

# Tysoe Parish Council Planning Report



Application	Address	Description	Deadline
20/03658/FUL	Land off Sandpits Road, Tysoe	Full Planning application for proposed removal of existing building and proposed development of 31 new residential dwellings, new vehicular and pedestrian access, public open space, landscaping, and other associated works. Application made by Cameron Homes.	02/03/21

## Contents

1. Summary .....	2
2. House Design and Layout .....	3
3. Affordable Homes Committee .....	3
4. Construction and Ecology .....	4
5. Flood Risk Assessment .....	5
6. Landscaping & Trees .....	6
7. Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment & Built Heritage Statement .....	7
8. Parking, Roads and Traffic .....	8
APPENDIX 1 .....	10
APPENDIX 2 Tysoe Parish Council – comments on Cameron Homes proposed development, New House Farm, Sandpits Road, Tysoe (October 2019) .....	11

## 1. Summary

- 1) This planning application has been considered against the criteria set out in [Appendix 1](#).
- 2) The proposal put forward is for a 31-dwelling scheme, 11 of which will be affordable. The housing mix meets the criteria set out in the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The inclusion of 11 affordable houses partially meets the needs identified in the Housing Needs Survey.
- 3) The NDP suggests an approximate capacity for this site would be 15 houses. Whilst this is an estimate, 31 houses are considerably over this. However, it is acknowledged that the original NDP assessment did not include the area of the site that contains the metal work shed.
- 4) Overall, the building materials are considered acceptable with a few minor changes. The Village Design Statement suggests that all hard standing should be semi-permeable. The developer is proposing to tarmac all hard standing.
- 5) The open green space to the north of the development ensures that the most sensitive area of the site will not be built on. The ownership of this needs to be agreed and also consideration given to the costs of maintaining the area.
- 6) The developer is proposing to use LPG to heat the dwellings. This is not considered sustainable. There also does not appear to be any use of sustainable energy; for example, air source heat pumps, ground source heat pumps, solar panels, or water recovery, such as water butts.
- 7) A Construction Plan is required to ensure that any disruption to village life is kept to a minimum and that any damage caused during the construction is made good before the site is signed off.
- 8) There are issues regarding the amount of standing water on the site which is significant in several places. The water flow needs careful consideration to reduce the risk of flooding towards the centre of the village.
- 9) There are some minor issues in relation to landscaping and trees that need to be addressed. One of which relates to the ownership of a strip of land which is outside the Application Area on the submitted landscape proposals, but also appears to be outside WCC highways ownership (to the far side of the existing ditch). Who will have responsibility for the trees?
- 10) The Archaeological report recommends that a number of matters, including machine evaluation trenching in the pond area followed by any recording as appropriate. The remnants of the ridge & furrow should also be preserved rather than landscaping in NE area. There should be an archaeological watching brief during groundworks.
- 11) The built heritage recommends that the footpath should be routed to the southern boundary and should carefully bisect the boundary wall, which should be sympathetically restored. Clarification regarding the ownership of the open area should also be agreed.
- 12) There is to be a footpath proposed over the open landscaped area to the north of the site which will allow access to the centre of the village. The footpath should be routed to the Southern boundary of the open space and there will need to be careful bisecting and sympathetic restoration of the boundary wall.
- 13) A traffic and transport report were undertaken for one week in July 2019. This showed that 36% of vehicles exceeded the speed limit as they entered the village. There are 60 car parking spaces but 32% of the parking spaces on the site are tandem parking. Sandpits Road was not surveyed for traffic. A recommendation is that Sandpits Road should be made one way and that a way to reduce the speed of the traffic as it enters the village from Oxhill should be installed.
- 14) In October 2019, the Parish Council sent Cameron Homes a paper setting out recommendations for any development on this site – see [Appendix 2](#)
- 15) A decision will be made on this application at a Tysoe Parish Council meeting to be held on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2021 at 19.15pm

