

# Report on Great Alne parish site consultation March & April 2024

Prepared by Sarah Brooke-Taylor, WRCC Rural Housing Enabler

24<sup>th</sup> May 2024

## Background

In 2023 Great Alne Parish Council asked WRCC to undertake a housing needs survey across Great Alne parish. As well as updating the 2010 and 2014 survey data, the main purpose was to assess the need for homes for those with a local connection to the parish.

The Housing Needs Survey Report, dated March 2023, identified a need in Great Alne for sixteen homes for households with a local connection:

### Housing association rent

- 9 x 1 bed flat/maisonette
- 1 x 2 bed house
- 1 x 3 bed house

### Owner-occupier

- 1 x 1 bed bungalow
- 3 x 2 bed bungalow
- 1 x 3 bed house

The report also referred to the sixteen households with a Great Alne address registered on the local authority housing waiting list and seeking affordable homes to rent.

Local connection criteria are set within the local authority policy and tenants for homes to rent are drawn from the local housing waiting list (with those in greatest need having the highest priority).

In response to the 2023 report Great Alne Parish Council (GAPC) instructed WRCC to investigate potential sites. Initial investigations concentrated on sites previously identified in 2012 and sites proposed to GAPC by land agents. WRCC provided comments concerning site suitability to GAPC in August 2023 and GAPC asked the Rural Housing Enabler to undertake further investigation. The Rural Housing Enabler met with several landowners and five sites were identified where the landowner expressed 'in principle' willingness to work with the community for the provision of Local Needs affordable homes.

Local Needs schemes must:

- Meet identified local housing need
- Have the support of the parish council
- Be small scale

## Community Action Day March 2024

The general location of these five sites was put to the community at the Community Action Day on 2nd March. The map showing the sites can be found at Appendix A.

Attendees were invited to vote on the five sites, indicating their 'most preferred' to 'least preferred' site, and could also leave comments if they so wished. It was made clear that these were just general locations, that no specifics had been discussed with either the parish council or landowners and that at this stage it is not known how many homes or what mix of homes may be brought forward or how much land may be required.

GAPC subsequently decided to extend the consultation with a deadline of Monday 8<sup>th</sup> April for voting and comments and this was then extended further to Monday 29<sup>th</sup> April 2024. A dedicated page was added to the GAPC website setting out the background and providing links to the information available on 2<sup>nd</sup> March. Further information was hand-delivered to each household across the village, asking for the community to vote and comment.

Community involvement is vital to the success of any Local Needs homes proposal.

### Comments

Comments are reproduced below. It should be noted that not everyone who voted provided comments and not everyone who commented also voted.

- I thought there was only ribbon development in Great Alne and housing was only acceptable on the roadside.
- Road access to sites 3 & 2 is poor. Road frontage of sites 5 & 4 more suitable for access. Site 1 has no footpath to end of Spernal Lane. Flooding at bottom of Spernal Lane impacts on sites 2 & 3. Field site 2 floods frequently.
- Least impact on traffic flow and current housing.
- We tried to buy a local connection house on Linfoot Oaks but were unfortunately unsuccessful. Please keep me informed of any information relating to the local houses.
- 3 & 5 flood continually. Springs run through the land. Mill Lane floods at base due to broken springs flowing from Great Alne Park down field 5. Access to 3 would only really work if through Linfoot Oaks.
- I live at Great Alne Park so I favour the sites on Henley Road. This main road has three problems - speed of traffic, insufficient pavements and street lighting. More houses would support the need to address these issues. These locations would help to increase the centre of the village and improve inclusivity.
- All others liable to flooding. I honestly doubt this will go to local residents.
- Options on the main road offer least issues to residents and fewer flooding issues.
- Concerns are doctors facilities, access to some sites, traffic.
- I think the issues with flooding in the village need serious consideration. Sites 2 & 3 are already subject to flooding on an increasingly regular basis and I Can't see how building there would be appropriate. Similarly, there is a flood plain near site 4.
- Not sensible to build on productive agricultural land. Unhappy about continuing village sprawl outside village boundaries. Sites 1, 2 & 3 will contribute to ongoing surface water problems in Spernal Lane.

