

Bidford-on-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015

Consultation on Draft Policies Results

98 responses were made between 25th May and 6th July 2015, and the number of responses made against each question is shown.

Full Name

72 provided

Capacity in which commenting on Plan – Those indicated

Resident	68
Business/Work in area	8
Statutory Consultee	0
Other	4

Organisation represented (where applicable)

7

Address

71 provided

Post Code

72 provided

Email Address

69 provided

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Neighbourhood Housing Section?

Yes..... 65 No..... 8

To comment on neighbourhood housing policies, please write your views alongside the policy number you are referring to.

Policy H1 - Village boundary	40
Policy H2 - Strategic reserves for future housing need	53
Policy H3 - Promoting an appropriate mix of housing for the neighbourhood area	37
Policy H4 - Use of brownfield land	39
Policy H5 - Use of garden land	37

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Neighbourhood Economy Section?

Yes..... 39 No..... 29

To comment on the neighbourhood economy policies, please write your views alongside the policy number you are referring to.

Policy ECON1 - Protecting and enhancing existing employment sites	30
Policy ECON2 - Strategic reserve for future employment need	24
Policy ECON3 - Protecting and enhancing the village centre	32
Policy ECON4 - Promoting high speed broadband	26
Policy ECON5 - Parking in the village centre	24
Policy ECON6 - Promoting riverside activities	28
Policy ECON7 - Homeworking and live-work units	22

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Neighbourhood Environment Section?

Yes	35	No.....	36
-----------	----	---------	----

To comment on neighbourhood environment policies, please write your views alongside the policy number you are referring to.

Policy ENV1 - Renewable energy	20
Policy ENV2 - Green infrastructure	23
Policy ENV3 - Blue infrastructure	19
Policy ENV4 - Drainage and flooding	24
Policy ENV5 - Protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land	26
Policy ENV6 - Protection of landscape, skylines and important views	25
Policy ENV7 - Preservation of heritage assets	23
Policy ENV8 - Promoting high quality design	21
Policy ENV9 - Nature conservation	21
Policy ENV10 - Minerals and aggregates extraction	19

Do you wish to comment on the policies contained within the Neighbourhood Amenities Section?

Yes	39	No.....	28
-----------	----	---------	----

To comment on neighbourhood amenities policies, please write your views alongside the policy number you are referring to.

Policy AM1 - Protecting and enhancing health opportunities	28
Policy AM2 - Protecting and enhancing education and library facilities	29
Policy AM3 - Protecting and enhancing sports and recreational spaces (formal)	25
Policy AM4 - Protecting and enhancing informal open spaces	24
Policy AM5 - Allotments and growing space	25
Policy AM6 - Promoting walking and cycling	29

General comments

Q8a
Policy H1 - Village boundary
a) No new development of the existing Outline or Reserved Matters approval should proceed unless: INFRASTRUCTURE and PLANNING GAIN Matters have been satisfactorily resolved. b) Already there are major flooding issues at the north end of the village caused by drainage capacity from the recent developments. c) There are no factual statements in the NPlan in this regard, simply promises for the unprofessional. d) In recent and current developments the construction datum has been set too high to ensure connection to the existing main sewerage, but at the expense of unusual watersheds into the natural courses or adjacent property. e) Planning Gain for the Village paid both from the Land Owners as well as the Developers - suggest that this is an "overt" arrangement so that the PCC know how much for what purpose.
Agree
Agree
Agree
Agree with the small infill developments in keeping with the character and the setting of the village should be pursued.
Agree with the boundaries
Agree with this policy
AGREED
H1 Completely agree. Bidford on Avon should be kept within the village boundary
How can any more housing developments not impact on the character of the village? The houses that are currently being erected in huge quantities are really not attractive and are not in keep with the appearance of the village and therefore any additional developments would completely destroy the character of the village.
How can the development on the land not have significant damage to the character and setting of the village? The houses currently been developed are not nice and are already ruining the character of the village as it is.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
I do not believe that increasing the density of housing/population within the village boundary is beneficial to either the present population or any additions to it. Given that most of the village residents who have arrived in the last 20 years work away from Bidford, any increase will make the road/infrastructure even worse than it is already. So my vote is against further development!
I do NOT wish to see ANY further development in the Bidford-on-Avon Neighbourhood Area. Please accept that 87% of us made this comment in the questionnaire. Bidford has already been significantly changed due to the massive housing development in recent years. In my view, it has had more than its fair share of new houses. The amenities are not sufficient to sustain further development and Bidford is now sadly, no longer the beautiful rural village it once was. If the population is increased still further the village will be entirely ruined and its rural feel will be lost forever.
I don't think the boundary should be extended.
I don't want any new houses built.
I strongly support the policy of no development outside the village boundary. The parameters of the process mean that the wishes of the majority of survey respondents for no further development cannot be met by the NDP. This policy does at least direct potential development to places where environmental impact is likely to be less.
I support sustainable i.e. matched by relevant services within the village boundary
If extends anymore will lose village feel and become a small town. Not enough amenities to support the proposed developments.
It was difficult to determine where the village boundary is from the map.
No development - village has had too much!
No development regardless of inside or outside of boundary - village already overdeveloped
No new development should take place outside the Village Boundary.
No objection to increasing the village boundary
No other policies in this Plan should support development outside the Village Boundary.

Please see comments on H2

Preface It is recognised the great efforts that have been made by the Steering Group to get us to the stage we are now at and they are to be complimented on that. This is a wholly commendable exercise in local democracy and it is encouraging to know that over 40% of the households responded. This should provide a strong mandate for the plan, once approved, and enable future development, should it prove necessary and unavoidable, to reflect the views of the residents which previous development, by its sheer scale, has not. Between the 1981 and 2011 censuses the number of dwellings in Bidford increased by 86% way and above the average across Stratford District Council's planning area. Since 2011 a further 420 houses have either been built or are in the process of construction. In October of last year approval was given for a further 150 homes on the Salford Road/Harbour Close development and there then three further planning applications which have been refused but which are either at the Appeals stage or in the pipeline for Appeal. They represent a further 315 houses which, if the Appeals are successful as it appears, will take the total number of dwellings in Bidford to 3085, a staggering increase of over 160% since 1981 and over 40% in the last four years! No wonder there is such widespread concern and opposition to more new development. The Neighbourhood Plan is supposed to represent the views of the residents as expressed in their responses to the questionnaire earlier on in the year. However there is only brief reference to the excessive development Bidford has had to suffer and only then to the post 2011 situation and, in my view, the whole tone and wording of the draft as it currently stands is too pro development and does not properly represent the views of the residents on this, the singularly most important, issue to them. Furthermore I believe that this view is quite widely shared in the community. When I have raised this issue I, and others who share my view, have been told that the political reality is that further new development cannot be avoided. Whether or not this is correct I am not competent to say but, notwithstanding that, it is not the point. The NDP must reflect the views of the residents and, in the event that the political reality is as it has been alleged and on which the residents will need some explanation, then a suitable form of wording and tone need to be found to accommodate what, on the face of it, appear to be conflicting positions. On this point the draft makes repeated reference to development being "supported". I think "considered" would better represent the residents views. I also feel it is appropriate to raise my concerns on the feedback and communications process to the residents following their responses to the questionnaires. It was clear to me from the two "roadshow" sessions I did at Budgens that the majority of people I spoke to had little or no knowledge of what the collective residents responses had been on the various issues. I realise that the "First Draft Report" from the Consultation and Insight Department of the District Council was made available on the Parish Council's website but, as I have pointed out before and from comments made by the public at Budgens, it appears that only about 50% of them are computer literate so these people, frequently senior citizens who incidentally made up at least 38% if not more of the respondents (65+ 38%, 45-64 42%), would have not had access to this feedback. Those who are computer literate would, of course, but it is open to question whether they had the time and inclination to go through the 164 page report. Given that they are likely to be from the predominantly younger age groups and, therefore be either working or looking after children, then whilst they have the capability to read the report they may not have had either the time or the inclination to do so perhaps. These factors when taken together are likely to mean that only a minority of the residents will know the results of the questionnaire's collective responses. So, whilst residents will be able to comment on the draft in light of their own comments, it is unlikely that they can do so cognisant of what others have said and, therefore, of the strength of opinion on the various matters. It is to be hoped that whatever communications process is going to be used regarding feedback on the residents' comments to the NDP draft it addresses these points adequately. The two issues that attracted the most comments were the revitalisation of the High Street and the Big Meadow. Of these the High Street gets some comment, but not much, and the Big Meadow none at all. Whilst I am given to understand that these are not matters for the NDP I suspect that the residents will not understand this, especially as there were questions on them. I suggest this needs a public explanation together with what will be done to recognise and act on their comments and concerns about these and other matters.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES Housing: How will the "needs of the community" be assessed during the Plan period to 2031? 2.0 NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSING 1. In the opening paragraph reference is made to the 426 new dwellings since 2011 but not to the 1981-2011 growth. These statistics were used at the recent successful March 2015 Planning Committee meeting as well as being quoted in the recently published and revised draft Core Strategy of Stratford DC. They help to put the concerns about further development into context and should be included in this section. 2. It then goes on to say that ..."to ensure that the level of new development". To my comments in the

preface this implies automatic new development without any qualification and needs rewording to correctly represent the residents views. 3. "The villages of Barton, Marlcliff, and Broom are not considered to be suitable for development due to their inability to support sustainable development". This needs explanation. By implication, therefore, Bidford is. I question if this is the view of the residents as expressed in their responses. 4. What does the District Council's study of the "capacity of villages" show with regard to Bidford? POLICY H1 – VILLAGE BOUNDARY 1. "The village boundary, as defined on the Proposals map". I presume the "Proposals Map" is the one entitled Policy H2 although that is not immediately obvious. There is no legend to show where that "Village Boundary" is so it is difficult to comment on this Policy. 2. Similarly it is not clear where the "built up area boundaries" are and where new housing development will not be supported. 3. Explanation: The wording is too pro development and, in particular, the reference in here to "Any new development will be focussed" should be qualified and prefaced by something like "which cannot be avoided".

The current village boundary must be maintained. Continued expansion threatens the character of the village and is unsustainable. Towns in the area (i.e. Alcester) have not had the same proportion of expansion in the last 15 years as Bidford has.

The draft document acknowledges that Bidford has contributed 426 new dwellings since 2011 and further states that the Plan seeks to ensure that new development is commensurate with the scale of the village. It acknowledges that 87% of respondents would prefer not to see any new development within the Neighbourhood Area. This view is seemingly "brushed aside" before a statement is given of where the new housing will be permitted - hardly relevant if the residents do not want more housing? In the Explanation, the statement is made that "small infill development on land within the Village Boundary will provide housing without significant damage to the character and setting of the village". "This pattern of gradual and piecemeal development will ensure new dwellings contribute to the attractive appearance and character of Bidford-on-Avon and its sense of community". Firstly, the new areas of development cannot be considered as "small" – they are very large in the context of the size of the village. Secondly, how do these statements accurately represent the views of 87% of the respondents of the questionnaire that prefer not to see any new development? In short, they do not.

The map does not show the village boundaries. How can we make a decision when no village boundary is shown.

The plans in the document do not clearly show the village boundary and the plans are not titled making it difficult to comment. In principle I would agree that development should not be allowed outside any village boundary.

The village boundary has been drawn up to suit the needs of developers, not the needs of the population.

The village boundary is not clearly defined in the document

The village boundary should be amended to include land south of Jackson's Meadow. Although within the strategic objective it states that growth to the north of the village has moved development away from the historical centre of the village creating an imbalance in the location of houses to local services. However, land south of Jackson's Meadow is well connected to existing services and facilities within the settlement of Bidford-on-Avon. The site offers access to a range of services and facilities within comfortable walking and cycling distance, with the Public Right of Way, which runs directly along the western boundary of the site, providing a convenient, attractive linkage towards Bidford-on-Avon primary school as well as bus stops and a convenience store on Salford Road, and Bidford-on-Avon village centre. It should be noted that development south of Jackson's Meadow will facilitate a direct pedestrian linkage to the Public Right of Way. The Waterloo Park Industrial Estate at Wellington Road to the east of the site is also within comfortable walking and cycling distance. Local employment opportunities can therefore be accessed sustainably. Within the proposed layout for the site, the public open space has been designed to align with the proposed position of the public open space within Reserve Site Allocation H2c. This will create an area of green space that existing and future residents can use in line with NP policy ENV2. It will also provide a softer edge than the existing one provided by the new boundaries of those properties on Jackson's Meadow which back on to it.

This is the boundary. No further development inside or outside of this area. Stop making ambiguous suggestions about what is a boundary. Bidford- on-Avon has played a significant role already, contributing 426 new dwellings since 2011.

This should be retained as far as reasonably practicable.

Will become a town boundary if any bigger.

Would not want to see any new development within the Neighbourhood area. There are already a

number of sites with planning permission which, in our opinion, should not have been approved and cannot be supported by the local infrastructure.