## 2. House Design and Layout

- 1) The proposal is for the development of a 1.55 ha site to the rear of the properties on the West side of Sandpits Road.
- 2) The scheme shows 20 private dwellings along either side of a cul-de-sac (approximately 200m long) leading North off the Oxhill Road together with 11 affordable homes around a 50m long cul-de-sac off Sandpits Road.
- 3) The northern part of the site, approximately 0.4 ha is given over to public open space, containing a SUDs pond and a footpath linking the development to the village centre.
- 4) The overall scheme has a good mix of house types, designs and sizes i.e., 2x1 bed, 14x2 bed, 10x3 bed, 3x4 bed, 2x5 bed dwellings, 6 of which are bungalows. See accommodation schedule on site layout.
- 5) The dwellings are traditional in their design, mass and fenestration being built in either Horton stone (23 units) or a Hampton rural blend brick (8 units) – see Fig 1. However, plot 8 looks a little contrived and out of place within the street scene being a stand alone brick bungalow. It would blend better constructed in stone.
- 6) The garages - 14 serving 11 properties - will also be a mixture of stone and brick. Screen walls/enclosures will either be 1.8m stone or close board timber fencing, see materials and enclosures layout.
- 7) All buildings will be roofed with a Weinerberger Rivius Antique Slate, which are a 16mm thick clay made slate measuring 418mm x 335mm, and slate grey colour. It is not a natural slate. See Fig 2.
- 8) A total of 14 garages serving 11 dwellings will be provided together with 60 parking spaces. The parking spaces together with all driveways, footpaths and road will be surfaced with tarmac to the engineer's specification. This might be justified if it diverts the surface water straight into new surface water drains directly to the new SUDs pond, i.e., helps drain the site.
- 9) The site in general is very wet and surface water will need to be carefully managed.

No objection subject to usual conditions for a development of this size.



*Figure 2 Hampton rural blend brick*



*Figure 1 Weinerberger Rivius Antique Slate*

## 3. Affordable Homes Committee

- 1) We welcome the applicants clear and comprehensive explanation of the provision of affordable homes within the application.
- 2) Observations are as follows:
  - a) The overall number of affordable homes proposed complies with CS18.
  - b) The proposed mix of dwelling size is weighted more towards 1 and 2 bedrooms than CS19 requires. TPC does not consider this to be a problem.
  - c) The proposed tenures of 8 social rent and 3 shared ownership are also acceptable.

- d) From the point of view of strict compliance with SDC's Core Strategy TPC have no objections, however, the applicant does not comply with several TPC NDP policies and design statement.
    - i) There is no proposal to provide a sustainable source of heating energy. LPG appears to be the main source of energy. TPC's NDP Built Environment Policy 3 and Village Design Statement require new developments to demonstrate the use of sustainable energy sources. We would like to see ground-source or air-source heating installed and also EV charging points installed.
    - ii) The Village Design Statement suggests that all hard-standing should be semi-permeable and that water butts be provided at down-pipes. It is not clear that the application includes this.
  - e) The TPC NDP Natural Environment Policy 2 and the Village Design Statement require non-intrusive, low-level street lighting to be utilised in any new development. It is not clear that the application includes this.
- 3) The Affordable Homes Committee would like to see the applicant comply with these NDP policies before agreeing to support the application.

#### 4. Construction and Ecology

- 1) The Construction management layout shows, for both Phase 1 (Ph1) [Affordable] and Phase2 (Ph2) [Commercial], carpark allocation on site. For Ph1 adjacent to the cemetery and Ph2 in the amenity space at the Northern end of the site against the boundary with the existing Home Farm properties on the southern boundary of the space. The former seems acceptable but traffic in Sandpits Road needs to be considered. P2 access from Oxhill Road does not seem suitable as vehicles will have to travel to the full northern extent of the site to park next to residential buildings cause a potential nuisance.
- 2) Site opening times are.
 

Weekdays	07:30 to 18:00
Saturdays	08:00 to 14:00
Sundays and BH's	No working
- 3) Roads will be swept, as necessary.
- 4) The traffic management shows access both via Sandpits Road and Oxhill Road with a "request" not to transit through the village centre.
- 5) **Pollution Prevention.** Existing Heritage Fields storm water drain to be connected to SUDs as a first phase of work to divert water to the SUDs rather than via the ditch to the pond on the South West Boundary [P1].
- 6) Prior to work commencing a licence from Natural England will be required to start construction work. Although the project recognises the population of Great Crested Newts [GCN's] in P1 and possibly P4 which is located on the Western boundary at the Northern end of the site in the adjoining field, with the proposed diversion of water courses it is difficult to see how the maintenance of P1 and draining the site is possible.

#### Points to be further investigated with Cameron Homes

- 7) Traffic in Sandpits lane has in recent years become problematic for users and residents.
- 8) Vehicles are getting bigger and the difficulty for users to pass is destroying the street scene by breaking down verges and in some cases obliterating them altogether.