- Sites are not preferred at all. The village is prone to flooding and does not have amenities for more people. Site 3 is prone to heavy flooding and I live in one of the properties that backs onto that site. My back garden already floods with every rainfall and I need to wear wellington boots to access my garden. Building on that site will make it worse! There is a narrow access to that site and the road floods there all the time.
- Site one should include a gateway for the farmer to get on to his fields for Canada Far, just off Stoat Lane. We previously had one just past the rectory but it was lost when Linfoot Oaks was built. Suggest a name for site one, if chosen, would be 'Canada Fields'.
- Plot 3 is subject to flooding.
- I am in favour of affordable housing in the village as there is so little currently. Young people especially are unable to find anywhere to live here, even though their family is local. As we have flooding issues it is important to me that any developments are fully compatible to carbon neutral and flood mitigation principles.
- I do not feel that any of the proposed sites are good for the village or for people moving in to the village.
- Site 3 is a field which regularly floods, has permanent standing water in places and is frequently hard to cultivate due to wet conditions. One summer combine harvester became stuck in the mud and following year field was left fallow because too wet to cultivate. I believe it would be ridiculous to use this area to build houses. Areas 4 & 5 are also poorly drained and unsuitable for house building. Flooding issues throughout the Great Alne parish will be made worse by development.
- No.5 site is well hidden & good access, no flooding. No.3 narrow access, dangerous as too close to corner & traffic from Sernal Lane. Already dangerous for walkers. Entrance liable to flood. My garden floods already. Field liable to huge areas of water.
- I don't have a most or least preferred site but would suggest that for sites 1 & 2 a major consideration would be the lack of a footpath between Nightingale Close and The Mother Huff Cap. This is an incredibly dangerous section of road which has to be shared with pedestrians (day & night) when accessing the village from this section of Sernal Lane. This aspect of development should be seriously considered. Thank you.
- Sites 1 & 2 the road to the main roads floods & has no path or lights. Site 2 this farmers track is very limited in space is it big enough for cars in and out.
- No.2 is not an easy area to build. No footpath to school & road floods every time heavy rain. 5 is the best option or 4.
- Site 1 had a lovely development next to it ie Linfoot homes built. If this site was used it would have less impact and fit in better in the village (especially if the work was carried out by Linfoot Homes). Other sites will have more of an impact on views & countryside.
- 3 & 5 aren't suitable as they flood already and building works could cause more flooding.
- Capacity and condition of local infrastructure mainly flooding/drainage. Sernal lane is like a river at times. Local road network is crumbling and increased flow of traffic will make this worse. Lack of local amenities in the area to support further housing. Local crime will increase as a result of further housing there is already issues motorbikes/mopeds within linfoot oaks. Parking issues around the 'Mother Huff Cap' with speeding in the local area is an accident waiting to happen. Significant effect on

house prices in the local area with a further development which surely was addressed by the £5million contribution into the Alcester housing project. The negative impact on the local protected nature reserve with rare bird species and bats within the area, there are regular deer crossings on Spernal lane with no signs around the area.

- Current local infrastructure, my main concern being the flooding issues which are incredibly serious. Spernal Lane is inaccessible whenever there is a significant downpour and further developments will increase the severity of this issue. The condition of Spernal Lane and the surrounding roads are appalling and will not sustain these new proposed developments. Spernal Lane is often used as a cut through from Studley/ Redditch to Stratford-Upon-Avon, causing the road to become overly busy and leaving the road in desperate need of repairs. There are minimal local amenities, with the nearest place for essential items being Alcester, further dwellings will be at detriment to the already over stretched local amenities. Crime in the area will undoubtedly increase, being a serving Police Officer myself this is an issue that remains at the forefront of my mind and how it will be coped with. The local pub 'Mother Huff Cap' is inaccessible by foot from plot 1 and 2 due to there being no footpath and no street lighting, this is a safety concern. Further to this, the car park is an unsubstantial size already, causing cars to park on the blind bend onto Spernal Lane and the stretch down to Nightingale Close, with cars causing obstructions, this is an accident waiting to happen. The above reasons are of a great concern to myself as a local Home Owner and further to this I was under the impression the housing need had been met when the £5million S106 contribution into the Alcester Project had been agreed.
- A response rate of 17/390 returned forms which is not even 10% I would classify as an inconclusive report based on previous returns in 2010/2014 and a recommendation from this would not reflect the true demographic. Current local infrastructure, flooding is a serious issue and any further developments will increase demand and at times the village is inaccessible. The local road network is at breaking point with serious repairs needed. Speeding throughout the village is a fatality waiting to happen down Spernal lane and congestion with parked cars at the Mother Huff Cup junction. Lack of amenities in the village for a further development. Rejection of the phase 3 at Great Alne park for the affordable housing which was passed onto the development in Alcester which can accommodate further housing. Which attracted buyers from outside of the local area such as Birmingham. Impact on local wildlife in area, bats/owls roosting in the trees on Spernal lane. Comparison of housing need across the other local villages Aston Cantlow, Wilmcote, Bearley, Sambourne etc. Further housing will attract crime in the area how will this be addressed. Negative impact of increased traffic throughout the village with a new housing development and the Natural Burial ground proposals on Spernal Lane. Should a proposed site on Great Alne Park be looked at again did the £5mil s106 contribution into the Alcester project not provide the housing need.
- We have concerns in relation to both site proposals on Spernal Lane due to the following: - persistent speeding along Spernal Lane that has still not been addressed, vehicles do not adhere to the 30 limit when passing this sign and continue at high speeds where there is no pavement between Nightingale Close and the Huff Cap pub putting pedestrians at risk. - lack of pavement, safe walking space for pedestrians between Nightingale Close and the Huff Cap pub. - persistent run off water down Spernal Lane from the fields, which will only increase if there is further building on

