

## **Responses to Representations made on the Pre-submission Draft Stratford Neighbourhood Development Plan**

### **Policy CLW14**

#### **Representations:**

Total received: 16 (excluding duplicate)

Number in Support: 9

Number neutral or outside scope of CLW: 3

Number of objections: 4 (excluding duplicate)

#### **Summary of representations received:**

Residents generally supportive. Objection from developers that standards higher than building regulations.

#### **Modification Proposed:**

Numbering changed – will be Policy CLW9. Only the minor modifications noted in the responses below and any needed to remain consistent with the Core Strategy and the NPPF are proposed. Wording changed to remove requirement for all new developments.

## Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

<b>Code Number</b>	<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Organisation represented (where applicable)</b>	<b>Policy CLW14</b>	<b>Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response</b>

<b>Statutory Consultees' Comments</b>				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>The need to support and not stifle opportunities for renewable and low carbon energy development is welcomed, in line with the NPPF. Criteria 2 of the policy relating to arrangements for parking and servicing appear to be unrelated to this policy. If it considered appropriate and necessary for the policy, an explanation why this considered appropriate would be helpful. The policy seems to replicate the requirements of Core Strategy CS.3 'Sustainable Energy'.</p> <p>If there is no third criterion, (4) should be renumbered.</p> <p>Explanatory Notes: The two paragraphs are rather repetitious.</p>	Criterion 2 will be deleted and the criteria will be renumbered

<b>Agents and Developers' Comments</b>				
512	RPS re Taylor Wimpey and Miller Homes		<p>The policy seeks to maximise the opportunities for renewable energy systems in all new development. This should be read in the context of policy CS.2 of the emerging Core Strategy.</p>	This is not a strategic issue so full alignment with CS2 is not required.

			Regarding the sustainability of new development, part B of this policy makes reference to a fabric first approach to encouraging a low carbon economy, which offers the greatest gains in reducing overall carbon emissions. This is followed by the supply of efficient energy from decentralised sources, to then be followed by renewable energy on site. This is considered the most effective way of addressing the challenges of carbon reduction and to be consistent with the emerging Core Strategy, this policy should be drafted in accordance with the fabric first approach.	
516	Framptons re ROSCONN Group		This policy is inappropriately worded in requiring 'All new developments should include proposals for maximising opportunities to install renewable and low carbon energy systems'. There is no evidence base to justify the imposition of a policy in a Neighbourhood Plan that seeks to impose higher standards than the requirements of the Building Regulations.	Reference to "All new developments" will be amended.
519	Daniel O'Donnell		There is no justification for including standards that are higher than the Building Regulations.	See above comments.
520	Charles Vickery		There is not any justification for including standards that are higher than the Building Regulations.	See above comments.

Residents' Comments				
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support	Supportive.

057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree	Supportive.
062	Anthony William Dennis		Bullet point 1) is a very subjective statement, the definition of "adverse impact on landscape and character of the area" will mean many things to many people. Visual amenity is an important principle to maintain, but should not be a block to change. I suggest that bullet point 1) be deleted and become part of the principle statement of policy. Maybe rephrase as "Proposals for renewable energy facilities should be sensitive to the landscape and character of the area, and will be supported providing: 1) There are satisfactory arrangements for parking and servicing; and 2) There would be no adverse impacts on neighbouring uses." Explanation, paragraph 2, page 114. Solar power should be included in the list.	Noted.
066	Brenda Stewart		I strongly support increasing usage of renewable energy resources.	Supportive.
070	Matt Sharpe		I am very glad to see this here.	Supportive.
092	Suzanne Helen Bower		I would be very pleased to see Stratford leading the way in terms of meeting its energy needs through local renewable.	Supportive.
095	Eric Ward		Lucy's Mill should be generating electricity.	Noted
174	Sarah Eglin		Agree	Supportive.

201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree	Supportive.
226	Debs Campton		Good	Supportive.
228	John Campton		Yes	Supportive.
253	Daniel O'Donnell		There is no justification for including standards that are higher than the Building Regulations.	Duplicate of 519 above. This is not a strategic issue so full alignment with CS2 is not required.