- 9) Site traffic would only exacerbate the problem and diminish the character of the street scene and the comfort and amenity of the residents. A recommendation is to make Sandpits Road a one-way road prior to construction starting and for the traffic to flow away from the centre towards Oxhill Road. This will also help with residential road traffic and help to regenerate the ambiance of the road for residents.
- 10) Relocation of the car parking for Ph2 to the Southern entrance should be agreed to limit neighbourhood disturbance.
- 11) The impact of the scheme on the population of GCN's is rated as "HIGH" due to the loss of habitat and isolation of the breeding Pond [P1] and terrestrial habitat with 50m of the pond. To build near the site of the GCN's the developer must demonstrate.
  - a. 'over-riding public interest'
  - b. 'No satisfactory alternative'
  - c. 'must not be detrimental to the conservation of the species' GCN.
  - d. Consideration should be given to the relocation of the breeding habitat from P1 to the SUDs installation, but this will require the SUDs to be functional and pollution free and suitable for the breeding population prior to the start of construction and will also require a revised drainage plan to ensure the 'purity' of the SUDs water supply as well as terrestrial habitat that meets Natural England requirements.
  - Siting a property within the P1 environment contradicts ecological conservation requirements. Houses #20, #19, and possibly #15 at the northern end of the site, because of the proximity of P4, should be removed from the scheme unless a revision to the layout can mitigate the problem.
  - The SUDs design should be suitable for wildlife in general and safe for public access.

## 5. Flood Risk Assessment

- 1) Having read the Flood Risk Assessment by Banners Gate Engineers and visited the site we report the following.
  - a) The site is formed in effect, by two separate developments. The main development of Private houses and bungalows is accessed via Oxhill Road in the Southern end and the smaller Affordable development via Sandpits Road. The site runs north from the Oxhill Road towards the Green. It is bounded on the West by open farmland and to the East by Sandpits Road, the Cemetery, and the Heritage Fields development.
  - b) The land falls significantly from the South entrance to the North East corner of the site and East towards Sandpits Road on the smaller site. The site was visited on 16<sup>th</sup> February and the amount of standing water was significant in several places. In general, the land is boggy demonstrating the terrain is retaining significant water flow and reducing the risk of flooding towards the centre of the village. Away from standing water the ground was soft enough for boots to cut through the surface vegetation and sink some 100mm into the ground. The land will require major drainage to be installed. Natural drainage is limited. The boundary hedge to the west does not have a working ditch and the fall from pond 4 [P4] to pond 1 [P1] is very slight. A resident reported that in the previous week a considerable area of the site was under standing water and that this was not abnormal. Photographic evidence has been requested.
  - c) The 'proposal' offers a drainage solution including a SUDs pond in the Northern end of the site [lower ground]. The plans show a SUDs pond of significant size, but the drainage plan does not meet the Ecological needs see [4. Construction and Ecology](#)).

The Flood Risk Assessment conclusions include:

- d) The site is included in Flood Zone 1 “Low Risk”.
  - e) The water course flowing along the western site boundary is too shallow for a gravity drainage system to be viable<sup>1</sup>.
  - f) The proposal is to join surface water drainage to the main combined sewer in Sandpits Road as are the foul water flows.
  - g) The report also concluded that the site will not increase the risk of flooding into the houses adjacent to the site and the rest of the village, but this needs to be challenged.
- 2) Semipermeable hard standing, hard roof materials, and roadways will increase the rate of run off as currently the slow ground seepage to the North East is slowed by the surface vegetation and stored in the ground. A surface water input limit to the combined sewer in Sandpits Road of 5ltre. S<sup>-1</sup> (litres per second) is set by Severn Trent who now agrees<sup>2</sup>. It is observed that the existing combined sewer in Main Street cannot currently deal with existing demand so this must be addressed before planning support given.
- 3) The size and nature of the SUDs scheme needs to be in keeping with a village setting and designed to enhance the visual experience of the village and meet the habitat needs of the ecology<sup>3</sup>. Currently the very geometric form of the surface SUDs does not achieve this objective and does not enhance the character of the village adjacent to a Conservation Area. The area allocated in the scheme to the SUDs facility is in the amenity allocation and to be enjoyed by residents and their children. We have grave concerns with regards to safety and how this will be achieved whilst maintaining the character of the area.