proposed site 1 in particular. We hope that these concerns are taken into consideration.

- Sernal Lane is a race track and acts as a 'rabbit run' for people off the A435 to cut out Alcester on their way to A46, Warwick, Wellesbourne, Stratford, Charlecote etc. It is at times very dangerous so should not add to the problem. Sites 4 & 5 join a wider road that previously gave access to a factory and railway station. The road is wider, better vision so is less dangerous.
- Small development at the borders of the village has been successful in previous developments. As long as consideration is given to speed limits of the access points to road the development hits the B4089 or Sernal Lane this should work again.
- Please find attached my proposal for Alternative Sites, which I believe considers the impact of a development on all surrounding residents and would not impact as severely. I understand there may be a small appetite for additional developments within our parish, however this should NOT impact the environment, outlook and wellbeing of current homeowners. Considerations should be made for the well-being of those homeowners, along with the environment, wildlife and greenbelt land these proposed homes would destroy. With this in mind, I would like to object to Site 1 as a potential location as this would severely impact my family's home. As we live and work from home, a site here would drastically impair our mental health and well-being. There would be a significant negative impact on our landscape and outlook from our property, not to mention the disruption of local known wildlife. I imagine that further discussions will take place on this matter and I welcome the opportunity to discuss them collectively in a communal setting.
- There is an issue with the amount and speed of traffic already in Sernal Lane so additional houses would increase this problem. Henley Road is wider and more capable of coping with the increase in traffic. Also site 1 is on a bend (speeders).
- We would be really pleased with some new homes being built as we love the village. Just confused to the numbers and the 19 on the housing register? Will they be accommodated for or will it be strongest local connection first come first serve basis?
- Site 1: This is too far up Sernal Lane, with little or no pavement, nor street lighting. This is a very fast lane, used as a 'rat run', not only by private vehicles, but also many HGVs and fast moving heavy farm traffic. Site 2: See site 1 comments. Site 3: This site is probably the most central, however, the safety of access to it is severely in question. Bearing in mind the above comments, the access road will be situated very close to the junction of Sernal Lane/Henley Road. This is a very wide junction and by the time vehicles reach the current footpath/gate, they are often exceeding the 30mph speed limit. I would also question the proximity to the brook, which could render it almost impossible for homeowners/residents to obtain property insurance in the current climate. Site 4: This is probably the most suitable site. It is situated off a fairly straight stretch of the B4089 (Henley Road), and is fairly central to the village, with decent footpaths already in situ. However, as above, it does fall fairly close to the river Alne. Site 5: Again, well located on a fairly straight stretch of the B4089 but may be considered slightly too far out of the village. It is, however, a good distance from any water. Comment: Why has the field that sits to the south of the B4039, behind the houses in School Road/Henley Road not been included in this scheme? It is far better situated and is central to the village. The public transport that serves Great Alne will be better accessed, as will the primary school, the pub, the village hall and pedestrian access down to Alcester.