WRCC is concerned because Section 2.0 (Neighbourhood Housing) states that "The villages of Barton, Marlcliffe [sic] and Broom are not considered to be suitable for new housing ...". On the face of it, this statement would appear to contradict the Parish Council's previously-expressed support for the proposed rural affordable scheme which we have been working on in Broom for a number of years. I also note that the consultation document makes no specific reference to the proposed rural affordable Broom scheme. It may be that this statement should in fact read "... are not considered to be suitable for new open market housing ...".

Properly defined. Who has defined village boundary. Explanation (would prefer) "Don't want" believe that as per questionnaire.

Q8b
Policy H2 - Strategic reserves for future housing need
Agree with the strategic reserves
No comment
Concerns are raised over the allocation H2b as a mixed use allocation. Given the existing employment use to the north of this reserve site, it is suggested that this allocation should be solely for employment purposes to ensure that businesses are given every opportunity to grow and expand in the same area. If businesses are not able to grow and expand within Bidford-on-Avon, there is every likelihood that these businesses would seek to relocate to another settlement where the businesses could expand. Losing businesses to other settlements will have a detrimental impact on the economic output of the settlement. Local facilities and services would also be of detriment as the expenditure related to these businesses would be lost. It is therefore suggested that reserve site H2b is amended to be solely an employment allocation, with the housing element of the allocation relocated to land south of Jackson's Meadow. Land south of Jackson's Meadow is identified as an appropriate location for housing growth given the sustainable credentials of the site which have been previously detailed in this representation.
I don't want any new houses built there.
H2 Agree
As a 21 year old resident born in the village, and very strong local ties to the area, I find it very disappointing the lack of affordable housing given. As I have come to the age to move out and find my own dwelling, I have had a large desire to live within the village. However, the price of housing, even flats, within the village is far too high for me to afford, even though me and my partner both earn higher than average wage. We have had to look to Stratford for affordable housing. Yes, you heard that correctly. Stratford has more affordable housing than Bidford upon Avon.
I disagree that agricultural land should be used for housing and oppose building of any kind on Grafton Lane and Waterloo Road
H2a, H2b and H2c. The assertions from 87% of Bidford residents against future development have been massaged and therefore spuriously reported in the Draft NDP. The inaccuracy that the village "supports the safeguarding of land on areas H2a, H2b and H2c for potential future housing development, and that "all new housing development will be confined to within the Village Boundary", must be rescinded, and the correct view of this large majority of residents reported accordingly.
We note that land to the west of Grafton Lane is in line for housing development. Grafton lane is narrow and with parking has become very dangerous particularly as it is now being used as a through thoroughfare to the main B439 Stratford/ Evesham road. The traffic using Grafton Lane already exceeds the speed limit and with parking plus cars pulling out of Hillview Road is difficult to pull onto and drive along. Additional traffic onto the lane will need very careful planning and road widening, plus the speed restriction signs being moved considerably further along the lane. This will also cause additional problems with getting out onto B439. The houses on the edge of the village on Grafton lane lose their water supply whenever there is a difficulty elsewhere in the village. We understand that there have been reduced flow to the village when we have been deprived of our supply altogether. This is not a new problem, but one that has existed since the houses were built in the 1970's and additional water tanks installed in the lofts to alleviate this problem.
Development of these sites should additionally only be permitted if developers agree to provide sufficient contributions to the general infrastructure of the neighbourhood. There remains a general presumption against any early development.
I understand that 87% of respondents to the recent consultation wished to avoid any further housing in the area. The neighbourhood plan does not seem to reflect this strength of view of residents.
87% of responders did not want development in Bidford. Bidford already has planning approval for more than its fair proportion of new homes contained within the core strategy. Recent applications for further developments in the assault indicated on the proposal were rejection by SDC for numerous reasons in particular sustainability of infrastructure. Even if the core strategy leads to an increase in the number of properties required in Stratford district then this does not mean the Bidford needs to take more than its fair share. The way this proposal is written gives a green light to over development of Bidford which is not with the majority of residents views and

ignores all the valid infrastructure concerns put forward at planning meetings, including by the parish council and our local district councillors.
Please refer to comment made in Policy H1
Strongly against future housing development on area h2b west of Graton Lane. Grafton lane is used as a thorough fare for cars going to a from the Leys More. More housing will mean more traffic on the road potential hazard. Any development will spoil the look the landscape/ surrounding area. The fact that Grafton lane it is quiet with very few housing developments/countryside right on our doorstep is what drew us to move to Bidford/Grafton lane in the first place. Anymore development on Bidfords rural areas will destroy the villages character and environment.
Strongly against future housing development on area h2b west of Graton Lane. Grafton lane is used as a thorough fare for cars going to a from the Leys More. More housing will mean more traffic on the road potential hazard. Any development will spoil the look the landscape/ surrounding area. The fact that Grafton lane it is quiet with very few housing developments/countryside right on our doorstep is what drew us to move to bidford/Grafton lane in the first place. Anymore development on Bidfords rural areas will destroy the villages character and environment.
I do not support future housing development within the village boundary because of the already excessive expansion of Bidford-on-Avon village. This is a village, not a town and I fail to see the benefits to any resident of the village. The only winners seem to be the developers by the profit they make. There are no jobs, not enough school places, inadequate health facilities and nothing that would benefit either the current residents of the village, or anyone moving to the area to live in these houses. If all of the green spaces of the village are filled in, it takes away the rural character of the village and destroys valuable farming land and open spaces which contribute to environmental health.
Agree
H2b should be reserved for agricultural use only.
Generally acceptable. However, I would also exclude more three storey houses and would support more bungalows which are particularly advantageous for an ageing population.
These plots of land (although safeguarded at this time) would bring an increase in traffic to narrow roads and junctions to the B439 There are no amenities at this time to this side of the village, causing more traffic to the nearest shop/supermarket.
The three areas for potential future housing developments are noted but would only be supported if the parish is forced to accept more developments.
The sdc core strategy says that housing should be sustainable, we as a village have very little to offer anyone as far as services are concerned therefore this village does not need any more housing. In my opinion more sites should not be allocated for housing.
No development! Greenfield Grade 2 agricultural land. Massive potential development of 200 homes...this is NOT SUSTAINABLE! Village has no infrastructure to support.
No development - huge development will break the village. Not sustainable no infrastructure
Disagree stance should be that we have as a village grown to maximum size given the amenities and infrastructure. For any further development to take place there must first be a plan for material enhancements to infrastructure and amenities and any housing development should follow afterwards as part of the 15 year plan.
a) H2 should not be allowed until the H1 comments are addressed - Drainage and Sewerage Infrastructure and Planning Gain b) H2c should be tightly controlled as to the design density of the development - including open spaces. c) Design Density is the key. The Professional Planners are sleep walking into the urbanization of villages, simply to satisfy the incorrect housing policies.
we do not want any more housing in the future
Again not entirely satisfactory given the wishes of the majority for no new development. However, it is the 'best of a bad job' and development in the nominated reserve areas should be resisted where possible.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Policy econ2 would produce considerable traffic impact onto Grafton lane. The plan should make clear when this land could be made available bearing in mind that it is already in use for agricultural business.
As 87% of respondents did not want any further development, why are we supporting any land for future housing developments. The village infrastructure can't take any further housing especially Grafton Lane, the road is not wide enough, the sewerage is not adequate nor is the water supply.

<p>this is grade 2 agricultural land and should be preserved.</p>
<p>No planning application for new housing should be considered unless it clearly states the area in square metres (m2) of the floor area of the dwelling and for each individual room. (A 3-bedroom house on two floors with a total floor area of 65m2 including kitchen, bathroom, lounge and stairs is ridiculous and should be rejected as unfit for human use due to the lack of adequate space for 4 persons). Sustainable development of housing must mean dwellings of a size - including that of the garden - and quality reasonably fit for human habitation.</p>
<p>We do not need to put this in the NDP 87% of respondents said no to future development, we should not put in place strategic reserves, all this does is play into developers hands. This should be removed.</p>
<p>These sites should only be used if we need to take any more houses on top of what we already have planning permission for.</p>
<p>Policy H2. The drafts further states that the "Plan supports the safeguarding of land for potential future development". Once again the views of 87% of the respondents have been ignored. How can you oppose more houses but support the safeguarding of land for development? You cannot. The Explanation for Strategic reserves for Future Housing Need explains that the Inspector has instructed the District Council to undertake more work on certain aspects of the Core Strategy before it can be adopted. We are led to believe that the NDP is needed so that the Core Strategy can be accepted and adopted. Therefore, it needs to be accurate and any delay is critical. It is perhaps worth noting that the District Council has not had a Plan since 2005. It seems incredible that councillors have failed for so long to get a Plan approved thereby paving the way for developers to continue to build more houses against the wishes of the local residence.</p>
<p>Seeing the number of houses already being built, the numbers suggested for more developments are well over the figures proposed in the core strategy. The recommendation for the level of houses in Bidford was 220 over 15 years and yet currently the number of new homes which are either being built or where planning permission is being sought is a massive 740!! Every time permission is granted for a new development it opens the floodgates for more to be approved, and soon Bidford will be an ugly polluted town, with all the issues that come with a town life ie more anti social behaviour and crime.</p>
<p>The questionnaire originally issued phrased the question do you want any further developments in Bidford to which most people I have spoken to have said no more yet this answer doesn't appear anywhere. Also of the four sites shown only 3 are in this draft, all of which are green field sites which policy H4 says it is against! Why is the old united carriers site not included as this is also the only brown field site in Bidford.</p>
<p>Once one development is passed it will open the door for other developments to be passed and Bidford on Avon will become another town and not a village. This will lead to serious problem such as traffic congestion and crime.</p>
<p>Disagree - we cannot take any more development at all. It's already well above what the infra structure can cope with.</p>
<p>Disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.</p>
<p>land off Grafton lane should not be used for development of further housing and industry</p>
<p>H2B is high quality agricultural land which is helping to balance our food requirements. Why are we not using lower grade land for development?</p>
<p>There is nothing strategic about building housing. The Core Strategy already identified that Bidford had already built enough housing for many years to come.</p>
<p>Land to rear of Waterloo crescent not appropriate for increased housing needs: only applied for profit/gain and adds nothing to village and increases traffic on unsuitable access road (Waterloo crescent)</p>
<p>POLICY H2 – STRATEGIC RESERVES FOR FUTURE HOUSING NEED 1. "This Plan supports". Change "supports" to "provides" and qualify by adding "in the event that future development cannot be avoided". 2. Why have areas H2b and H2c been included when they did not have a majority of the residents in favour of them, scoring 45% and 42% respectively, and when especially 87% would prefer not to have any development. 3. Why is area 11 which scored the highest at 68% not included? 4. Explanation: "this plan has identified 4 potential sites". There are only three listed above.</p>
<p>no more houses in our village</p>
<p>H2b is currently as I believe farm / farm land. As a country with food production close to 50% how on earth can a council be thinking of promoting the conversion of farm land to housing / industrial development? Councils efforts should be to keep our farms. Shame on the council for even</p>

considering this as a development site.

I do not see any real evidence of a shortage of housing for local use.

Bearing in mind that 87% of respondents don't want any further development the draft NDP currently states the village supports..... potential future housing development. This is a gross misrepresentation of the 87% who stated otherwise.

The Bidford area has Bourne its fair share of development and is in danger of being bigger than local towns but without the basic amenities.

No, this is not in the boundary of the village and no developments should be pursued in this area. I do not agree with building in this area. Housing need should not trump sustainability and infrastructure in the village. It should not be included.

I can see H2b and H2c on the map at page 18. Where is ava? (I can also see something on the map labelled H2a.) The 'explanation', below the policy box, refers to 4 sites allocated; is that the four just mentioned (including ava, wherever that is?). The policy box only refers to three. In the policy subhead e), what have pallets got to do with it - do you mean 'palette'?

AGREED

These weren't chosen United Carriers were. Why wasn't land on Tower opposite Grafton Lane taken into consideration. Explanation (4 potential sites) "only 3 listed why" *Why wasn't land owned by WCC on top tower hill opposite Grafton Lane put on. No references to services water sewage.

