (see Consultation Statement Appendix 2 for timeline of meetings/consultations).

A public meeting in September 2018 was principally concerned with the proposals for the site of Roses Farm. A detailed presentation was made of the proposed scheme by the site owner followed by public questions.

Note 10. What are ‘Allocated Sites’?

Having decided on the approximate number of houses required to be built (see Note 3) the Plan needs to decide where they should be most suitably located to conform to the character, visual well-being and infrastructure of the village. The Neighbourhood Planning Group inherited a list of potential sites identified as early as 2012 by Stratford District Council.

(<https://www.stratford.gov.uk/doc/205783/name/ED412%20SHLAA%20Review%202012%20Strategic%20Housing%20Land%20Availability%20Assessment%20Jan%202013.pdf>). The community was also asked to suggest other possible locations and there was a ‘Call for Sites’ to encourage landowners to come forward. The result was a ‘long-list’ of 16 possible locations from which the allocated sites could be selected.

Note 11. How were the Allocated Sites chosen?

Each of the 16 possible sites (see Note 10) was assessed individually by the Neighbourhood Planning Group and also independently by the Group’s independent planning consultant whose remit was to consider them strictly in planning terms. A number of criteria were used to assess each site including relevant planning history and constraints; the landscape and topography; drainage and flooding; accessibility; the adjacent natural or historic built environment, and how any new build might fit into the existing settlement pattern and density. As a result three sites were selected as appropriate locations for future development. These provide capacity for approximately 18 dwellings. The full 16 site assessments are all in the public domain and are referenced in the Plan.

Note 12. Would an Allocated Site automatically get planning permission?

There is no guarantee that planning permission would automatically be granted on an Allocated Site but, given that each site has been carefully selected on planning grounds and would come with the full support of the community in the Plan, refusal on grounds of principle would not only be unlikely but also contrary to the spirit of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) and the Localism Act (2011) which underpin the Plan. Ultimately it is the Planning Authority (the District Council) who has the power to grant permission for any application and a

fully approved Neighbourhood Development Plan will provide them and the Parish Council with a template of what might be acceptable within the parish (see Note 13).

Note 13. How can the Parish Council control what is built on an Allocated Site?

Once adopted, the Neighbourhood Development Plan will carry statutory weight being part of the Development Plan. All development will be assessed against all relevant policies contained within the Plan. All stakeholders, including developers and the District Council will therefore have to have pay due regard to the Village Design Statement, contained within the Plan in terms of character, style and construction materials etc. In short, the Plan gives added reassurance that the development would respect the local density and style of buildings.

Note 14. What is a Built-up Area Boundary (or BUAB) and what is its purpose?

This boundary is a key element of a Local Service Village (see Note 2). It is a virtual boundary drawn tightly around the existing built form of a settlement (and any proposed allocations) to define the area within which development will be supported in principal. Outside the Built up Area Boundary only development of a few very specific types will be supported – these include Rural Exception Schemes (developments of affordable housing which may also include a small number of market dwellings to make the scheme financially viable) (see Note 24), conversions of agricultural buildings into dwellings, rural workers dwellings and dwellings of significant architectural merit. Within the boundary development will be supported in principle by the Parish Council but would have to be subject to the normal planning rules and constraints.

Note 15. What are the implications of Lower Tysoe having its own Built up Area Boundary?

The Plan proposes that Lower Tysoe becomes part of the Local Service Village with the same planning rules as the rest of the village. In order to make this change it has to have its own Built up Area Boundary.

Drawing a Built up Area Boundary where one did not exist previously will mean that the principle of new housing development within the boundary will be acceptable. However, any new development would still have to comply with all relevant planning policies in the Plan (see Note 20) including those that apply to the density of development, character and style of the proposed development, vehicle and pedestrian safety, flood mitigation etc.

Note 16. How were the Built up Area Boundaries drawn?

Stratford District Council had already drawn a Built up Area Boundary around Middle and Upper Tysoe and the draft Plan has largely followed this line. It encompasses the buildings and gardens of those two settlements and also includes some currently undeveloped areas within the village which could be available for limited infill.

The proposed Built up Area Boundary for Lower Tysoe is drawn in very much the same way but as tightly as possible. This minimises potential development opportunity within the boundary. However, because the existing properties in this settlement are generally larger and sit on large plots, it necessarily dissects some plots in a very few places. This differs from the Built up Area Boundary for Middle and Upper Tysoe but is necessary as the placing of large gardens inside the boundary would otherwise offer the potential for inappropriate medium-scale development. This will provide a better future safeguard against unwanted or speculative building than at present. Built up Area Boundaries otherwise follow, as far as possible, physical demarcations such as building lines, fences, hedges, streams or other physical boundaries.