- Site 5 seems to have the most vegetation to lose by using this site, others are fields with smaller hedgerows, less trees etc. Sites 1 to 3 seem to be better infilling sites with less disruption.
- Preferred site 1 is the least invasive to existing residents and would continue the pattern of most recent development in the village, utilising land not used by villagers, with Stroat Lane as a natural break point. New pavements and infrastructure also in place. At the other end of the scale, site 4 is wholly inappropriate, with access and flooding issues abounding. Sites 2 & 3 are significantly more appropriate and a good back-up to site 1. I'm hugely disappointed that, once again, the focus has been on providing social housing and ignoring the needs & desires of regular homeowners/villagers to create a more accessible & appropriate housing stock in the village.
- Site 1 seems the best location - extending Linfoot Oaks and not impacting other areas of the village, where a new scheme would have a big impact on existing properties. Surprised at the inclusion of site 4 which seems a wholly inappropriate and far more rural location - impact on wildlife, an area already badly impacted by flooding/proximity to River Alne, access issues on road - already a stretch where speeding & safety is a big concern. Be great to have more provision for owner occupied homes for those with a local connection - Linfoot Oaks wasn't particularly 'affordable'.
- Site 5: Easy access off highway and close to Great Alne Park development, so building already at that end of the village. Site 1: Linfoot Oaks adjacent so precedent already set for development in this location. Flooding would be an issue as Spernal Lane still has major issues in spite of assurances that any development would alleviate flooding issues. Site 3: Too long an access route and part of public footpath. Site 4: Flood plain. Site 2: Too long an access route to any development. Because of width of track there would not be room for two-way road and footpath for safe pedestrian access.
- 1 & 2 are adjacent to recent new developments & this newest supporting infrastructure & services for utilities. Also least risk to flooding compared to all other sites. 5 & 4 are in my view inappropriate given their proximity to conservation areas & listed buildings.
- Site 1: continuation of a new site (Linfoot Oaks) which has set a successful precedent for a new development. Least impact on existing residents. Flooding concerns will need to be addressed. Site 5: similar reasons - limited impact on residents. Near to all amenities including village shop, leisure facilities & eateries at Great Alne Park. Site 3: big impact on existing residents and near to flood plain on Henley Road. Site 4: new development would be out of place in heart of village/conservation area with several listed buildings. Access from the busy Henley Road would be dangerous (and uphill). This field suffers from significant flooding.
- If this decision was made to build on site 3 this would have a detrimental effect on my property. Potential devaluing the value of my property. I feel some of the other sites are less likely to infringe on properties. Site 1 would also be in keeping with the new build look and feel, and would not infringe on other peoples properties. As with site 4&5, the new build houses would not infringe on peoples properties.
- Option 3 difficult access due to an already busy road junction. Site 3 has two public footpaths that could be impacted by any development, also deer and other animals have pathways through this field. To retain the character of the village development should be on the outer edges of the village, not near the centre.

- Objection to site 1. Any proposed development on site 1 would cause a severe NEGATIVE impact on my home. Surrounding house prices would be affected and the impact on the new members of our community at Linfoot Oaks would suffer the most. Our outlook would be destroyed. We have recently invested in our property, as we intend to live here in Great Alne forever and make this community our home, a place where our children can grow and develop in peace. Quietness, security and mental wellbeing are crucial for this. Nature and wildlife are also very important to us and seeing another housing development created would destroy that. Additional housing needs have been constructed for the community already with the creation of the nearby retirement village. Local members of our community should be encouraged to consider residence there.
- Any planned development must be compatible with the facilities available in Great Alne. Access to schools, services and basic supplies must be considered - including sustainable links to Alcester. Access to the site must be safe and sympathetic to the topography of the village. Great Alne has a unique and historic character. Any development must be scaled to maintain the village's qualities and not impact the historic conservation area.
- 1) most preferred site as is on Sernal Lane close to Linfoot Oaks a very successful development and a new site there would be in keeping with the village and new building work there would be less intrusive for the rest of centre of village. 2) same as above - more disruption to locals than 1). 3) good access to this area with minimal disruption to centre of village; and also same comments as 1) & 2). 5) this site is towards other end of village so less close to central village and development there will be less intrusive for the whole village, access would be OK. 4) least preferred site: worst site as completely central and development would impact multiple homes + with loss of outlook and disruption for many roads - Henley Road, Park Lane, access to the church; entrance/development would be less safe as visibility not so clear on main Henley Road, due to bends in Henley Road towards main village hall.
- Site 1 seems to be the area which would result in the least impact to existing residents in terms of traffic and imposition (loss of access / view onto greenery/farmland etc).
- If these are to scale, 4 seems the best site. 1 & 2 could possibly be one construction.
- I feel that site 1 would effect the least amount of Great Alne residents. If site 3 were picked it would negatively effect our family and our neighbours. The junction between School Road and Sernal Lane would become busier and more dangerous for our children to cross and the view from the back of our houses would be impacted.
- 2) is a logical extension to Linfoot development, walking distance to school. Established access. 3) adjacent to Appleby Close so already built on, close to school + within village envelope. 4) elevated site so no floods. Out of sight. Already house under construction. Established access with business operating on site. 1) small development next to established dwellings. 5) floods continually since GAP affecting Main Rd + Mill Lane, Productive grazing for sheep/goats,hens. Outside envelope of village development (GAP - Great Alne Park).
- The options I have listed hopefully would impact the least amount of residents.
- Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development of local needs affordable homes for households with a connection to Great Alne. In reality, none of the five sites shown on the map ([https://www.greatalne-pc.gov.uk/doc/212640/name/Great Alne Proposed Sites 2024.pdf](https://www.greatalne-pc.gov.uk/doc/212640/name/Great%20Alne%20Proposed%20Sites%202024.pdf)) is suitable for affordable housing. Although the WRCC presentation describes them as small scale,