Q8c
Policy H3 - Promoting an appropriate mix of housing for the neighbourhood area
Agree with the housing distribution
No comment
The housing mix of 35% 2 bed dwellings or less; 35% 3 bed dwellings; and 30% 4 bed dwellings should be given flexibility in light of the varying degree of circumstances that relate to each individual site. The same applies to the mix of affordable tenure which should also be given flexibility. It is agreed that the property types, sized and tenures of the affordable housing will vary on each individual site. Giving flexibility to the affordable housing will allow for individual sites to address the affordable housing need accordingly when they come forward for development. It is also stated that a review of local housing need will be undertaken within the first 5 years of the adoption of this Plan. It is suggested that the local housing need is reviewed as often as possible to ensure the affordable housing need in the local area is met.
Not needed.
H3 Agree
Affordable housing should include starter homes for purchase as well as for rent. There is a lack of affordable housing for young families in the area. All previous developments should be considered when housing mix proportions are agreed.
As above
Please refer to comment made in Policy H1
Agree
Bidford is becoming an ugly mix of characterless housing estates and is losing any claim to be a village or providing any facilities to accommodate the extra population. The near destruction of the bridge over the Avon should be used as an opportunity to reassess its use. I suggest an alternative road bridge for vehicles (possibly from the roundabout on the by-pass below Marriage Hill) and the Bidford bridge could be used merely for pedestrians and bicycles.
Having been involved in a housing needs survey for a neighbouring parish I have considerable reservations as to the significance of the Housing Needs Assessment. Adequate parking should be provided for all new properties. This means at least two car spaces for each house.
There is a need for low cost starter homes and social housing for our children who cannot get on the property ladder in this financial climate. We need to address this in order to keep the next generation here in the village they were brought up in and the village that holds so much history for them. The next generation need to be proud of their village and be part of it.
As a high percentage of people are retired consideration should be given to bungalows and warden monitored housing.
No development.
No development
I support a suitable mix of housing types including that suitable for new/first time home dwellers
agree - subject to comments in H2 being addressed
a) What is "affordable" b) No statements on "who will own" properties for rent - Council Houses, fine but do not be ashamed of the name. c) Why not 2 bedroom Flats, to save land coverage
ok I agree
Provision of affordable housing is absolutely essential for the parish.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
The mix of types of dwelling must include sizes/lay-out/prices suitable for older persons wishing to "downsize", and for younger persons not being able to afford to buy their own home, but earning too much to qualify for affordable (social) housing.
The housing that is required by the village is bungalows for our ageing population at a price locals can afford.
We require a better mix of housing such as bungalows, 2 & 3 bedroom houses perhaps some semi detached: More flats/apartments 1 & 2 bedrooms
It is worrying to think that we could have an increase of affordable houses as it may yet again impact on the character of the village. Also, because of the lack of work and school places in the vicinity, no matter what kind of houses are built, Bidford would become a commuter and again polluted town.

Who decides what is an affordable house or affordable rent for these properties. Shared ownership is a very expensive way of buying a property as the rent part of the share is governed by market forces & will regularly rise as local rents increase and end up costing more than a full mortgage would have done.
How can young families be housed in an area where our school's are at a maximum. There are also no employment prospects within the area. With a plan of 740 houses in Bidford on Avon been already developed or planned development, how will these people find employment or school there children. Building affordable houses will take away the character of our " at the moment " village !!!
Bidford cannot cope with any more development.
Disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
There is no mention of housing that is affordable to buy (affordable housing, is social housing) for low to middle income people. £200,000 or so for a 3 bed house is not affordable for people who want to own their own home. There is no plans for a Marina in Bidford? Why not use some of the flood plain land to create a live aboard Marina. This would provide a step onto the housing ladder at a much lower price range £ 50,000 or so. It would also provide some employment opportunities for craft people.
My issue is not with the type of housing to be build but the fact the Bidford is being targeted for development without the infrastructure to support it. It is becoming nothing more than a commuter town, with everyone commuting by car.
Agreed that a mix of affordable housing is needed
POLICY H3 – PROMOTING AN APPROPRIATE MIX OF HOUSING 1. Do we really need more four+ bedroom houses in Bidford? Are there not enough already? Who would the new ones be for? It is highly unlikely they would not be for local people particularly young families. They will probably be for people coming into the village but who are highly unlikely to work in the village and who will, therefore, be commuters with more cars (often with two, if not, three cars in their household), more traffic congestion, and more greenhouse gas emissions. Not sustainable development in my view! In the comments made to this question (Q5a) there was not one supporting this point of view. If we're going to be forced to accept more development then let's, at least, make it so that it benefits and meets the needs of the community especially with regard to young families and also to the needs of an ever ageing population. 2. Notwithstanding the points made above the 30% provided for 4+ bedroom houses in the draft greatly exceeds the 15-20% in the updated draft Core Strategy of Stratford District Council. 3. "80% affordable rent". How is "affordable rent" defined and by whom? 4. Is the "Housing Needs Survey" the same as "the 2012 Housing Needs Assessment"? 5. Consideration should be given to setting a minimum internal footprint depending on the house type to prevent the development of more "shoe box" sized rooms. A maximum development density should also be set to prevent developers cramming as many houses as possible into a site. In it's recently updated Core Strategy document Stratford DC say that"Town or Village design statements" should be developed. We should have one for Bidford and incorporate it into the NDP. 6. Stratford DC's document also stipulates 35% of new development be of "affordable housing". The NDP should be consistent with this. 7. Explanation: It should be noted that any application must meet the defined criteria in Policy H3.
We do not need any more homes swallowing up green fields as all our school and doctors are full
Again, overloading the amenities of the area, particularly schools, can only be detrimental to the welfare of the younger population!
What does this mean? Mixed development. Are the residents aware? I do not support development of housing in this area
AGREED
*NP said 67% small family Homes. (The 2012 Housing Needs Assessment) "Why using when 3 years elapsed!! Bungalows 53%? Retired. What Market Housing. No reference. Questioner for NDP.

Q8d
Policy H4 - Use of brownfield land
Agree with the policy
No comment
We are currently not aware of any available brownfield sites that will help meet the housing and economic needs of the local area.
The only houses that should be built is on brownfield, not on greenbelt.
H4 Completely agree. We must keep agricultural land for crops to feed ourselves in a sustainable manner
It appears we have very little brownfield land.
Development of these sites should additionally only be permitted if developers agree to provide sufficient contributions to the general infrastructure of the neighbourhood. The brownfield land should not be outside the Village Boundary, not just "within the envelope".
This should be the only permitted development land.
Please refer to comment made in Policy H1
Agree
Infill existing space rather than extend boundaries.
Strongly support.
The Current developments do nothing to enhance our village or its community and are on good agriculture land. No further building should take place unless on brownfield sites.
Brownfield land should be redeveloped in preference to greenfield land subject to the criteria stated in the policy.
Leisure center on carriers land please !!!
If there has to be any..Use this before Greenfiled H2 land
If have to have more...use this first instead of greenfield land
I would support use of brownfield land for housing where available
agree - subject to comments in H2 being addressed
a) Use for commerce
Brown field land should always be the first choice
Strongly agree with the presumption against greenfield development.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
As United Carriers is the only brown field site, may be this should be allocated/promoted for housing.
Agree
The only brownfield land we have is United Carriers, I thought this came top of the list for housing, why was this not listed.
These sites should be used if they are safe from contamination and any new development is in keeping with the surrounding areas.
Seeing that Bidford is already a commuter town due to the lack of employment within the village, how could additional residents find jobs? The jobs at the Industrial Estate are already filled and even if a dozen people could possibly find work there, the site would not accommodate the thousands that all these developments would attract! Therefore this will just aggravate the situation by creating more traffic as people have to commute in the thousands to work.
There is only one brownfield site within the village at the old United Carriers site which for some reason isn't now contained in the draft plan. See comment in H2 re greenfield development.
As it is Bidford on Avon is over populated and believe me there is no extra employment to be had. I need to travel myself 120 miles a day as I am unable to seek employment in Bidford and this before any new housing schemes begin. If people need to travel out of Bidford to work, the traffic congestion will be chaotic
Greenfield land should not be built on. A total commitment for this is required.
Disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
In principal I have no issue with this, but developers won't use brownfield, it's too expensive.

Agreed - brownfield site is a good use of existing, derelict land

POLICY H4 – USE OF BROWNFIELD LAND 1. The residents were opposed to any development on Greenfield land. Therefore the provisions of the last paragraph need careful consideration and, specifically, the statement that “proposals will be looked at favourably” should be amended to read “in order for any such proposals to be considered”.

Limited brown field development would be more appropriate if it was to promote more industry locally to reduce the number of existing residents traveling outside the area.

I do not agree with or support development of housing in this area at all!!!!

Should be encouraged

AGREED

68% one area Public@hose for housing

Q8e
Policy H5 - Use of garden land
Agree with the policy
No comment
No comment
H5 Agree
Where no comment has been made there is agreement with the policy.
Please refer to comment made in Policy H1
Agree
Agree with policy.
No
If kept in the character of the village. Other large villages have done this successfully.
No . Gardens are gardens!! And should not be used to squeeze more houses in . It ruins the look of streets to the cost of the people who wish to remain in the village and lines the pockets of those who do not .
No development
No development
I would prefer that garden land is not freely developed for additional housing
agree - subject to comments in H2 being addressed
a) No development on Garden Land - should remain
should not be allowed
A sensible policy
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Garden land should not be used unless it is able to offer all premises a decent area of garden and parking
Agree
We should not be using garden land unless in exceptional circumstances and only in Gardens of a size that can be divided to give all proposed properties adequate garden space and parking, unlike those at the plough
I feel is wrong on many levels.
If the development causes no harm to neighbours and fits in with its surroundings this could be allowed. There would be a need to ensure enough parking spaces (at least 2 to each dwelling). Also a garden space.
Every new development requires new entry access and would impact on the neighbouring properties due to the increase in traffic, creating more noise and more pollution. These new access points mean a loss of character again. Some of the proposed plans are putting forward green/play areas but no parking facilities which means that the neighbouring properties will have to cope with added traffic and parking within their area.
There should be a limited development allowed subject to local consideration, access etc.
Again it is trying to over populate an already populated area. In keeping with the character of the village, this is taken it away. There is a poor very means of access. Victoria road for example is a very small road where only one car at a time can go up or down.
Agree
Disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
land off grafton lane backing on to houses on hillview road should not be used for development of further housing and industry
Should not be considered as anything other than madness.
Inappropriate - turns a village into a concrete jungle
POLICY H5 – USE OF GARDEN LAND 1. Line 1 - change “permitted” to “considered
This just 'backdoor infill!
I do not agree with or support development of housing in this area at all!!!!

Should be avoided
AGREED

Q10a
Policy ECON1 - Protecting and enhancing existing employment sites
Agree
No comment
I agree. Local employment is vital to the wellbeing of the village
Where no comment has been made there is agreement with the policy.
I am in support of the Geodis site for development for services for the area of Bidford and employment for its residents.
Yes
Agree
There are enough empty industrial units the focus should be on filling them. Any more would create too much heavy traffic on Waterloo road which is already dangerous as a pedestrian to walk down due to size and speed of vehicles
I support a policy of maintaining existing businesses or creating new business opportunities on existing sites
agree
Yes subject to earlier comments on Infrastructure and Gain
should be encouraged
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
It is vitally important to enhance all existing employment opportunities for village, to create jobs for locals, to be proud of Bidford on Avon
We need to protect the employment sites we have
Agree
We need to protect the employment sites we have. Waterloo Road is not suitable for growth due to the need for all vehicles over a certain size needing to come down an already congested Waterloo Road
We need to protect all employment sites to allow people moving into the area and our young people to be able to find work locally.
There is not enough work provided by the businesses on the industrial estate as it is. The site could in no way cope with the massive increase in population. There is no-where for the current workers on the estate to support the local economy as there is not much available in Bidford anyway... unless you need a hair cut.
Bidford consists mainly of warehouse type units, there is no office accommodation for white collar or "high tech" type employers
There is no employment to be had in Bidford.. I should know as I need to travel a long distance to my job.
yes agree
agree
The idea that somehow you are going to turn Bidford into a business hub is ridiculous, there are not trains, no access and as we are seeing now, one little accident with a crop sprayer ginds the place to a halt.
Agreed
3.0 NEIGHBOURHOOD ECONOMY 1. Stategic Objective: "including the provision of infrastructure". How is such infrastructure defined? POLICY ECON1 - PRTOTECTING AND ENHANCING EXISTING EMPLOYMENT SITES 1. Line 1 – change "permitted" to "considered". 2. Add sub para g) as follows – "Does not result in a reduction in the number of people employed locally".
Agree
Only within the areas where they are already located and not extension of those boundaries. I support development of old UC site but with a shop only and not housing.
Where is the "Geodis site"? Is it labelled somewhere?
AGREED
Only 12% work and live in village . No need for more units some empty access there.

