

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

Policy H7

Representations: Total received 15

Number in Support: 7

Modification Proposed:

The policy will be reviewed in the light of the HNS and in discussion with SDC to ensure it is consistent with the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H7	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	-----------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	This promotes a different mix to that set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.18; based on the January 2013 SMHA (Should Table 7.2 should be Figure 8.17?). Given the significantly different stock profile proposed for affordable housing under Policy H6/Table 1, concern is raised over the ability to create “tenure blind” schemes.	Up-to-date evidence is provided by the HNS undertaken for the Town Council and the policy will be reviewed with SDC in light of this and the adopted Core Strategy.

			<p>More generally, similar concerns are raised in relation to the application of the Policy (similar to Policy H6). It appears from the second paragraph this Policy merely seeks to achieve an optimum stock profile across the Neighbourhood Area as opposed to specifying a required mix for individual sites. Operationally, this Policy will be very difficult to apply and monitor.</p> <p>The final paragraph of the policy refers to the provision of an appropriate mix of homes for employees, managers and senior executives. It is not clear what this is trying to achieve. Suggest text is deleted or if retained, more appropriately worded e.g. "...an appropriate mix of homes to meet the full range of housing needs, including for those in all areas of work."</p> <p>Explanation: Should refer to latest evidence base, rather than include a table that becomes out of date quickly.</p>	<p>It should be for each qualifying site so this will be reworded to make that clear.</p> <p>The idea behind this was to ensure that an appropriate proportion of executive homes are built to ensure that there is an adequate supply of new executive houses coming forward in the plan period, the benefits of which would be to continue to attract new business to the neighbourhood area (and district as a whole) and retain existing business.</p> <p>Disagree. See comments above.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Agents and Developers' Comments

507	JLL re: Gateway One	Developer's Agent	<p>This policy requires that developments of 10 units (dwellings) or more should seek to meet the residential 'mix' requirements identified by current up to date evidence, such as the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), or Local Housing Needs (LHN) surveys. Whilst this is appropriate for the provision of affordable housing, more flexibility should be provided in this policy in respect of market</p>	<p>It is our view that this policy is reasonable in that it ensures that developments of significant size play their part in satisfying contemporary housing need. It is recognised that demand does not equate to need and that it may not be possible for every given site to</p>
-----	---------------------	-------------------	---	---

			housing. As currently drafted, the policy will require regular updates to both the SHMA and LHN surveys, to ensure that the mix of housing required remains current. In addition, it should be noted that housing 'need' does not necessarily equate to housing 'demand'. The policy should therefore be flexible enough to recognise this to ensure that housing delivery is viable (i.e. not constrained by this policy), both now and in the future.	match the requirement. However, in using the term “seek to meet” the policy does in effect impose on the developer an obligation to show that efforts have been made to meet its requirements. We consider that not to be unreasonable. Further, it is not considered onerous to require that contemporary SHMA and LHN evidence have been used.
508	Pegasus Group re: Gallagher Estates	Policy H6, H7, H8 & H9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These policies are unnecessary and overly prescriptive and should be deleted • As currently drafted, none of these policies are consistent with the CS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These policies are necessary and correctly prescriptive • These policies will be redrafted to take account of the latest position in the CS. The CS sets out a range of mixes. The NDP using up to date Housing Needs Survey results is entitled to be more prescriptive than the CS
512	RPS re Taylor Wimpey and Miller Homes		<p>Policies H6/H7 – Affordable and Market Housing Mix</p> <p>Both of these policies propose a housing mix different to that in the emerging Core Strategy, drawing from the January 2013 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).</p> <p>Evidence used in the generation of policies should be both robust and up to date. Whilst the SHMA is a credible evidence source, the document referred to pre-dates the most up to date SHMA, published in November 2013. It is this document that the Core</p>	<p>The Stratford Housing Needs Survey 2015 provides a robust and the most up-to-date evidence on this issue.</p> <p>Further discussions with SDC will be undertaken on this issue after which the policy may change.</p>

			<p>Strategy has used as part of emerging policy CS.18, as per the proposed modifications. The emerging policy in the Core Strategy includes a more flexible range (as indicated below) than proposed as part of policies H6 and H7 and the Plan should consider the needs to produce a flexible, responsive document.</p> <p>Core Strategy Mix for new Policy CS18</p> <p>Dwelling type Market Housing Affordable Housing</p> <p>1 bed (2 person) 5-10% 10-20%</p> <p>2 bed (3 or 4 person) 35-40% 25-45%</p> <p>3 bed (5 or 6 person) 40-45% 25-45%</p> <p>4+ bed (6, 7 or 8+ person) 15-20% 5-25%</p> <p>As currently drafted, this NDP policy is not consistent with the emerging Core Strategy and it is recommended that this is removed from the Plan and a simple cross reference is made to the Core Strategy.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Residents' Comments				
018	Stephen Wreford		I support this policy	Supportive
025	Jane Dodge		I agree	Supportive
038	Amanda Waters		No view	-
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We generally support this policy. However, whilst on bedroomed dwellings may be appropriate in Stratford –upon Avon, demand in Tiddington and Alveston for such small units is likely to be weak. We therefore	The policy will be reviewed in the light of the HNS and in discussion with SDC to ensure it it is consistent with the Core Strategy and the

			recommend that separate market housing mixes be included in this policy for Stratford upon Avon and for Tiddington and Alveston. For Tiddington and Alveston, the one bedroomed requirement of 10.4% should be added to the 4+ bedroomed mix. For the other house size categories the mix should remain broadly the same.	NPPF.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed but needs to be firmer "Developments of 10 or more units MUST meet the ..."	Supportive The policy will be reviewed in the light of the HNS and in discussion with SDC to ensure it is consistent with the Core Strategy and the NPPF.
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree	Supportive
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree	Supportive
125	Mandy Last		There already enough properties for higher earners. There is more need for affordable homes with a priority to young Stratfordians and lower paid workers so they don't have to pay exorbitant rental charges. My husband and I live in a 1 bedroom flat the mortgage all paid and would love to move to somewhere with 2 bedrooms but are in low paid job so just can't afford to. I'm a Stratfordian of several generations and was told before I moved out of my parents' house at 29 that I should become pregnant to get a council house by a councillor canvassing for votes prior to a local election.	The policy will be reviewed in the light of the HNS and in discussion with SDC to ensure it is consistent with the Core Strategy and the NPPF.
143	Chris Strangwood		This does not make any sense	Opposed?
174	Sarah Eglin		strongly agree	Supportive

210	Rachel Syson		Agree	Supportive
-----	--------------	--	-------	------------