Note 17. What are Stratford District Council's views of Lower Tysoe having a Built Up Area Boundary)?

Currently Stratford District Council regards Lower Tysoe as a hamlet separate from the Local Service Village comprising Middle and Upper Tysoe (see Note 19). They did not include it in the Local Service Village because without its own services they regard development there as unsustainable. This has been the case for some years. However, their view, which has been consistently and often stated, is that whilst they would keep the *status quo*, should it be the wish of the community to change it, then they would accept that.

In effect, the decision as to whether Lower Tysoe has a Built up Area Boundary is a matter for the Neighbourhood Development Plan which covers Upper, Middle and Lower Tysoe and the rural parish.

It should be stressed that the Neighbourhood Development Plan is a community venture for the entire parish, not just parts of it, and is designed in the best interests of the whole Parish over the longer term.

The District Council has stated, in their comments on the draft Plan, that they are “generally comfortable with the justification for including Lower Tysoe within the BUAB for Tysoe”.

Note 18. Is it appropriate for Lower Tysoe to be included in the Local Service Village?

Residents of Lower Tysoe enjoy easy access to the facilities located in Middle Tysoe – the Church(es), Social Club, Public House, Shop, School, Post Office, Village Hall etc. These can be accessed from Lower Tysoe via well maintained footpaths, a newly resurfaced pavement or by a

short distance on the road (by cycle or car). In all practical terms these facilities are just as easily accessed from Lower Tysoe as they are from Upper Tysoe and, in the instance of school children, just as safely.

As a result the Group sees Lower Tysoe as much a part of the village as the other two settlements. However, the strong opinions of some residents from Lower Tysoe regard the planning implications of a Built up Area Boundary there to be detrimental (see Note 19). Many other comments have been received questioning why it is that Lower Tysoe should remain outside the village and be treated in some ways differently from the rest. Many residents have questioned why it is that new development should not be shared equitably across the three parts of the village rather than concentrated in Middle and Upper Tysoe alone.

Some residents have argued that the village survey, conducted in 2014 and in which the majority of respondents agreed that the village comprised the three settlements, cannot be relied upon because residents did not understand the implications behind the question. It is the Group's contention that residents were answering a simple question which demonstrated what is plainly evident: Lower Tysoe is regarded as an integral part of the village and as such should not be subject to any different rules or treatment from the rest of the village. This supports the view that Lower Tysoe is not regarded as sufficiently distant or separate from the rest of the village to warrant being treated in any way differently from the other two settlements.

The proposal to include Lower Tysoe within the Local Service Village with its own Built up Area Boundary supports the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), with which the Plan must comply. Paragraph 78 promotes the development of rural villages to support local services and the Plan sees Lower Tysoe as supporting the 'central' services in nearby Middle Tysoe.

It should also be noted that development has not been significantly inhibited by Lower Tysoe's exclusion from the Local Service Village. Since 2011 some 11 dwellings have been granted planning permission in Lower Tysoe largely because they have been supported by the Parish Council. Other recent applications have been refused permission for various planning reasons in addition to the principle of development. Planning applications in Lower Tysoe would continue to be assessed against all material planning considerations and unacceptable and inappropriate development will continue to be resisted.

Contrary to what has been stated in some documents, Lower Tysoe's inclusion in the Local Service Village would have no implications for existing houses. Any implications relate only to future new development.

Note 19. Will the inclusion of Lower Tysoe in the Local Service Village mean more development?

Whilst the principle of new development would be acceptable within the Built up Area Boundary, the fact that the Built up Area Boundary has been drawn in the way proposed would limit opportunities to small infill or conversion schemes (which are likely to be supported currently) apart from on Site 1 (land south of The Orchards). On this site a prior application to build 7 dwellings in a courtyard style development was refused permission because of over development and inappropriate style (among other reasons). The site is identified for a potential development of approximately 3 dwellings and whilst the Parish Council cannot control what may come forward in an application it is difficult to see how an application for a larger scale development would be acceptable.

Note 20. What is a Reserve Site and why are they included in the Plan?

Reserve sites are sites identified as being a possible “safety valve” in the case where Stratford District Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Reserve sites would only be released for development in very specific circumstances (Stratford District Council Core Strategy CS16) or they may be released if a suitable Rural Exception Scheme were proposed on them (see Note 23). If the circumstances under which Reserve Sites would be released for development were triggered then, in the absence of a Reserve Site identified in the Plan, it is likely that the District Council would allocate one through the Site Allocation Plan (currently being prepared); equally a developer might apply to build in a place unwelcome to the community. So, whilst it is not prescribed that villages should identify Reserve Sites it is highly recommended that they do. It is considered better for the local community to be in control of where development should be located rather than to leave it to others. Reserve Sites remain outside the Built up Area Boundaries to protect them from development except where the circumstances identified in Policy CS16 occur.