Q10b
Policy ECON2 - Strategic reserve for future employment need
Agree
No comment
I agree
The vast majority of People who work in the village and on the industrial estate could not afford the proposed houses, they are aimed at high earners who work away from the area .
agree
H2b Agreed
must have more employment in the village
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Future employment goes hand in hand with current employment both areas need to be healthy
As the majority of people commute from the village and there are industrial units are empty, I do not feel we need a strategic reserve for future employment
Agree
If we have to have further employment sites these should be at the end of the village nearest the A46 and then only for clean green industry and offices
The site in Grafton site is not really suitable for heavy delivery lorries as the lane is quite narrow. If the site is needed then the industrial part should be positioned so that all vehicles use the existing roads and come in and out of Waterloo road. The part nearest Grafton Lane should be used for residential.
This would again destroy the character of the village. The beautiful village is being turned into a crowded industrial town, what a shame.
See ECON 1 to allow non engineering type employers to move to Bidford.
This will destroy the character of the village. It will become one big town with no schools or police stations and the likes that will be big enough to cope.
yes agree
agree
It's good to consider encouraging employment and employers into the area provided that everyone is happy to for the Village to become a town....this seems to be what the powers that be have in mind for the village of Bidford,
Agreed within curtilage of existing industrial parks
POLICY ECON2 – STRATEGIC RESERVE FOR FUTURE EMPLOYMENT NEED 1. “This plan supports the safeguarding of land west of Grafton Lane for a mixed use development”. The questionnaire relating to this area (Area 13) was only about new housing development on which there was only minority support (45%). Is there a mandate for mixed use development? Have the local residents been consulted on this as it will affect them most? 2. What consideration has been given to access and traffic issues regarding this proposal? 3. Are there any empty units on the existing industrial estate or sites capable of development? 4. Explanation: “64% of residents commuting”. This is likely to be an underestimate as 25% said they worked from home, some of whom may use their home as their base but may well commute also from time to time. Only 12% said they worked in the neighbourhood area.
Agree if confined brownfield industrial development.
Says that the "plan supports the safeguarding of land west of Grafton Lane as shown on the proposals map for a mixed use comprising Class B1 and B2 employment development as part of a mixed use scheme in accordance with Policy H2". Is this land identified on the map on page 18, if so as what? Also - where does policy H2 refer to employment development, or mixed use schemes? It gives the impression of being solely about residential housing development - isn't it? development
AGREED
Loss of farm / agricultural land. This was not in the questionnaire therefore should not be included.

Q10c
Policy ECON3 - Protecting and enhancing the village centre
Agree
I understand that in an ideal world all the shop units would remain as shops and not be changed to residential use. However, is it not better for old shops to be changed to residential if they are not financially viable as shops? Surely a row of houses would look better than a row of boarded up/derelict shops. The old Avon Spice building is an eye sore in a key location in the village, would this not be better if changed into apartments rather than being allowed to fall in to disrepair?
I agree
Due to the vast amount of newbuild houses which have risen in Bidford it needs to now come to a halt as the village is being spoilt.
Very important. As I have said previously I think the bridge should be traffic free.
Protecting the existing high street shops and Budgens should have the highest priority.
Encourage businesses to remain in village or set up in village. Will become a ghost town if businesses continue to close.
Bidford village centre does need protecting, but it needs support and with the loss of the health centre (the new health centre is an asset,) and the post office, for a lot of people there is no longer any purpose to go into the old village as we know it. There have been many new businesses but very few manage to remain.
Following the recent accident on the bridge . I think we can all agree that the village is a presenter area with out traffic, I would like to propose pedestrianising the village , and marketing it as an attractive tourist destination . A much more realistic and economically sound way to increase employment for locals .
I would like the village centre to have a good mix of independent retailers and as few empty units as feasible
agree
a) Should be maintained b) river and meadow are assets of the village
the village centre is dying, something must be done
The decline of the village centre in Bidford concerns me greatly. We have lost the health centre and the post office (what is next? the bank?) with a likely effect on footfall. Agree with policy to try to protect retail and commercial premises in the High Street.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
The heart of the home is the kitchen likewise with village centre it needs to be a thriving community with services, retail stores which ultimately will provide current and future employment. The creation of SPECIAL EVENTS to make it a destination spot is vital, i.e. a play on history, local myths, fun runs, cycle events - make the village a fun place of activity to sustain a healthy business community.
I feel we should look at protecting the village centre, we do not need another supermarket, but try to support smaller business like the butchers and bakers
Agree
We need to look at rejuvenating the village centre. we need to enhance this and make it a place people would like to visit
Is an absolute must.
Although it would be nice to enhance the Village centre, it will quite a challenge. Unfortunately when the new relief road was built and most new development in the 80s took part on the north side the number of people using the High Street fell. The removal of the Health Centre and now the Post Office relocation to Budgens are fresh blows.
People who would move into these new developments are likely to do their shopping where they know best i.e. large shopping centres in cities. The added population does not mean an increase in spending in the local business. It may just mean more traffic to go shopping outside of the village.
The village centre needs to be protected and residents must be encouraged to use it or lose it ! It is already looking quite forlorn around the church area with the loss of the post office, The Bulls Head pub, the relocation of the hairdresser from No 44 and the move of the Health centre out of the village. This situation will not be assisted if Bidford continues to become a commuter centre where people come home to eat & sleep.
What village !!! You are trying turn it into a town..

yea agree
agree
All the development seems to be moving away from the village centre. Something needs to replace losing the Health centre. There is no tea/coffee shop open on a Sunday for the cyclist/fishermen/canoists. We do not make full use of the river/meadow to attract people in.
The way to protect the village centre is to keep it the centre of a village. Increasing the population will just increase the number of people heading to Stratford at the weekend.
Agreed
POLICY ECON3 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE VILLAGE CENTRE 1. “the Village Centre as defined in the Proposal Map”. We can’t see where this is defined. 2. There was overwhelming support (98%) for the High Street being preserved as a shopping and commercial area and opposition to any changes to residential use. This is not reflected by the wording “will only be permitted”. 3. It is disappointing that this matter which received the highest number of responses (1009) does not get more attention. This merits an explanation and also information as to what will be done to develop the various ideas and suggestions made on this matter by the residents. It needs a “Development Plan” in it’s own right. 4. Explanation: In our view, and that of others as expressed in their responses, the construction of the B439 which the draft so rightly points out has lead to the gradual loss of trade in the High Street which has occurred since it was opened in 1978. The two are connected and, whilst we cannot undo the past unfortunately, there is a need both to revitalise the high street and village “centre” as well as address the major issues and concerns of traffic volumes and, specifically, HGVs. As long as the B439 remains available to HGVs and other through traffic things will only get worse as it provides the easiest route for them to Stratford on Avon and destinations to the south, especially now that Stratford town centre can be avoided. It is probably not possible to ban HGVs, as many people have suggested, so that serious consideration should now be given to the construction of a new and proper bypass to the north around the village. This would be consistent with the comments in Policy AS.3 Bidford on Avon of the Stratford DC Core Plan which states ...“Reduce the impact of traffic through the village”.
Agree
AGREED
This needs to be prioritised.

Q10d
Policy ECON4 - Promoting high speed broadband
Agree
No comment
I agree
Within the high internet society, I much agree with this need. High speed broadband makes working and studying from home much easier.
The introduction of high speed broadband should not be at the expense of the existing broadband framework.
all in agreement of high speed broadband
Very important.
I support access to high speed broadband
agree
Yes
agreed
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
YES!
Agree
Would be good.
Any new developments should include the infrastructure to allow this to happen. It is important to businesses both large and small. Many people also work from home and it would be a great advantage to them also.
This sounds like more disruption for the local residents.
I am a bit sceptical that all the hype about high speed broadband will be the saviour if the British nation. We also need upgrades to our living infrastructure as well. The water, sewerage, gas & electrical supplies need to be improved as well as the road system. We seem to keep adding to the village without increasing the capacity of the infrastructure..
More disruptions for the local people.. High speed broadband will not increase employment or stop major congestion in the area..
yes agree
agree
Unless you are planning on making Bidford a hub for online gambling, or adult entertainment I can hardly see how this is going to change much.
Agreed
Agree
This is supported as it is woeful.
AGREED

Q10e
Policy ECON5 - Parking in the village centre
Agree
No comment
I agree
We do not have enough car parking spaces in the village and especially the High street is always a nightmare.
Remove parking restrictions to enable people to shop and use existing facilities
Agree
Stop giving parking tickets to people who are supporting the village .
I think current facilities are adequate
agree
Yes
agreed
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Needs to be available. Not having parking creating pedestrian only areas is the kiss of death for a thriving business community
Agree
It is necessary to allow parking in the village to encourage people to use the shops, Bank etc.
More parking would again destroy the character of the village. Surely it would be better to get better footpaths, cycling lanes and encourage people to leave the cars at home!
Have you seen the size of Bidford Village. Where are you supposed to put extra parking in an already over populated area.
yes agree
agree
You would be better building proper access to the new doctor's surgery than worrying about parking.
Agreed
POLICY ECON5 – PARKING IN THE VILLAGE CENTRE 1. Explanation: Insert the word “free” between “Current” and parking”.
Without increases in population/industry not necessary.
AGREED

Q10f
Policy ECON6 - Promoting riverside activities
Agree
No comment
I agree
all in favour of promoting riverside activities
Continue to promote Bidford as an interesting and beautiful place to visit.
Our biggest asset.
Keep bridge for pedestrians , making access to village and river a pleasant experience
I support promoting this valuable resource for both residents and visitors
agree
Yes
agreed
I would like to see more active use made of the river; e.g. hire boats, trip boat, canoe launch site etc
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
100% YES - again SPECIAL EVENTS make the village exciting - a destination spot.
The river is a wonderful asset and we should try and promote this
Agree
This can only improve Bidford as a community
It is important to encourage more events on the Big Meadow such as the Vintage Gathering. Lots of people including families use this facility, the price of £2.50 which allows you to stay for the whole day is very good value. Some visitors also walk over the Bridge and explore what Bidford has to offer.
This would be a good initiative! Bidford could do with more community spirit and more events.
Bidford could do with more community spirit..
I feel its value as a peaceful location could be lost.
Do wish to lose the peace and quiet of the riverside
We do not make full use of the river/meadow to attract people in. Other than the Youth club running kayaking on a Friday night or the Bull running a raft race, there is not much use made of the river.
Finally some common sense, the river is the heart of the village, the meadow around it attracts visitors from miles around, THIS is the way to bring interest and revenue to the village.
Agreed
POLICY ECON6 – PROMOTING RIVERSIDE ACTIVITIES 1. “Future developments must protect and where possible enhance the attraction of the river to visitors”. In the event that there is future housing development it should be a requirement that the developers make an appropriate contribution to the improvement of the river and the Big Meadow which, despite, receiving 92% support, is not mentioned. These developers are happy enough to use the riverside character of Bidford in their advertising so there should be a “quid pro quo”.
Agree
AGREED

Q10g
Policy ECON7 - Homeworking and live-work units
Agree
No comment
I agree
As someone who would have the chance to work from home in the future, this is very important. There should also be facilities for those who set up their own businesses e.g. hair and beauty to run those from their own houses.
A nice idea.
agree
Yes
agreed
A sound policy -- but unsure how practical this is.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
The requirements set out here are laudable and comprehensive. I wonder how well they will sit alongside the general specification of smaller houses (e.g. 2 bedroom), and how much of the footprint will be used – or would the footprint need to be enhanced to accommodate these features? In general, the size of the public accommodation in most houses relates to the number of bedrooms. Houses with fewer bedrooms have smaller public rooms, and the office space requirements could be out of proportion to the remainder of the house (and would be likely to be used for domestic rather than business purposes). Are there model designs which could be appendices to the plan if the question should arise? On the same theme, I see no mention of wheelie bins. On many housing estates, these can be a blight. They occupy too much space to be accommodated inside the house. They are an eyesore when lined up outside, especially with terraced houses. If they are kept at the rear of the house, is there any way of taking them from the rear to the front on collection days, without going through the house?
Very good idea. Small start up businesses cannot afford big rents. Apple started in a garage in Palo Alto. The Main Street (high street) is a buzz of activities and it has on street parking. It can be done with careful planning. Keep egos and greed out of the mix with the objective of a sustainable environment for both young and older generations - you'll have a winner
Agree
These are a good idea. Small Craft units with living accommodation above will allow people to set up small businesses. These could also be used by people who run Companies on the internet.
I don't see how you could have a home office in most of the types of houses currently being built in Bidford, they are barely big enough to live in , let alone run a business from. I don't see how this can be a sustainable form of development when in practice it would not work.
yes agree
agree
Really? Seriously? This seems like a great way to justify building more houses.
Agreed
POLICY ECON7 – HOMEWORKING AND LIVE-WORK UNITS 1. “All new dwellings must include space to support home working.....adaptable to a home office”. Can this requirement be clarified particularly as to how it would apply to smaller houses and apartments. Does this requirement not lead to more larger houses and, therefore, contradict earlier statements on housing type and mix? 2. Second para, line 2. Change “permitted” to “considered”
Agree
AGREED

Q12a
Policy ENV1 - Renewable energy
Agree
Agreed, as long as within the character of the village
agree
no windmills
Strongly support
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Agree
Where possible we should in the developments encourage Renewable energy but these must fit in with the area.
Some of the new builds that incorporate these are already compromising the appearance of the village so I don't know how we could improve this.
By making Bidford into a dormitory village you will hardly do much to reduce the carbon footprint due to all the people having to drive to get to work, shopping etc. Hardly sustainable !!
A lot of houses already have this and I do know what impact this will have..
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
agree
To be incorporated into new builds only (e.g. solar panels), not separate plots/sites not large wind turbines
POLICY ENV1 – RENEWABLE ENERGY 1. Change “supported” to “considered” in line 1. 2. “the importance of mitigating climate change”. What effect will more housing have on “mitigating climate change”?
agree
AGREED
* The identities of settlements is s**** they all roll into 1