only sites 1 and 2 really meet this description. The others are relatively large scale proposals for a small rural village. A relatively large scale development of affordable homes is not in keeping with the nature and heritage of the village, nor would it be consistent with the conservation area within which the village sits. In addition, there are no - or insufficient - amenities within Great Alne village to support additional new housing of any scale; there are no retail outlets, no doctor's surgery and no entertainment premises, the public transport links are very limited and the school is small. It would be better to place affordable housing closer to nearby settlements with more of all of these facilities - Alcester being the most obvious location. Of the five sites, sites 1 and 2 are the least worst because they are small, and sit close to an existing development of relatively new homes, where the clash with listed properties of architectural and historic value will be minimised. Sites 1 and 2 are also towards the outskirts of the village, and not on the main road through it. These factors makes sites 1 and 2 most likely to preserve the heritage and character of the majority of the village. Sites 1 and 2 much better correspond with the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") definition of Rural Exception Sites, particularly in the sense that they are small, and "situated on the edge of a village". The same cannot be said of sites 3, 4 and 5. These are much more central to the village, and within, or much closer to, the conservation area which includes most of the village east of the Memorial Hall. The conservation area includes within its curtilage twelve listed buildings of local architectural and historic value which would be significantly and negatively impacted by the proximate erection of a sizeable development of modern dwellings. Site 4 is definitely the worst of all the sites - it sits prominently on the main road through the village, is centrally located within the village, and would be directly opposite - and very close to - a number of important listed properties. These listed properties play a big role in defining the character and heritage of the village, and a new residential housing development right next door would be totally inappropriate. It is impossible to see how any new properties constructed on site 4 in particular could be sufficiently "sensitively designed, keeping with the character and appearance of the local area" for site 4 to meet the definition of a Rural Exception Site as defined by the NPPF.

- Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development. We don't think any of the proposed sites are suitable for affordable housing. The sites seem large for a small rural village that has little infrastructure. The relatively large development is not in keeping with the heritage of the village and is not consistent with the conservation area in which the village resides. Further, there are no amenities within great Alne to support additional new housing at any scale. A better site, would be one which has more land and located closer to facilities, Alcester for example being a much better location. 1 and 2 would be the least worst options due to the smaller scale next to existing similar developments. 3,4,and 5 are totally unsuitable and would encroach on the listed buildings within the area, all of which would be negatively impacted by the development.
- The sites I have chosen have best access and affect fewest existing properties.
- We would prefer the option that has the least impact on residents.
- Spernal Lane (Proposed Sites 1,2,3). There are a number of major issues that affect all three proposed sites on Spernal Lane, which indicate to me that none of the sites are suitable for development. 1. Flooding - Flooding is a major problem on Spernal Lane, the volume of water/silt that runs off the fields above Stroat Lane (West) floods down the lane into the land ditch at the corner of Stroat Lane and Spernal Lane and



deposits silt and gravel into the ditch and culverts that run down the side of the road. The ditch/culverts frequently block causing severe floods across the road down the length of the lane towards the Appleby Close/Henley Road junctions by the Mother Huffcap. This is a constant problem and is dangerous to both pedestrians and cars using the road.