Note 21. How were the Reserve Sites chosen?

Clearly, to be effective as a “safety valve” in the circumstances outlined in Note 20 above, Reserve Sites have to provide a reasonable capacity for new housing, they also have to be deliverable and outside the Built up Area Boundary. There are not many sites in the parish which comply with these requirements. The Neighbourhood Planning Group, assisted by the planning consultant, have assessed that the two sites identified in the Plan – Roses Farm and Herbert’s Farm - provide suitable characteristics to be identified as Reserve Sites.

Roses Farm has the additional benefit of a landowner (Compton Estates) who is prepared to construct a proportion of affordable housing and manage the rental arrangements in perpetuity (see Note 22). That said, neither is perfect, they both lie within conservation areas and they both present challenges for gaining suitable access. It is believed that these challenges can be mitigated (See WCC Highways Authority report at <https://1drv.ms/x/s!ArddfdNv8IM0nR3du8gH5pGQCC7H>) but ultimately this is a matter for the developer. No permission will be granted unless these can be satisfied during the planning application.

At Roses Farm the owners also own the surrounding properties and, if development were to be permitted, believe they could design vehicle access into the scheme which would meet Highways Authority's requirements. Pedestrian access could also be obtained via the footpath (suitably upgraded) which currently runs through the orchard and allotments to Shenington Road where it would connect to a metalled pavement.

Contrary to some comments, there is no reason to suspect that Herbert's Farm would not continue to be a working farm even if development took place. The present outbuildings and byres could be moved further west thus ensuring that the village still possessed an active farm close to its centre.

It should be remembered that any development of a Reserve Site would (a) only occur in the event of the housing supply not being met, and (b) would always be subject to the normal planning rules which, if they were not met, would prevent permission being granted.

Note 22. Is there a site specifically proposed for affordable housing?

Numerous comments on the Plan express concern that there are no small or affordable housing schemes proposed in the Plan either for the elderly and young families. From a commercial point of view small affordable houses are uneconomic to construct. Stratford District Council recognises this and has specified that in any development of 11 or more dwellings, approximately one third must be classed as 'affordable' (CS 17). One of the allocated sites in the Neighbourhood Development Plan (Site 3, proposed for 13 dwellings) will fall into this category (see Note 26).

Elsewhere, in order for housing to be realistically available to those on lower incomes, it would have to be subsidised. For example, a suitable plot of land would need to be acquired either cost free or well below market value, possibly through a charitable body, or be bought in conjunction with a housing association or other landowner, possibly for rental purposes. The Group has pursued potential sites with several land owners, most notably at Feoffee Farm (see Note 24), Roses Farm (see Note 21) as well as Sites 2 and 3 where the owner is seriously considering an affordable scheme. Alternatively affordable housing may be permitted under a Rural Exception Scheme (see Note 23).

Note 23. What is a Rural Exception Scheme?

Schemes which primarily provide affordable housing are termed 'Rural Exception Schemes' because of their value to the community. Such is the importance attached to need for social or affordable housing, and because of the special status of the scheme, these can be built after the

Plan and *outside* the Plan's Built up Area Boundary. However, they may also include a small number of market dwellings to make the scheme financially viable. In view of this, the Parish Council would prefer to control future planning by the provision of a supply of affordable housing inside the Built up Area Boundary of the original Plan although they would support an application for a suitable Rural Exception Scheme outside the Built up Area Boundary if one were proposed which met all relevant requirements.

Note 24. Why is Feoffee Farm not included as a proposed site?

Feoffee is a small working farm (outbuildings and fields, but no dwelling, at the core of the village) owned by the Tysoe Utility Trust which is a registered charity. Many respondents pointed out that part of this site would be an ideal location for a small number of affordable homes, particularly for the elderly. The Trustees have voted not to allow this to happen despite likely funding available to support such a venture (see Note 26). Sites can only be included in the plan if the owners agree. Therefore Feoffee is unable to be included as a proposed site. There were also comments that wished to see the site remain as it is; one respondent pointed out that Feoffee would make an excellent 'starter farm' for a young person.

Note 25. Could the Methodist Church site be used to provide affordable housing?