**Notes:**

- 1. Pond 1 at the South Western end of the site is shallow and has evidence of Great Crested Newts [GCN's] being present [see Ecology Report]. Currently House number 20 is sited immediately next to the pond. To protect GCN habitat this site will need to remain boggy and it is not clear how this can be achieved with this unit so close as water will need to be drained from the property. Currently the water table is within 300mm [we estimate] from the surface.
- 2. It should be noted that initially the Keith Baker, rejected the use of the Sandpits Road combined sewer on the basis that the site elevation was to the North and the use of the Oxhill Road and Western Boundary ditches flowed under gravity. In an email dated 6<sup>th</sup> February 21 he corrected this error.
- 3. See review of the Traffic and Ecology Plan [TPC].

## 6. Landscaping & Trees

- 1) The Planning application proposes the removal of existing buildings and the proposed development of 31 new residential dwellings, new vehicular and pedestrian access, public open space, landscaping, and other associated works.
- 2) The Tree Survey, Long Term Landscape Management Plan & Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals have all been prepared by BEA Landscape Design Ltd; a multi-disciplinary practice, which is registered with the Landscape Institute.

### Tree Survey to BS 5837:2012

- 3) The planning application is accompanied by a tree survey, dated 2018. The survey is simply a statement detailing the extant trees present on the site at that time, and as such does not provide any assessment of the scheme's arboriculture effect, or its acceptability in arboriculture terms.
- 4) A tree survey is the minimum level of detail normally necessary to validate a planning application. The best practice guidance is that an application should be accompanied by at least: a Tree Retention/Removal plan; a plan illustrating the proposed layout overlain on the retained trees; and an Arboriculture Impact Assessment. The explanatory commentary to Stratford on Avon Core Strategy Policy CS.5 states '*An assessment of the impact of the individual scheme on existing trees and hedgerows must show how new planting will be incorporated to mitigate impact and/or to enhance provision*' and it is understood this has not yet been provided.

- 5) The majority of the tree removals are anticipated to be internally located and of low arboricultural quality, thereby having little effect on public amenity; those which are appreciable from the public realm could be mitigated for within a scheme of landscaping. Whilst this approach would likely accord with the principles of Core Strategy Policy CS.5, the impact and ultimate relationship is not confirmed, or justified within the submitted arboricultural information.
- 6) The production of an Arboricultural Method Statement is recommended within the submitted Tree Survey information. Should the Council be minded to approve the proposed development, it is recommended that a Pre-Commencement Condition is applied which requires the production of a scheme of tree protection and AMS to ensure the confident protection of retained trees.

#### **Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals and Landscape Management Plan**

- 7) Upon review, the landscape proposals appear sensible, proposing native, larger canopy bearing species within areas of Public Open Space. To complete the palette, several smaller ornamental plantings are proposed within the development where space is more constrained. This seems to accord with the relevant NDP and Core Strategy policies (NE Policy 7; BE Policy 2 & CS.5).
- 8) The explanatory text to policy CS.5 sets out that: *'Applications must also set out detailed arrangements for the long-term management and maintenance of landscape features.'* In accordance, the submitted landscape management plan details at paragraph 6.2 that the development's *'Public Open Space areas will be managed by private Management Company. Maintenance is funded through a service charge that is levied on the purchasers of the market properties, which is managed by agents.'* Therefore, if approved, it is understood that the onus (& cost) of maintaining the area will not become the responsibility of Tysoe Parish Council.
- 9) One area which does need additional clarification relates to the boundary trees bounding the affordable housing area adjacent to Sandpits Road. The trees in this location are shown to be outside the Application Area on the submitted landscape proposals, but also appear to be outside highways ownership (to the far side of the existing ditch). Therefore, confirmation regarding ownership of this strip and subsequent responsibility for the trees' ongoing management is needed.

### **7. Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment & Built Heritage Statement**

- 1) These have been conducted by a reputable professional organization and carried out rather clinically in a prescribed way. They have made the most of all the evidence available in the public domain to good avail – the HER, statutory protections, and previous archaeological evaluations in the area - and have utilized the standard secondary historical texts that tend to be relied upon. The map regression analysis has been incorporated into their reports to good effect.