Q12b
Policy ENV2 - Green infrastructure
Agree
Agreed, as long as within the character of the village
important to keep greenland
All new houses should have solar panels. We have installed it and save a considerable amount of energy.
Agree.
We are a VILLAGE green spaces are essential .
agree
Yes
must be powerfully enforced
'Landscape led development' is a highly important principle for any new development
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
In the past trees have been removed and not replaced as promised. Hedgerows are removed this is detrimental to wildlife
Agree
We need to protect our rural environment by keeping as many trees, hedge rows as possible. we also need to plant more and keep our open spaces.
New trees and hedges would take years to grow and yet we seem happy to let developers destroy what is already here and push away the natural habitat. What will happen to the birds of pray that live on our vicinity? The wildlife? The plans we have seen look very sterile and no new development will help keep the current green infrastructure.
We have plenty of "green infrastructure" It is called open fields & hedgerows which you are advocating we build on !!
New trees will take years to grow and developers are trying to take away what we have already got. Our natural habitat will be taken too.
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
Agreed
POLICY ENV2 – GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE 1. “Where this is not possible new treesmust be planted”. These could be saplings which take years to properly replace those removed. Appropriate wording needs to be developed to cover this. 2. “Large scale developments will need to demonstrate.....”. How are “large scale developments” defined? “will need to demonstrate” should be changed to “must demonstrate”. This paragraph implies that large scale development will take place. Here again this does not reflect the views of the residents who, if they have no alternative but to accept new development as has been alleged would not want “large scale development” in our view.
agree
AGREED

Q12c
Policy ENV3 - Blue infrastructure
Agree
Agreed
Agree
agree
Yes
agreed
Strongly support
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Agree
We need to ensure we protect the rivers Avon and Arrow for future generations
it is necessary to safeguard our water resources.
Same as above
Same as above
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
Agreed
POLICY ENV3 – BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY ENV4 – DRAINAGE AND FLOODING 1. Line 1, amend to read “All development must ensure the safeguarding of existing”. 2. There were 521 adverse responses on the existing “Sewerage” infrastructure as well as 413 adverse comments on water and sewerage combined. This clearly is a major issue where the residents believe that the existing infrastructure cannot cope let alone with further new development. These sections should, therefore be qualified by wording to the effect that “any new development will only be considered where it is demonstrated that the existing infrastructure can cope with it or, where not, that effective plans are proposed to upgrade the existing infrastructure in order that it can cope with the proposed development”. 3. Policy ENV4, last line. Change “supported” to “considered”.
agree
AGREED

Q12d
Policy ENV4 - Drainage and flooding
Agree
Any development that increases the risk of flooding to other households must be refused.
All parties to the waterways and drainage infrastructure, including sewage and boating interests and the Environment Agency, should be involved in any agreements.
Crucial to ensure that new developments do not overload existing pipes and sewers.
We need to be promoting more soft landscaping. We can already see on the new housing sites either side of Waterloo road either water running off the sites into drains that cannot maintain the amount of water or water standing in the roads as it has nowhere to go. On one such road I was hydroplaning after a heavy shower.
new development must address all drainage and flooding issues before any application is granted - this may mean cost to the developer but it means the village will not be exposed to the risk of planning permission being granted without adequate evaluation having been done which will result in bodged solutions to problems that can not really be fixed.
ESSENTIAL TO UPGRADE CURRENT INFRASTRUCTURE WITH CORRECT DEVELOPMENT DATUM LEVELS THUS: If drainage cannot work without raising level of building, then it should not be allowed.
agreed
New development should be built around sustainable drainage systems rather than it being an afterthought. Government, developers and the building industry have tarried too long on this. Bidford and the other villages all suffer from flooding and we should set an example.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
The more properties that are built the more run off and risk of flooding
Developers must consider flood prevention measures such as SUDS as the starting point of any development and not as an afterthought: just ticking the box.
The more houses we build, the greater risk of flooding.
We should make sure that new development does not cause any kind of flooding, Drainage must be good enough to cope with and be sustainable
The more we build the more we all suffer from flooding. The plans that we have seen seem to take care of the new houses but seem to forget the current population and we are exposed to more and more issues due the lack of green spaces. There is nowhere for the water to go.
The sewerage system is very strained relying on pumps to pump it from the village. All of the villages poo is reliant on these pumps & old pipes to get out along Salford road & over Marriage Hill to the sewerage works. This is a major pinch point and cannot be expected to keep carrying ever increasing amounts of sewerage without being enhanced. Other utilities also need to be increased as well with more demand being placed upon them.
Flooding is a major issue in the village. More houses will have a major impact on this.. Our garden already floods on Steppes Piece..
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable. I cannot see how the drainage can be improved without substantial investment from the council and severn trent. Bidford cannot cope with the current system - we have made numerous call outs as the sewers on Victoria Road are too old to properly cope with our waste. Any developers of new homes will leave the council with enormous ongoing costs to address issues and this does not appear to be understood. We believe our land will be prone to flooding by any agreed development besides it and no one will be answerable for this. The focus will be on ensuring the new homes are protected and not the current homes. This is completely wrong.
This is a very important issue. Current developers will be leaving the village with many problems to cope with as the drainage system is not able to support any more housing. This issue alone makes any further development unsustainable. Flooding is a big issue too - developers are not concerned about the adverse impact of building on current residents at all. This is completely wrong. Residents should be protected from know problems.
All new housing should collect rainwater for use in flushing toilets. This can be included in future building Regs.
Agreed

POLICY ENV3 – BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY ENV4 – DRAINAGE AND FLOODING 1. Line 1, amend to read “All development must ensure the safeguarding of existing” . 2. There were 521 adverse responses on the existing “Sewerage” infrastructure as well as 413 adverse comments on water and sewerage combined. This clearly is a major issue where the residents believe that the existing infrastructure cannot cope let alone with further new development. These sections should, therefore be qualified by wording to the effect that “any new development will only be considered where it is demonstrated that the existing infrastructure can cope with it or, where not, that effective plans are proposed to upgrade the existing infrastructure in order that it can cope with the proposed development” . 3. Policy ENV4, last line. Change “supported” to “considered” .

agree

AGREED

Q12e
Policy ENV5 - Protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land
Agree that this policy must form part of the final document to protect the valuable agricultural land within the parish which is considered one of the best in the county - it is essential this be protected against development
Totally agreed. The best and most versatile agricultural land must be protected
Why is grade 2 agricultural land being earmarked for housing, again I object to this are being included for housing in the NDP
Agree
Agree
It said on radio four that we as a country running out of decent agricultural land, as our village has grade two land it would be irresponsible as a community to allow development on it, as well as being detrimental to the country as a whole.
agree
Yes
agreed
Agree
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
We need to do our utmost to protect all agricultural land.
Bidford has a good supply of Grade 2 agricultural land, the best type in the County, and it is essential that it is preserved, if we are to consider a sustainable environment.
We need to preserve all of the agricultural land, we should not use any grade 2 farming land for houses or industry. This has to take priority over politicians and Stratford District Council Core Strategy in our NDP
Vital so that Bidford remains a rural village, surrounded by farms and fields.
In the future all Agricultural land will be needed for food production. With the worlds population growing and more and more land being built on.
I'm struggling to see how this would work as the land which is proposed to be built on is agricultural land. How can we magic more agricultural land after that??
This plan seems to me to advocate building on our most productive farm land which seems contrary to policy ENV5.
You could be looking at least an extra 1500 cars coming into the village "Town". Pollution will destroy our agriculture.
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
H2b Is high quality land why is it marked as development land?
Agreed
POLICY ENV5 - PROTECTION OF BEST AND MOST VERSATILE AGRICULTURAL LAND 1. "the Best and Most Versatile agricultural Land, as outlined in the Proposals Map ". It is not clear where this land is on the map. 2. Change "supported" to "considered",
agree
AGREED
* How can this be when so called protective sites are on agricultural land

Q12f
Policy ENV6 - Protection of landscape, skylines and important views
Agree
Agreed
Strongly agree
strongly recommend protection of landscape and views
As a child I could see the Malvern hills from my bedroom window, now all I see is brick . Very sad
agree
Yes
agreed
Strongly agree
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
We need to protect our landscape
Strongly agree
Bidford has already been blighted by some ugly buildings and landscaping. This has to be stopped otherwise the village will be ruined.
We should protect our rural landscapes and skylines where possible.
There is no way the landscape can be kept with a potential 740 new homes!
This plan seems to me to advocate building on mostly farm land which doesn't seem to fit in with policy ENV6
Building 740 new homes means we will have no landscape or views to enjoy.
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
Agreed
POLICY ENV6 – PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, SKYLINES AND IMPORTANT VIEWS 1. Add to the end of line 2 “skylines and views not only in the village itself but also from the surrounding countryside including the Big Meadow”.
agree
The constant building of new houses has already damaged this. No further building of houses is supported or agreed with on my part as this will further reduce this important aspect of the village. It will reduce it to a town.
AGREED
Grafton Lane - go out of village.

Q12g
Policy ENV7 - Preservation of heritage assets
Agree
Agreed
Strongly agree
Preservation of the bridge is good however should we not benefit from a new bridge from allotments to meadow. The old bridge being kept solely for pedestrians and cyclists
Very important.
To protect our 16 th c bridge and its rich history we have to stop the daily bombardment of heavy inappropriate traffic
agree
Yes particularly in Village Centre
agreed
Strongly agree. Much stronger and effective safeguards are needed for Bidford Bridge, our most important heritage asset if a repeat of this year's totally unnecessary damage is to be avoided. There has to be both weight and width limits, well signed and publicised with traffic sensors in place.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
We need to look at ways of protecting Bidford Bridge
Strongly agree. We have just experienced the part destruction of Bidford Bridge, a listed heritage monument. Measures must be taken to prevent such occurrences happening again . The subsequent closure of the bridge has highlighted the absolute lack of alternative infrastructure, which is damaging the local businesses, as access to the village is hindered.
As a community we are not doing enough to protect the bridge for future generations. The weight limit is frequently ignored, we should explore ways to make it pedestrianised or at the very least cars only
Very important for future generations.
Our heritage sites are our pass and should be protected. Our bridge is over 500 years old and a big part of our village. Unfortunately it was badly damaged 2 weeks ago and will be closed for some time.
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
Bidford needs a new bridge crossing the Avon. The current old bridge was not designed for our traffic requirements. A route from the Salford road going behind the meadow connecting up at the Barton/Marlcliff junction would seem the best route. This would allow the old bridge to be pedestrianised.
Agreed
POLICY ENV7 – PRESERVATION OF HERITAGE ASSETS 1. Change the two references from "supported" to "considered".
needs more identification
AGREED

Q12h
Policy ENV8 - Promoting high quality design
Agree - again an essential policy to ensure the character of the village is preserved
Agreed
Agree. Current housing being built is not pleasing to the eye. It is bland and box like. It adds nothing to the village and diminishes its character.
New houses would be more acceptable if they were better designed and had architectural merit. The area
All the houses built in the last thirty years are ugly and suburbanis that really what we want in our village . No
agree
Yes
agreed
Strongly agree; local character and good design have been casualties of the much recent development.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Strongly agree
History has shown that this has not been a priority of planners with our village now looking like lego land.
It would be good to have some quality designed new houses and not just small square boxes. This would enhance the development and environment.
The houses that are already being built do compromise the character so how can we guarantee doing better with more developments?
Having observed recent construction in Bidford I can't see this in evidence anywhere, The estates being built are "bog standard off the peg" designs which could be in Anytown, Anywhere in England with no consideration to their location
You want to build affordable houses. That is not high quality design.
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
Agreed
Totally subjective, who decides what it means?
AGREED

Q12i
Policy ENV9 - Nature conservation
Agree
Agreed
More trees more input from environmental experts if plans have to be agreed . Big yellow taxi comes to mind
agree
Yes
agreed
Strongly support this
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
The only way we can protect nature is to stop the village havign any more building
Agree
Again very important for future generations.
We should keep and protect as much of our open spaces and habitats as possible.
Same as 2
So why build on the ones we have which are perfectly balanced so don't need to be re-created
Same at Number 2
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
Agreed
POLICY ENV9 – NATURE CONSERVATION 1. “Where development involves a loss of biodiversity or habitat, appropriate habitation should be created in mitigation”. Protection of the natural environment was the second highest priority in the residents responses. The current wording does not adequately reflect that and needs further consideration. 2. Explanation: Change “should” to “must” in line 1.
agree
AGREED