There are a small number of strong but opposing views in the village regarding the Methodist Church. While one side argues that it has been inexcusably omitted as a community asset, another sees it as being an ideal site for affordable housing, were it to be demolished. The Church lies inside the Built up Area Boundary and therefore the site is open to appropriate future redevelopment. Any site which was offered by a charitable body would certainly be considered for an affordable housing scheme and the Methodist Church knows the Parish Council would be interested if the site were to become available.

Note 26. Does the village or the District Council have any money to fund an affordable housing scheme.

Under normal circumstances there are no Parish Council funds available to support this. Affordable housing has mostly occurred under Stratford District Council's requirement that developments of 11 or more dwellings should contain a defined proportion (35%) of affordable houses (see Note 22). Developments below that number are required to make a contribution *in lieu* for the off-site provision of affordable housing in the District (known as a Section 106 agreement). Under this arrangement one recent development in Tysoe was required to allocate a sum which the District Council has promised will be available for affordable housing in Tysoe itself. The sum (around £400,000) is available to support a suitable scheme although none has yet been identified.

Note 27. Why are some areas of the parish designated wild-life areas?

Map 6 in the Draft Plan illustrates features of the natural environment and its biodiversity. This map has been downloaded directly from Warwickshire County Council's website and is the result of the work of the Warwickshire Wildlife Trust commencing in 1999. There are no 'designations' as such, statutory or otherwise. The places denoted are simply those which flag up areas or points of interest.

Note 28. Do we need a Strategic Gap if we have the protection of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?

The Strategic Gap was highly valued in the draft Plan and received much positive feedback, although a small number of respondents wished to see ribbon development between Middle and Lower Tysoe. The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty only covers the east side of the road between Middle and Lower Tysoe and, although a significant designation, in itself is not a full guarantee against future development. The Neighbourhood Development Group wished to enhance the protection of this gap on both sides of the road and this has been achieved by defining a Strategic Gap within the Plan.

Note 29. How are Local Green Spaces designated?

'Local Green spaces' have been designated as being those areas which are local to the community and considered to be special or important on the basis of their beauty, history, recreational value or tranquillity. They should remain undeveloped in perpetuity in order to retain oases of open space and 'green lungs' within the village. The criteria for designation are laid out in the National Planning Policy Framework: (http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=7&ved=2ahUKEwjfxuudtsjhAhV4ShUIHXgpC2kQFjAGegQIARAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.harborough.gov.uk%2Fdownload%2Fdownloads%2Fid%2F1493%2Flocal_green_space_background_paperpdf.pdf&usg=AOvVaw3nLnRXiF1iyO-QgphykqZr). The majority of these designations are in public ownership, but this is not a requirement. The 'Local Green Space' site assessments are referenced in the Plan.

Note 30. How does the Neighbourhood Development Plan affect the role of the Parish Council?

The Parish Council will continue to make representations on planning applications within the parish but will have the additional strength of the Plan to back it up (see Note 4). It will support development on allocated sites, so long as plans accord with planning regulations, and will use discretion about potential minor development inside the Built up Area Boundaries. It will be able to retain the integrity of designated Local Green Spaces and the Strategic Gap.

For the allocated sites, the Parish Council will have the authority of the Plan to support proposals for homes the village needs: that is, smaller homes rather than large executive dwellings. It will also be guided by the Village Design Statement which reflects the wishes of the majority of

residents and will use the authority of the Plan to oppose developments outside of the Built up Area Boundary other than for the exceptions stated including Rural Exception Schemes which would be of benefit to the community.

Note 31. Can we have more conservation areas within the Parish?

There are currently two conservation areas in the Parish (one in Middle Tysoe and one in Upper Tysoe). It is outside of the remit of the Plan to alter these or to designate additional conservation areas. However, the Parish Council can request Stratford District Council to update or review existing designations or to consider new conservation areas, for example one in Lower Tysoe. This would undoubtedly have cost implications. Conservation areas are *not* exempt from development, but any development in a conservation area would have to have particular regard to the heritage asset.

Note 32. What are the next steps in the process and when will it be completed?

The feedback from the pre-submission draft of the Plan has been redacted and made public on the website as well as being made available in hard copy and lodged in the village church for inspection. The submitted Plan has been redrafted in the light of these public comments as well as from comments made by Stratford District Council. The resultant Submission Plan will now be subject to a further six week consultation which will be managed by the District Council before handing the Plan over to an Independent Examiner. The Examiner will decide whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and, subject to any suggested changes, will allow the Plan to proceed to referendum.

The District Council organises and publicises the Referendum which is likely to take place in later in 2019. The website will be updated continually, but no further public consultations are envisaged at this time.