#### **Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment**

- 2) Overall, they have done a thorough job; their conclusion that the likelihood of there being archaeological remains other than remnant ridge and furrow in the development area is low and one we would concur with based on evidence known. We would also concur with their suggestion of a watching brief during groundworks. However, we have concerns that the geophysics evidence has been dismissed too lightly (figs 10 and 11) and that the ferrous 'noise', especially in the NE area, was considered not to be of particular archaeological importance. That may well be the case, but at this NE end where the development site approaches the core of the medieval village/marketplace, this assumption should be subject to shallow machine trench testing in the area of the balancing pond.
- 3) Suggested conditions.
  - a) Machine evaluation trenching in pond area followed by any recording as appropriate.

- b) Preservation of remnant ridge & furrow rather than landscaping in NE area (unclear in assessment)
- c) Archaeological watching brief during groundworks elsewhere (as intimated)

### **Built Heritage Statement**

- 4) Again, the assessment is comprehensive, and I concur with the assessment's views that minimal harm will be done and that, in the main, factors of views and rurality will be maintained. Key to this is the retention of the open space (Conservation Area) in the NE part of the development.
- 5) The only issue not fully flagged up is the route of the footpath running NW/SE down to Sandpits Road. This will need to exit via a stone wall which runs continuously along the SE boundary. The quality of the wall is unremarkable and is largely shrouded in ivy which has damaged some of the fabric, however, it reflects local character. also incorporates a pair of stone benches (dated 1893). Any route through the wall would need to be handled sympathetically as a result.
- 6) As shown, the proposed footpath will sever the wall at approximately mid-point which would (a) detract from the continuity of the wall and (b) would require an unnecessarily large area of the Green (allocated as Green Space in the NDP) to be taken out to the road. A preferred route would take the path close to the S boundary of the open area and bisect the wall at the very end of the Green. Fortuitously, this is directly opposite a dropped kerb on the other side of the road. Running the path by the S boundary in the open space would additionally prevent the area being so obviously bisected, as well as minimizing severance of the remnant ridge and furrow.
- 7) *Suggested conditions.*
  - a) Routing of the footpath to the Southern boundary of the open space
  - b) Careful bisecting and sympathetic restoration of boundary wall
  - c) Clarification of future ownership of open area at NE and responsibility for maintenance

## **8. Parking, Roads and Traffic**

### **Road Traffic**

- 1) Cameron Homes instructed Savoy Consulting to produce a Transport statement on their behalf and this is available to Stratford District Council's Planning Portal.
- 2) In terms of traffic, a survey was undertaken for one week on the 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2019. The monitoring equipment was placed just inside the 30mph limit on the Oxhill Road. During the survey, it showed that:
  - a) 2419 vehicles – of all kinds entered the village (these were predominately motor cars – 84%)
  - b) 2450 vehicles – of all kinds left the village (these were predominately motor cars – 85%)
  - c) Of all vehicles entering the village 62% were travelling at over 30mph and 36% were travelling at more than 35mph
  - d) Of all vehicles leaving the village 54% were travelling at over 30mph and 19% were travelling at more than 35mph
  - e) No significant highways issues or collision data had been recorded in the period 2014 to 2019.
- 3) All local amenities, including the school which is the furthest away from the site can be walked to in 8 minutes and cycled to in 3 minutes.
- 4) A new pedestrian walkway will be created across an area of open green space into the centre of the village.
- 5) Unfortunately, no readings appear to have been taken for Sandpits Road itself. There is therefore no data regarding the volumes of traffic on Sandpits Road or recorded speed limits.



Sandpits Road is very narrow and vehicles, particularly large vehicles, or SUV 4x4 struggle to pass without going onto the grass verges.

### **The site layout**

- 6) There will be a total of 60 car parking spaces, together with 14 garage spaces. In addition, cycle storage is provided. There are also 31 EV charging points.
- 7) Ten of the dwellings, plots 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, & 19 have tandem parking spaces (32%) of the site.
- 8) A survey has been undertaken to show the vehicle splays at the junctions on the entrance and exits to the site.

### **Summary & Conclusions**

- 9) Measures need to be taken to reduce vehicles from speeding as they enter the village.
- 10) The number and type of parking spaces proposed on the site is insufficient and does not meet with Stratford District Core Strategy or the Tysoe Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) By the criteria set out below there should be 75 parking spaces.
- 11) "New development proposals should provide off-road car parking in accordance with the standards in the District Council's adopted Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document. In the case of new dwellings this should be one off-road parking space per bedroom up to a maximum of three spaces"
- 12) More acceptable parking spaces need to be made available on the development and these should not be tandem spaces.
- 13) Sandpits Road should be made one way to reduce volumes of traffic and allow for vehicles to remain on the carriageway. It should be made "no entry" from the Oxhill Road entrance.