2. Volume, Speed and Type of Traffic - The recent Traffic Survey captured the volumes of traffic that use Spenal Lane on a daily basis, and the speeds of that traffic. The average daily volume of traffic was recorded at c1000 vehicles a day, and the speeds of vehicles showed constant excessive speeds of 40mph within the 30mph zone. (the speeding issue is also supported by the Community Speed Watch Surveys undertaken through out the year.) Currently the lane is used daily by all types of vehicles including HGV's. Large agricultural vehicles, Large Lorries, Cars, Vans, Cyclists, Horses and Pedestrians. The current width of Spenal Lane already causes issues with the larger types of vehicles.

3. Vehicular Access - Adding any new development on Spenal Lane would increase both the number of access points onto the lane, and the volume of traffic accessing the lane, Proposed Site 1 would add an access point c100m above Linfoot Oaks access, on or just after a left hand bend in the road (after the 30mph zone ends), Proposed Site 2 would add an access between Nightingale and Linfoot Oaks creating 3 access points within c200m - I would question that the proposed access would allow 2 way traffic and footpaths to the proposed site, Proposed Site 3 would add an access point on/around the already congested junction with Henley Road/Appleby Close and opposite the Huff Cap (which is frequently used by deliveries to the Pub). Given the high volume of road traffic that uses Spenal Lane the creation of additional access points onto Spenal Lane will increase the risk of accidents and cause safety issues to pedestrians in that area. Currently there are 3 roads and 6 private drives access Spenal Lane within <400m.

4. Water Mains - There are a series of Severn Trent water mains and associated valve chambers located in the area proposed for Site 1. These water mains run westwards along the side of Linfoot Oaks development and eastwards underneath Spenal Lane on their way towards Little Alne? - These mains would need to be taken into account in locating the specific boundaries for Site 1. If as a result, the site location was moved towards Stroat Lane the issues with access / flooding and speeding could worsen.

5. Pedestrian Footpaths - There is no footpath alongside the properties from the junction of Spenal Lane/Henley Road and Nightingale Close. This already causes issues for pedestrians which would be increased if additional properties were developed on Spenal Lane.

Henley Road (Proposed Sites 4,5). The potential issues that impact both Sites 4,5 include Volume, Speed and Type of Traffic -The recent Traffic Survey captured the volumes of traffic that use Henley Road on a daily basis. The average daily volume of traffic was recorded at c1800 vehicles a day, and the Community Speed Watch Surveys undertaken through out the year indicate a minimum of 11% of traffic speeds on this stretch of road. (11% is a minimum as the CSW programme indicates a survey is being taken and drivers slow down as a result of the warning), Currently Henley Road is used daily by all types of vehicles including HGV's. Large agricultural vehicles, Large Lorries, Cars, Vans, Cyclists.

Vehicular Access - Proposed Site 5 - Proposed vehicular access would be on a sweeping corner in an area of road recognised for speeding. To summarise my comments above, if there is a genuine need for a further development in the village, my preference would be either site 4 or 5 which ever would be the safest in terms of traffic and volumes.

## Voting

People were asked to indicate their 'most preferred' to 'least preferred' site of the five general locations (shown at Appendix A). Not all respondents voted on all five sites.

Most preferred site  $\longleftrightarrow$  Least preferred site

Site number	Number of votes
1	33
2	9
3	1
4	7
5	22

total	72	Site number	Number of votes
		1	7
		2	20
		3	6
		4	21
		5	16
		total	70

total	65	Site number	Number of votes
		1	9
		2	9
		3	23
		4	14
		5	10

total	60	Site number	Number of votes
		1	5
		2	19
		3	11
		4	17
		5	8

total	63	Site number	Number of votes
		1	12
		2	7
		3	22
		4	9
		5	13
		total	63

Voting results from the comments sheets and emails are shown above, with the most preferred site being no.1 (receiving 33 'most preferred site' votes) and the least preferred site being no.3 (receiving 22 'least preferred site' votes).

However, this is just the start of the process. Site investigations and further discussions need to take place involving not only the landowner but also the parish council and community. And a housing association needs to be included within the partnership, alongside Officers at Stratford-on-Avon District Council and a developer.

As per the information on the GAPC website "residents will be consulted and have an opportunity to engage at all stages during the process."

### **Additional sites**

As part of the community response one person provided a map suggesting a number of sites, and the Rural Housing Enabler was approached directly by a landowner with a site not yet investigated.

The Rural Housing Enabler will investigate these further sites and provide a separate report to the parish council with regard to the general suitability of them.

# Appendix A – general location of consultation sites