Q12j
Policy ENV10 - Minerals and aggregates extraction
Agree
Agreed. Full environmental restitution must be made within a short timescale
There should be no more mineral extraction in the area - it has been ravaged enough!
The area has provided its share of minerals and aggregates.
Very difficult to ensure rapid restoration of mineral workings due to the timescales involved. Any proposals require really strong access arrangements.
The mineral extraction at Broom should never be repeated. Lessons should have been learned, never to be repeated.
agree
Not to be allowed within the Village Boundary
agreed but must be enforced
Restoration of mineral sites offer excellent opportunities for landscape and biodiversity improvement, for example larger areas of open water. conditions on any future minerals permissions should require this.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Agree
If it becomes necessary for more mineral extraction to be done in our Parish we should ensure that we put a strict limit on the time scale and how long it will be before the land is put back to its correct purpose.
Don't allow any. The area has already been over developed re mineral extraction
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
Agreed
There should be no further abuse of the area by this means!
AGREED

Q14a
Policy AM1 - Protecting and enhancing health opportunities
Agree -
Improving access to the health centre is required so that people don't have drive all the time. I recently wanted to cycle to an appointment but there are no facilities to secure a bike.
Agreed, although given that the surgery is over a mile away from the village it is questionable how much use a footpath will get.
Where no comment has been made there is agreement with the policy.
Strongly agree.
Health centre provides a good service but it is a pity it is so far from the village as this creates extra traffic.
The new health centre is an asset but it does seem to have affected the village centre. A footpath to the health centre should be a high priority.
With the village increasing in size. There is a great need to protect and enhance our Health centre. There does need to be a footpath, the grass verge is not safe to be walking on and a lot of people step into the road when they think they are safe, but it is still too fast a road to be walking on.
Give us some decent running and cycle routes . And leisure facility's such as a pool/ lido That will keep people within the village and create jobs .
agree
yes
agreed
I would support the idea of a footpath from Bidford village to the new health centre on grounds of sustainable transport, health and well-being and carbon reduction. The entire saga of the new centre is a prime example of infrastructure not being in place to support the development.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
There is mention of a footpath along the B439 between Bidford and the health centre. That would be a distance of around half a mile from the end of the village speed restriction, and a mile from the old health centre/village square. I think it unlikely that such a provision would be used by those visiting the health centre. If unwell, or old and infirm (includes many of the catchment population), if the weather is inclement, or it is dark I think people would be reluctant to use such a footpath, whilst being buffeted by the wind (and spray?) from passing vehicles. Possibly useful for cyclists or for electric chariots such as some of the elderly use. There would also be an issue of lighting for the winter months. Given that few of our elderly probably ever walk that far on a good day
The health centre has moved out of the village meaning meaning everyone has to use a vehicle to get there, not enviromentally friendly. This is a loss to the village centre
Agree
Essential in a expanding population
The Health centre has moved to Cranhill and no footpath was provided to the building. Buses do run to Stratford ever 30 minutes but this is still not convenient for everyone and not all people have access to cars either.
A footpath would definitely be required. But the current health centre is already very busy and it is difficult to see how it could cope with a massive increase in population.
Our GP's has stated that the surgery is at capacity now & with the impending retirement of GP's over the next 10 years may well have trouble attracting new GP's to come to rural warwickshire. Adding to our housing can only increase the strain on the health centre.
A safe footpath is required as the road leading to very fast. The health centre is always extremely busy, so how are they going to cope with all these extra houses.
The location of the new surgery is extremely difficult for many users to access. There needs to be other services available in the village.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
Agreed
agree
The provision of health services in and around Bidford is already under significant pressure, any further plans to build in the village will further aggravate that stress if the system.

AGREED

Q14b
Policy AM2 - Protecting and enhancing education and library facilities
Agree
No comment
Agreed. Providing above average facilities for primary school children (including playing fields of sufficient size) is investing in our future
Given the existing new building permission there will be a need for increased educational facilities. Expansion of the present school should not be at the expense of the outdoor recreational facilities. If necessary, a two-story extension for the school should be considered.
There will no doubt be further closure threats to the library even though it is run by volunteers. This must be strongly opposed.
The school and library are important parts of village life and should be supported.
Primary school is excellent. Would need to be expanded to cope with future developments and would therefore no longer be a village school.
Any more development would create the need for a secondary school. Already 357 children being bussed to schools is a large number.
agree
yes
no more housing without more school places
I support the idea of planning gain being used to help maintain the Community Library.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Strongly agree
Essential for cultural and educational development
It is necessary to keep the Library going for people to use not just for books but also community groups. Computer training and the use of. a place to meet and make new friends. Also a hub for the CAB and where you can make contact with S.D.C free of charge. The School is also very important to the village
Expanding the school means more buildings again rather than natural space. The village school would definitely not cope with the increase in population but then the increase in population is not required.
With the school now being full and with the school site now being boxed in by development, the only place that could be developed on by building on is the school playing field, not a good solution !! which is contary to policy AM3
Whether it is increasing school sizes running extra bus services, Bidford is simply not big enough for all these proposed plans.
Yes agree - I am not sure how the school can be expanded though at its present location without adversely impacting on the provision of library services. Bidford doesnot have the infrastructure to take increasing development.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
If the village is to get much bigger it will need a secondary school.
Agreed
POLICY AM2 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING EDUCATION AND LIBRARY FACILITIES 1. The school is virtually at capacity now so how is any new development in Policy H2 to be accommodated? 2. Add the following to the last line “and in order to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases”.
Bigger school needed and a high school
agree
As things stand there are not enough places in local schools for the current number of children living in the area and no space to provide mire .
The provision of education services in and around Bidford is already under significant pressure, any further plans to build in the village will further aggravate that stress if the system. Bidford school is full. There is no transport for children to get to other primary schools. We chose for our daughters to attend catholic primary in Alcester (freeing up spaces in bidford and Salford) but we were refused a bus pass to get them there. Ludicrous when there is a half empty bus taking

children from Bidford to Our Ladys already. Making me use my car on an unnecessary journey, polluting the environment, increasing traffic congestion as peak times. Also decimating any faith in Warwickshire county council logic.

AGREED

Loss of green space.

Q14c
Policy AM3 - Protecting and enhancing sports and recreational spaces (formal)
Agree
No comment
Agreed
A purpose built sports hall is required (and ideally a swimming pool!). Developers money should have provided these facilities.
Tennis club is very active and all sports facilities should be supported.
Both my children enjoyed sports, both needed to travel to Alcester schools, Stratford Leisure centre or even Redditch schools to fulfil their sports needs. Its always been a need in Bidford.
Cycle and running track , lido , pool ,
agree
yes
agreed
Supported for social, environmental and health reasons.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Agree
Essential for healthy living and keeping open spaces
It is important to keep and enhance our Sports facilities for the good of all our residents. It is a good way of helping people to keep fit, walking , running playing football, cricket, bowls, tennis etc. It is hoped to put more gym equipment for all ages to use in the near future. we have a number of play areas for children to use but need to keep undating them..
Any expansion to the Crawford Hall would seem unlikely as the only space is the car park which doesn't seem logical. Why encourage people to use additional facilities when there is no car park.
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
Agreed
More sport faculties needed
Not as a 'trade off' for housing development.
There is no leisure centre/swimming pool. Everyone has to commute to it. Build a swimming pool instead of more houses.
We cannot affect the Big Meadow at all.
The explanation says that "the Crawford Hall provides the only indoor facility within the Neighbourhood Area for potential recreational use", and goes on to record its support for any proposals to widen the range of facilities and services provided and enhance the opportunities for recreational use there. I don't know how you define recreational use, but surely Broom Village Hall provides them, too? - eg ballroom dancing, Pilates, Taekwondo. And given the limited facilities in Broom I feel that the plan should record a similar level of support for any such proposals there, as well.
AGREED

Q14d
Policy AM4 - Protecting and enhancing informal open spaces
Agree
No comment
Agreed. Bidford on Avon needs to have as many green spaces as possible to retain its character as a village and to maintain the quality of its environment for the benefit of this and future generations
yes
Important.
The informal green areas on St Lawrence Way are very much appreciated by residents on my estate and should be strongly protected. They also make a real difference to the appearance of the estate and similar pspaces should be encouraged on other new developments.
This is important as the houses currently being built have small or no gardens and people need somewhere to go and "chill".
Agree
Edible fruit trees that people can help them selves to, this is a great success in Germany
agree
yes
most important
Supported, for social, environmental and health reasons
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Agree
Essential for the ambiance of the village
It is good to have and protect our open spaces but we must ensure that any new development also gives new open spaces to enhance the environment and allow people to appreciate them.
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
Agreed
Agree
Any plans that adversely affect the current population is not welcomed or supported.
Why is Broom Common not identified as an important existing open space? I would regard its maintenance and protection as being of great importance to the character of the village, and to the villagers.
AGREED

Q14e
Policy AM5 - Allotments and growing space
Agree - support the design of larger gardens that promote the growing of vegetables etc.
No comment
Agreed. Opportunities to grow fresh vegetables should be made available within reason to everyone who wants them
Good.
It is noted that there appears to be a demand for more allotments. This is a contrast to Salford Priors where the PC could not give the plots away!
Small gardens mean households who wish to grown their own produce need allotments.
Agree
Use the ground proposed for building as allotment and communal spaces , the village is big enough
agree
Definitely Yes
agreed, 60 sq m minimum should be more
As above, supported for social, environmental and health reasons.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
In the Explanation, the term "made available in perpetuity for those residents" is used. Does this mean that the allotment would be available in perpetuity as a function of the residence to which it relates, or a function of the resident? The latter would imply that the allotment would then be part of the estate of the resident, and would be passed from generation to generation.
The village needs more allotments,
Agree
Essential for residents for encouraging healthy living and communal bonding
We already have a number of allotments but we still have a number of people awaiting plots. It would be good to have a few more to allow people to grow their own food which we should be encouraging. Some allotments would be advantageous on new developments.
The allotment land must be protected from development
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
Agreed
POLICY AM5 – ALLOTMENTS AND GROWING SPACE 1. "All new dwellingsof secure gardens of at least 60sqm". Is this the area front and back or just back. If the former, it's not enough in my view. 2. How many of the existing allotments are neglected and could be freed up to meet the current waiting list?
Agree
AGREED

Q14f
Policy AM6 - Promoting walking and cycling
Agree- safe cycle routes are important and should be encouraged
No comment
Agreed. Opportunities for keeping fit and enjoying the environment are very important
The footpaths in the area should be better maintained (many are overgrown) and new footpaths created. Cycle routes utilising the old railway lines should be promoted
yes
Walking over the bridge is unpleasant and dangerous with children.
The number of footpaths thorough the village are much appreciated particularly where they provide short cuts to the shops and other services.
Agree.
Wider paths , slower traffic . cycle way round perimeter of village (before it's filled with houses)
agree
Yes
agreed
Provision of improved walking and cycling facilities would help contribute to health & well-being and carbon reduction. The possibility of a new cycle way facility using the disused railway from Broom (or even Alcester) through Bidford to Welford, joining up with the Greenway via quiet roads should be investigated. Sustainable transport provision and social, health and economic benefits could flow from this.
I agree & concur with the comments in the Consultation Document on Draft Policies
Strongly agree
Essential to discourage car use and promote healthy lifestyle
All new developments should be asked to make pathways wide enough to allow cycle paths to be put in and these should all be joined up routes.
Huge improvements required. More people would mean more movement and more paths required, and probable wider too. There is currently nothing available for cyclists.
A nice idea, but as a "dormitory village" it is probably not going to happen. You only have to be at the school at the beginning & end of the day as parents drop off/pick up their children to & from work. This situation will only worsen as the developments currently under construction are occupied and parents bring their children to school especially during the winter. I feel most people will do their shopping near their work or have it delivered so will do very little walking or cycling from their houses to the village centre.
Walk ways could be improved and there is no cycle lanes as the roads are too small, so it is already dangerous and you want to increase traffic by building more houses. There is an accident waiting to happen..
yes agree but I don't support any new housing development in Bidford - its not sustainable.
Agree with the sentiment of the policy but disagree with any housing development - there has been so much already without the sufficient infrastructure to sustain it.
There is no natural walking/running/cycling routes around the village. There are right of ways etc. but nothing that can be used all year round, in fading light etc. Provision of a 5Km and 10Km circuit would encourage everybody from parents with buggies to committed runners. Cycle routes separated from the roads connecting the other local villages would help.
Agreed
OTHER COMMENTS It is clear from the residents' responses to the NDP questionnaire that there are two principal reasons for the overwhelming opposition to further development in the village. One is the adverse effect that the level of development has already had on the character and environment of the village and, the other is the fact that there has been little or no investment in the village's infrastructure in order to cope with that level of development. Neither of these key issues are addressed in the current draft. They should be. With specific regard to the infrastructure issue the recently updated Core Strategy document from Stratford DC says that planning authorities should"assess the quality and capacity of the local infrastructure". Such an

assessment of Bidford's infrastructure should be carried out and included in the NDP. SDC's Core Strategy goes on to say that"Infrastructure should be delivered with or in advance of development". The same caveat should be included in our NDP.