## **APPENDIX 1**

The planning application has been considered in line with the following, extracted from the Tysoe Neighbourhood Development Plan:

### **1. Appendix 2 - Village Design Statement:**

- Hardstanding to be semi-permeable.
- Low energy power sources - i.e., ground or air-source heating. This is a wonderful opportunity to provide a whole-site, central sustainable power source perhaps sited on the area of grass in the conservation area to the north of the site.
- Low level lighting, discrete and non-invasive
- Water butts provided.
- General style compliance

### **2. Housing Policy 5**

- Ensure that mix of both market and affordable homes is in compliance.

### **3. Employment Policies 1 and 2**

- Is the removal of Henry's barn the removal of an employment opportunity and is it being replaced elsewhere?
- Is working space provided for homeworking in each house?

### **4. Natural Environment Policies 2,3, and 7**

- Dark-skies policy, low level, and non-invasive lighting
- Are drainage and flood prevention measure adequate?
- Retention of trees and hedgerows

### **5. Built Environment Policies 1,2,3 and 4.**

- Are there sufficient safeguards for the heritage assets that may be impacted in the Conservation Area – stone seats, village green etc.?
- Is local character protected?
- Are sustainable energy sources being built into the design?
- Is adequate off-road parking being provided?

## **APPENDIX 2 Tysoe Parish Council – comments on Cameron Homes proposed development, New House Farm, Sandpits Road, Tysoe (October 2019)**

Following are Tysoe Parish Council's comments on your proposed development off Sandpits Road:

We welcome Cameron Homes' initiative to consult with the residents of Tysoe. Whilst we welcome the proposed 11 affordable homes we believe that the absolute quantum of houses, 31, may be too high. We await detailed plans to assess lay-out and density on the site. Specifically, any planning application which seeks Parish Council support will have to demonstrate due consideration of the following matters:

**Style and character:** We ask that you carefully consider the Village Design Statement in our emerging Neighbourhood Plan (NDP). It is important that the design and layout of the development should reflect the vernacular style, especially that in the adjacent Conservation Area. The building materials should be predominantly local, natural Hornton stone with red bricks where appropriate. It is important that the new houses match as closely as possible the traditional styles seen in the village.

**Environmental matters:** Houses should be designed to be as energy efficient as possible making use of latest insulation materials and environmentally friendly energy sources. Street lighting should be low-level and designed to minimise light pollution. Hard surfaces (e.g. parking areas and roadways) should be designed to minimise run-off. Discussions should be held, prior to any application being made, to ensure that Severn Trent Water has adequate capacity for the increase in rainwater run-off and sewage treatment required by the new houses. All houses should be equipped with an EV charging point. We would expect any application to include a high-quality landscaping plan to both shield the development from neighbouring properties and to enhance the visual quality of the site.

**Parking and traffic:** Adequate off-street parking must be provided at a realistic cars-per-house assumption. Discussions must take place with the Highways Authority to minimise traffic disruption in the village. Consideration may have to be given to making Sandpits Road a one-way thoroughfare.

**Heritage:** Where you envisage making a pedestrian access through the stone wall at the north end of the site you should demonstrate that you have done everything possible to maintain and enhance the historic stone benches and well-head at this location.

**Management of affordable homes:** We would expect to see that a reputable housing association has been engaged to manage the affordable homes for the benefit of people with a close association to Tysoe. The homes should be offered on a variety of tenures and should be of a mix that will address the need as expressed in the Housing Needs Survey and the Stratford on Avon District Council (SDC) housing waiting list.

**Housing mix:** The overall mix of houses, both market and affordable, should comply with the mix proposed in Housing Policy 5 of our NDP. This mix differs from that in SDC's policy CS19.

**Construction Management Plan:** We believe that any application should contain a robust construction management plan designed to minimise any disruption to neighbouring properties and the village as a whole. This should not wait until an application has been granted permission as it is vital to addressing the acceptability of any application.

**Disposition of the green space at the north end of the site:** You propose to reserve a "green amenity" area at the north end of the site within the Conservation Area. We would like to see proposals for protecting this from development in perpetuity. This may include giving the Parish

Council ownership rights over the land and will include provision for regular grounds maintenance of the site.