Agree

Totally agree but given we cannot even provide a foot way to the Drs what chance do we really have

I feel that in order to encourage and facilitate walking, the plan should acknowledge the need to make pathways or other similar provision for walking along roads that currently have no pavements at all. The existing grass verges are not level, and consequently are dangerous to walk along.

AGREED

Comments

2.0 1) The housing developments planned will make the village totally "top heavy" and turn what was a pleasant village into a suburban town, the very reason why people relocate! H1 2) Has a full study into whether the sewage system can cope be looked into. If the discharge goes into old pipes which already are prone to flooding it will just add to the problem. H2 3) I have not seen any study on the impact of additional traffic on the Salford Road. It is already a "highway!" and virtually an "A" road. Heavy transport are frequent users and residents adjoining this road are subject to a high level of noise pollution and have a right to enjoy air quality which does not breach current regulations. The last traffic study on this road was several years ago and I would suspect that already with the new builds completed have increased traffic by at least one third if not more. Any further increase would be intolerable for residents. H3 4) According to Housing Needs survey the current needs are very small in proportion to projected housing development, some of the new estates have struggled to sell properties so why build more? 5) Parking, the plan states that new developments within the village centre must provide adequate parking - why then were the new build houses at the rear of Lloyds bank permitted with only ONE space, no provision for visitors on an already congested site? 6) ENV 7 The latest issue regarding the bridge highlights total disregard for speeding. I have personally witnessed a huge trailer virtually "scrape" by over the bridge. This problem will occur again and again. A new crossing further down adjacent to the island at the bottom of Marriage Hill needs to be built and funded by the new developments, we don't need yet more recreational gizmos, we need a pedestrianised bridge with a new access road - THIS WILL BENEFIT THE VILLAGE - not yet more unused swings. 7) AM3 - Another very useful recreational facility would be the provision of a community swimming pool / fitness facility. Again this could / should be funded by developers - we have missed a trick with current developments this is what the modern young family want and could be used by schools, etc. very important for children to learn to swim when living by a river! 8) AM1 - We need an out of hours provision - it's surely not acceptable for a young mum to have to drive to Warwick (IF she has got a car!) because her son has earache and needs medication! Further development could "overpower" our GP provision. 9) Bus service on Sundays pathetic, needs to be improved for families without transport. 10) Carbon emissions need to be addressed on the B439 road plus additional safety railings, reduced noise road surface and speed controls first before you can encourage cyclists, at present it's an accident waiting to happen! 11) Speeding a problem, also new Post Office - motorists still turn right and disregard signs - again accident waiting to happen.

Bidford ceased being a proper village some time back and friendly it is not. I don't think we need more houses and more people with no regard for village life. Although it has been enlarged would the health centre be able to cope with what could be perhaps almost a thousand more patients, will the school need to be enlarged again. The roads are already very busy. Last but not least I object to the loss of habitat for the wildlife. The bats disappeared when the school was built and the hedgehogs 5 years ago. Perhaps the answer to the future housing problem would be to build more blocks of flats in the towns, not everyone wants a house and garden, just somewhere to live and a patch of concrete. I see no need to develop the village any further.

The people of Bidford-on-Avon and surrounding villages need to stand together to prevent further development. The infrastructure is not there to support new housing and all the needs of a larger population. Existing roads and schools and doctors could not cope with the extra people that would live in the area. There is already more than enough houses for this area to support. We must protect this lovely village. The draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) states that the village "supports the safeguarding of land on areas H2a, H2b, H2c for potential future housing development" and that "all new housing development will be confined to within the village boundary". But then there are references to new development being permitted or supported !!! How can you "support" future development if you have already said that the land areas H2a, H2b and H2c would be safeguarded! I believe all Bidford residents do want any new development to be curtailed. We want to protect the village. We live in Jackson's Meadow and are fighting Bloor Homes who want to build 40 houses near where we live. In Jackson's Meadow it is already a tight fit with residents' cars and family visitors. Some residents have to reverse quite a way out of their drive to the turning circle that developers want to use to access the land. The thought of many cars using that limited access and other cars reversing to get out, with children playing and families coming and going, does not bear thinking about! It would be dangerous and essentially not necessary to build the houses and use the access at all! We must get the Neighbourhood Development Plan RIGHT.

Please leave this village alone. Bidford-on-Avon is a lovely place to live. PLEASE PLEASE leave it alone. NO MORE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT. THE 426 NEW DWELLINGS SINCE 2011 ARE TOO MUCH. STOP NOW!

Congratulations on the hard work of the Steering Group in providing such an all-encompassing document. Although somewhat unhappy about the scale of housing (up to 2031) in a small village, and worries about the necessary infrastructure, I'm reassured by the Group's control and knowledge of every aspect of the Neighbourhood Plan. And delighted that 35% 2-bed houses and flats / affordable housing to rent 80% as against 20% (P.5) / are advised by the Steering Group.

As you see I am unable to find anything to disagree with. I congratulate the Parish Council on an excellent Plan which clearly helps the village. It will protect and enhance our beloved Bidford-on-Avon for the future. Well done.

H1 I agree H2 I agree H3 I agree H4 I agree H5 I agree ECON 1 I agree ECON 2 I agree, ECON 3 I agree, ECON 4 I agree, ECON 5 I agree, ECON 6 I agree, ECON 7 I agree, ENV 1 I agree, ENV 2 I agree, ENV 3 I agree, ENV 4 I definitely agree, ENV 5 I certainly agree, ENV 6 I agree, ENV 7 I agree, ENV 8 I agree, ENV 9 I agree, ENV 10 I agree, AM 1 I agree, AM 2 I agree, AM 3 I agree, AM 4 I definitely agree, AM 5 I agree, AM 6 I agree

Bidford is getting very crowded now. Lloyds bank in the High Street has no pavement to access the street at its side. Yellow lines have been marked "for cars" but no pavement is being put in for the new homes. Children use this place to get to and from school. To have more buildings in the village will be very hazardous from a traffic and pedestrian point of view. There is not even any pavement to reach the doctors on the main road. The people of Bidford need to be heard even if they are only pedestrians.

AFFORDABLE NOT SOCIAL The Bidford-on-Avon Parish Neighbourhood Plan is NOT at present MEETING its strategic objectives. HOUSING The cost of "affordable" housing is too high. More affordable houses, bungalows and sheltered accommodation is already required in Bidford. ENVIRONMENT Safeguard! How? Trees, hedges and copse are all being uprooted. More and more concrete is replacing fields, so that less water can be absorbed in the ground and with fewer trees to also absorb the water, the risk of flooding increases. Climate change - more buildings, more cars and as there are few jobs available in the local area - people are forced to commute to find work. We need sustainable energy - all homes should be built with solar panels. ECONOMY The "centre" of the village is gradually dying. The Medical Centre and Post Office brought in people. What are we offering tourists? How can we draw people in to boost our economy? Start with a competition for ideas. The prize could be a grant to jump start the idea. We have so much history, leisure opportunities and people who long for a vibrant village. AMENITIES The infrastructure is struggling now. There is not enough in place to sustain further large building sites, small infill areas only. Our school is already needing more room. Our medical centre will struggle to cope with 100s more residents. The access along the B439 is dangerous. We have been asked to conserve nature with corridors of undisturbed land and all we see are habitats being destroyed. Nature has a calming influence and is beneficial to health. We need more green spaces for dog walking, sports, a running track, etc. Builders like Taylor Wimpey should pay so much per new house into an amenities fund. Turn the land between the river Arrow and the river Avon on the B439 into a nature reserve, not a building site which will add to flooding. More allotment space and better protected. Many (particularly elderly and young) people are struggling with breathing problems, caused or aggravated by the work on building sites. No aggregate extraction in the area. This would exasperate health problems and destroy more habitats for nature. We live in a wonderful part of the Cotswolds, let's honour it. It is our inheritance.

H1 - In complete agreement with this prime objective. H2 - Agree. (Suggest future houses include good size gardens). H3 - Agree. H4 - Totally agree - development confined to "brownfield land". H5 - Agree. ECON1- Agree. ECON2 - Agree. ECON3 - Agree. ECON4 - Agree. ECON5 - Agree. ECON6 - Agree. ECON7 - Agree. ENV1 - Agree. ENV2 - Agree. ENV3 - Agree. ENV4 - Agree - Housing on unfavourable sites will "EXACERBATE" drainage problems. ENV5 - Total Agreement. ENV6 - Agree. ENV7 - Agree. ENV8 - Agree. ENV9 - Agree. ENV10 - Agree. AM1 - Agree. AM2 - Agree. AM3 - Agree - A very important community aim. AM4 - Agree. AM5 - Agree - but gardens to be at least 100sq m. AM6 - Agree. I would like to congratulate the parish council on producing such a comprehensive development plan for Bidford, and which I am in complete agreement. It has entailed a tremendous amount of work. I hope the plan will be adopted "as soon as possible" to hold to account house builders taking every advantage, in the absence of an approved core strategy plan for Stratford District, to rush through developments and, in the process, change the nature and attraction of the village of Bidford.

I have read the above-mentioned document / booklet and would like to express my agreement with all the proposals for future planning and developments stated within. The Parish Council is to

be congratulated on the sensible proposals. I would like to thank all involved for their dedication and hours of hard work.

This consultation document is a comprehensive and well-presented insight into the future needs and development of Bidford, making it much easier for residents to formulate their views: I would highlight the following points:-

1. There has in recent years already been significant housing development in Bidford, with additional large scale development already approved. Bidford has made its contribution and planners should therefore look more closely at the development of Brownfield Sites in local towns and cities, putting the people where jobs and amenities already exist.
2. In the limited development permitted preference should be given to the following:-
 - 2.1 Shared ownership properties which allow local young people to gain a foothold on the housing ladder and remain in the village.
 - 2.2 Properties for elderly residents, which can often free up larger properties for families.
 - 2.3 That the points made in the Consultation Document in respect of landscaping, Green / Blue Infrastructure issues etc. are adhered to.
3. The damage to Bidford Bridge has highlighted the problems caused by heavy commercial traffic. Thought should be given to a second river crossing which could improve access to the village centre for pedestrians via the existing bridge and offer possibilities for developing additional river and sports facilities.
4. Employment is a major factor if the village is to prosper. In addition to providing facilities for small / medium sized companies, future residential development should include provision for home working with high speed Broadband Access. Facilities should be provided to allow small companies to "cluster", to share ideas, expertise and support services, which should reduce their costs and improve their long term viability.
5. Care should be taken to ensure that education, transport and other facilities are available to meet the already increased demand.

We have had enough housing - no more if possible! Smaller houses, bungalows, flats (for young people). More houses to rent at reasonable amounts. Land at Grafton Lane is not suitable for large lorries, too narrow and parking along lane already causes problems. The High Street is a problem, not enough footfall now the Health Centre and Post Office has gone - The Bridge is now stopping people coming to Bidford. Health Centre is too far out of the village - needs a footpath to it. Everything else seems to have been covered in the book.

As there are three areas safeguarded in the draft NDP (H2a, H2b and H2c) there is no need for further development in the village. There is building of houses on Friday Furlong and off Bramley Way. This will increase local traffic so the village cannot cope with more if permission were given to the proposals at Marriage Hill and Jacksons Meadow. The village centre is dead and needs independent shops to open so to encourage villagers to use the facilities. Why can't Bidford become a proper village with a bustling community? Six hairdressers and numerous eateries hardly enhance a pretty village centre. We need to entice people visiting the Big Meadow to cross the bridge (hopefully this will be repaired A.S.A.P.) and spend money in unique shops. Many villagers don't even use what facilities are there. Bidford has lost its SOUL and is becoming one large housing estate.

For your information I cannot read a computer screen (and I have spent pounds at the options!!) Even though everything is on the website, that doesn't help me and I know I am NOT the only one. P.S. I read your article about the growth of Bidford. Found it very good.

The Parish Council is to be commended for its questionnaire of the village. But now the "plan" seems to have gone astray. It does not seem to represent our views. no.2. If Broom, Marlcliff and Barton are not sustainable, why is Bidford? We have failing pubs, shops (High Street closing down!) A sewage pumping station that is over capacity, no High Schools, an infant / junior school which is full: no room for expansion. AND most importantly no employment - meaning and houses will be full of commuters and would not spend money in the local economy etc!! H1. There is no village boundary map! And this is fundamental to this document. H". This "PLAN" supports ... NO!" I thought this whole process was to ask the villagers their views. H3. What is "affordable" rent or "affordable" house and who takes the loss - the developer? H4. The only "Brownfield" Site in the village is United Carriers site this is suddenly not mentioned in this draft. If this Draft Plan is against the development of greenfield sites why is it supporting H2c? ECON 4. Why should the "Plan" only be supporting infrastructure to allow faster broadband, we want infrastructure to allow new water, sewerage, electricity, gas and road working. ECON7 You can hardly fit a family of 4 into the houses they build now, let alone a business / office. ENV8. In most development now you could be standing in a suburb of Birmingham, London or Bristol. More local input should be demanded. 5. AM1. The health centre would not need a huge injection of cash to withstand any more development. AM2. Where would this school expansion take place exactly. There are only the playing fields left, and I hope the "Plan" is not encouraging the school to get rid of this! On the whole I found this draft plan did not support the people of the village and was very contradictory:- for instance, it mentioned older age group (AM1.) but gave them no

houses or old peoples homes.

Please find my general comments and overall concerns on the above. 1. On the PC Website it states that: "The Parish Council is very concerned about what it considers to be the over development of the village". I do not believe that this is fully emphasised in the Draft Plan, and with the current planning consents recently granted and also those under consideration such as Bloor Homes on Jacksons Meadow etc. the PC will presumably name the village of Bidford: Bidford New Town! 2. Indeed with other local planning proposals which will have a serious effect on our area such as Cala Homes possible development in Long Marston (admittedly not within our PC area) Stratford will shortly become the new Milton Keynes! 3. The PC must assist and influence the District Council in part through the Neighbourhood Plan to prevent these unfortunate and inappropriate developments destroy the beautiful character of much of our area, which is why many of us have chosen to live here!! 4. A more specific comment under "2.0 Neighbourhood Housing" I am delighted that the "villages" of Barton, Marlcliff and Broom are not considered suitable for new housing, etc. On a technical point, I believe that Barton and Marlcliff and possibly Broom under current planning law are "Designated Hamlets" not Villages! However, houses / buildings of "unique architectural merit" may be allowed such as the recent application in the grounds of "Stone House" in Barton, which I support as did the PC recently. 5. Under Policies H2, H3 and H4 there could be further emphasis on some smaller (and cheaper!) homes for the elderly and for younger first home buyers who were brought up and educated in the local villages (and hamlets!) 6. I totally agree that the use of brownfield land should be emphasised, as long as it does not mean that Cala Homes will build on Bickmarsh airfield when they have finished in Long Marston! 7. Another obvious comment is on protecting the businesses in the Village Centre. If possible this could be emphasised further as I am aware that some retailers are struggling especially with the closure of the Bridge. With all the new houses being built or planned we will need these shops etc! 8. Finally, I understand that there is a local statistic that 87% of respondents to the initial survey are against further development. This again must be further emphasised in the final NDP which should not be drafted just to satisfy the District Councillors from other parts of the District. Indeed, this could be the last specific comment! Best of luck.

The requirements set out here are laudable and comprehensive. I wonder how well they will sit alongside the general specification of smaller houses (e.g. 2 bedroom), and how much of the footprint will be used - or would the footprint need to be enhanced to accommodate these features? In general, the size of the public accommodation in most houses relates to the number of bedrooms. Houses with fewer bedrooms have smaller public rooms, and the office space requirements could be out of proportion to the remainder of the house (and would be likely to be used for domestic rather than business purposes). Are there model designs which could be appendices to the plan if the question should arise? On the same theme, I see no mention of wheelie bins. On many housing estates, these can be blight. They occupy too much space to be accommodated inside the house. They are an eyesore when lined up outside, especially with terraced houses. If they are kept at the rear of the house, is there any way of taking them from the rear to the front on collection days, without going through the house? There is mention of a footpath along the B439 between Bidford and the health centre. That would be a distance of around half a mile from the end of the village speed restriction, and a mile from the old health centre / village square. I think it is unlikely that such a provision would be used by those visiting the health centre. If unwell, or old and infirm (includes many of the catchment population), if the weather is inclement, or it is dark, I think people would be reluctant to use such a footpath, whilst being buffeted by the wind (and spray?) from passing vehicles. Possibly useful for cyclists or for electric chariots such as some of the elderly use. There would also be an issue of lighting for the winter months. Given that few of our elderly probably never walk that far on a good day...

- 1) Disagree, enough houses.
- 2) Rat run, not happy busy enough
It wasn't an original leaflet not
- 4) Object to more traffic!
- 5) Traffic on roads, no school places, no appointments at Doctors
Need land for crops / children See fields, so they don't pull out Tuees.
- 6) Work for locals, no more people in, but work for youngsters
- 7) Back handers, no infrastructure .
- 8) No school, need high school, Buraing, Doctors no Appointments

Got tractors and industrial. Traffic issues, noise.

9) Do want it, Roads already busy, too many children when filled N/P in views listened to and taken into consideration. Traffic up Village.

10) Against any further housing, village is too large .

11) Not viable traffic, Health Centre, School can't cope.

Main Roads are chocker, speeding issues.

12) Traffic issues, more speeding, Doctors can't cope

13) Traffic, detached Waterloo Road

14) Traffic, A46 cut through. Speeding through village.

15) No need for more housing

16) The Roads are not built

17) Stratford Basically pushing out to little village, when a kid, this village had everything s** all now. Traffic a problem, increase pedestrians. School no room for sport, losing green space.

Doctors joke, old people not accessible, Bring back cottage hospitals. Village High Street dead, B*****, Coup Shape 2 & 3 butchers, hardware, Noakes and Croft Thinning, Bury Community commuters, Roads are terrible.

18) End suitable due to Road Structure. School full. Utilities.

19) More amenities, better roads, school, Budgens

20) Wrong, ruin what open spaces remain. Dangerous getting out at main road. Need High School to sop buses going to Alcester. Village bigger all travelling.

21) Homes for social housing or youngster understand but not big money making houses. Get Rid High School, and then build homes. School not enough places. Doctors can drive too

22) More traffic, United Carriers built on first. School not big enough. Shipping out to somewhere else. Buses.

23) School no capacity. Buses not in evening. Bidford won't be a village anymore.

24) Greenbelt all going. Traffic issues. Schools. Shops, infrastructure.

I do not feel there should be any further houses built on Grafton Lane. I don't feel it will have a positive effect on the village / Grafton Lane.

No more houses. My family can't live here anymore because all the property is out of their price range I have lived here for 52 years.

City Slicker comes Bidford first thing they do is pull all bushes, slab and concrete it and blame me for no birds and animals around. People put bird tables up and all they do is feed rats.

I feel there is ample housing in the village. I don't think we can cope with any more, the houses the back of Salford Road if built will take a business that brings work into the village away. The road is dangerous, off Marriage Hill there has already been accidents. Say NO to anymore houses in Bidford.

We feel that it's becoming a TOWN instead of a village - Too many houses being built in

Also there is too much traffic about! San no to any more houses.

I don't want any more houses too many already.

We already have too many houses built recently. How doctors are going to cope I don't know.

Traffic is bad enough already without adding to it with building work and more people living here.

No more houses in Bidford-on-Avon.

No more houses in Bidford. .

Bidford is turning into a commuter town. No more housing is wanted. Roads are saturated already.

No we don't want any more housing in the village it was once a village, now growing into a town.

We can't cope now the with all the traffic, schools no longer can take any more children, shops closing having to travel into towns, let alone all the infrastructure, water and sewage.

Grafton Lane can not cope with any more traffic. More affordable houses and bungalows required.

Think of the future generation, where are they going to school.

More shops, Doctors, Ridiculous, Travelling.

High school, too many houses.

Infrastructure sewerage drainage, capacity existing capacity future capacity covering of green land drainage.

No more houses, paths repairs, voluntary car to doctors.

Supermarket, easy access to doctors, camera. Too many houses. Carbon footprint of driving children to school. Doctors full. No High Street.

Doctors, open land, schools services. .

We have had more than our fair share of housing with the omittance of no infrastructure being put in place. There are already problems with flooding down in the village, now it is occurring at Jacksons Meadow, the new development at Copenhagen Way is being flagged up at Orbit housing

as flood issues occur in back gardens. All the run off from all these extra houses will impact on the river levels. There is no consideration for the elderly in this document, nursing homes, bungalows, footpath to the doctors, and above all the elderly wouldn't have been that computer literate to attempt filling online. They presumed that these were going to be delivered through the door like the questionnaires why weren't they. We do need to think of the future regarding our local community and this needs to be made clear to SDC that any social housing is first allocated to local people with family links, work links or both. Why haven't United Carriers site been ear marked for building, the supermarket has obviously been shelved and the parish seems to turn a blind eye to that eyesore. We need to work with the developers more closely and get back what the village wants, we missed out twice on a health centre, now it is built half a mile out of the village, only accessible by bus or car. The majority of people in this village commute to work so there is no need for more industrial units, there are empty ones already here. The village centre is such a sorry state this should be our Parish Council's main objective. We have lost all the shops apart from the chemist from the top end, and the butchers and bakery are just holding on. We need to put money in to turn it into a tourist haven for those who visit our beautiful meadow and river. Your environmental policies don't seem to access the need for controlling hedges, trees green spaces that are already here. The developers have come in and removed native boundary hedges, Poplar trees, and orchards without any consideration for wildlife or the overall street scene of this rural area. We have a large expanse of agricultural land which is grade 2 all around this needs to remain for food production and also keep the feel of the countryside, to which people who live in Bidford want to preserve. The school is nearly full and with the extra housing coming in inevitably it will become to full capacity, where do you propose to put the extra children without building a class room on valuable play field that they have.

My upmost apologies for you receiving this feedback to the Neighbourhood Plan late, however, as one of the minority 19% category (<45 years of age) of respondents to the original questionnaire, who will have to live with its outcomes for longer, I certainly hope you will consider these views. Firstly, I felt there was insufficient awareness raising on the outcome of the survey (as this was inconsistent with that of the original questionnaire being posted door to door) and time to respond, as the deadline preceded event the confirmation that the SDC core strategy has been accepted (so this could all just be academic until such time). However, having been present at the meeting this evening, I have been assured by Mrs Elisabeth Uggerlose that every effort will be made to include this feedback for consideration despite it being received after the deadline (the link on the website is now closed) and request that I be informed by e-mail if there is any problem with including this. Neighbourhood Plan Proposal Feedback; I cannot see how H2 and ECON2 can be justified given that the No's (47%) exceeded the Yes's (45%) to development on this site. It appears that the steering group has taken an undemocratic decision on behalf of / and against the communities wishes, rather than representing them. I also fail to see how mixed use with Class B1 and B2 employment development of this site would not conflict with ENV5, ENV6 and ENV8, and why it is included at all if only 12% of respondents felt a need for such industrial development? If anything, further consultation and analysis should be done on proposed sites 8-13, having removed the other contenders, and after confirmation of the exact housing figure / industrial development required by SDC's Core Strategy. I also feel that the word safeguarding as used in these sections was misleading as it has connotations of protecting in its everyday use, and is inconsistent with the use in ENV3 and the safeguarding of rivers. I fail to see how Policy H3 was arrived at given that the outcome from the questionnaire favoured 2/3 bed, low cost starter homes, and bungalows? Four bed houses are a lower priority for local people and the 2012 Housing Needs Assessment. ENV5 - I am uncertain as to on which Proposals Map the "Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land" was outlined, or how this was decided. Allotments featured in AM5 but a swimming pool didn't get a mention, despite being outnumbered 3 to 1 by comments calling for a local swimming pool. Why? Because it costs money and this plan is more about development opportunities than communities. If there are two larger sized allotments on land north of Stratford Road and 15 people waiting, why not propose dividing these larger plots up that waste words reminiscing on "digging for victory" or the Good Life? AM6 - whilst promoting walking and cycling got a mention, there were 30+ comments that specifically identified the old railway line as a cycle route / bridleway. Why didn't this get a mention here? In Conclusion; I understand there are housing requirements to be met, but this neighbourhood plan deals with little more than which sites we are going to permit development on, without giving sufficient argument to the real community needs and wishes, and consideration of the demands on the infrastructure, in return for such acceptance.

Having moved to Bidford nearly ten years ago to what seemed a nice little cul-de-sac and looking forward to a peaceful retirement we now find ourselves in conflict with one of the residents who

wants to develop a piece of land to the rear of six dwellings. The only access to this development will be by a narrow cul-de-sac never intended to cope with the amount of extra traffic this will create not to mention that all the building traffic, e.g. concrete mixers, loads of bricks, and all the ancillary vehicles, will have to use our crescent. In this leaflet it states that since 2011 426 houses have been built in Bidford, if it rises on at this rate Bidford will have to find somewhere to build a town hall for that is what it will become. It also states that the site H2a is for future potential (contingency) use. Having lost his case with his final proposal, the applicant has now altered this to two semi detached and eight dwellings.

We have had enough housing - no more if possible! Smaller houses, bungalows, flats (for young people). More houses to rent at reasonable amounts. Land at Grafton Lane is not suitable for large lorries, too narrow and parking along Lane already causes problems. The High Street is a problem, not enough foot fall now the Health Centre and Post Office has gone - The Bridge is now stopping people coming into Bidford. Health Centre is too far out of the village - needs a footpath to it. Everything else seems to have been covered in this book.