

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

Policy H8

Representations: Total received 21

Number in Support: 10

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 and will be merged with Policy H7.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H8	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	--	-----------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>The first line should read “ageing”.</p> <p>It is unclear whether this Policy is aimed primarily at conventional housing schemes, as opposed to schemes catering specifically for older people.</p> <p>It applies two different thresholds: (i) 20 or more units to include homes “designed for an ageing population” including a requirement for at least 10% of dwellings to be bungalows “unless there are site specific</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>The explanation will be clarified.</p> <p>The explanation will be clarified.</p>

		<p>reasons why this would not be appropriate”; (ii) 10 or more units – to be built to Lifetime Homes standard, in accordance with Policy BE6 (25% until 2020, 100% from 2020). See comments under Section 8 relating to Built Environment and Design and appropriateness of reference to Lifetime Homes. The policy does not explain why or how these thresholds have been chosen. This will require explanation and justification. What sort of ‘site specific reasons’ are envisaged that could allow a proposal to be acceptable and not meet these targets?</p> <p>The main concerns are essentially operational – around ambiguity – and failure to address the issue of care provision.</p> <p>In practice, the number of sites to which this Policy would apply (by virtue of the relevant thresholds) is likely to be limited.</p>	Windfall sites will still come forward...
--	--	--	---

Agents and Developers' Comments				
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		The draft policy cites a number of provisions to deal with an ageing population in Stratford Town. Whilst the 2011 Census does point towards increases in the elderly population it is unclear whether the NDP has	Viability will be considered on a case by case basis. There should not be an assumption that the inclusion of a proportion of bungalows would

		<p>investigated any other ways of meeting this need. The preferred method of Policy H8 is to require developments of 20 or more dwellings to include housing designed for the elderly, at least 10% of which should be bungalows.</p> <p>Within the emerging Core Strategy, the different house types and housing mix have been tested through a viability appraisal, however this has not considered the types of development promoted in the policy including bungalows. Given the amount of land take, bungalows present different land values than either houses or flats and may impact on a schemes ability to remain viable. It is recommended that the reference to bungalows is removed to ensure flexibility for developers to make appropriate arrangements based on the type of site and local requirements.</p> <p>The draft policy also refers to the use of the Lifetime Homes standard, which is also the subject of the emerging Core Strategy. This issue should be deferred until the adoption of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>render a scheme unviable. It is accepted that land values may decrease as a result but it is important to ensure that there is continual supply of bungalows to meet the aging population. Bungalows are a more accessible form of development for this demographic. Bungalows may include a greater footprint but equally, they do not always have to have large gardens, which could become unmanageable for elderly occupiers.</p> <p>The lifetime homes standard will need to be reviewed alongside the progress of the CS. The NDP can of course impose a higher standard than the CS if it wishes.</p>
--	--	---	---

Residents' Comments				
018	Stephen Wreford		Tiddington already has a large older population given the number of retirement's homes. The village needs a wider age base to keep it vibrant. This policy should be resisted in Tiddington.	Opposed NP Policies elsewhere are attempting to provide a balance.
025	Jane Dodge		I agree	Supportive
038	Amanda Waters		No view	-
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We support this policy. However, for it to be relevant other policies need to enable this policy to be implemented across all settlements in the NDP area including at Alveston. As noted above Policies H1, H2 and H3 as currently written will impose severe constraints to the delivery of housing for an ageing population in Alveston	Supportive - but response to remainder of comment given under Pols H1-H3.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	The figure of 10% of dwellings to be bungalows appears both arbitrary and high. With land being a scarce and finite resource this is not an efficient use of space, especially in an urban environment. Appropriate use of lifts/stair lifts should be encouraged to enable less able people to continue to live in multi-story properties. Some indication should be given of an acceptable level of growth in care home capacity during the plan period.	Viability will be considered on a case by case basis. There should not be an assumption that the inclusion of a proportion of bungalows would render a scheme unviable. Bungalows are a more accessible form of development for this demographic.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed. Housing should incorporate what is suitable for all ages to avoid "ghettos"	Supportive
059	Maureen Dartnall	N/a	Older residents housing...I & many others have been searching to downsize in Stratford - but no suitable accommodation exists....moving from a 3 bed house to something smaller is impossible as any decent new build house is too expensive. Will the council ensure	Supportive

			affordable bungalows/flats/ houses are built in the private sector for older residents thereby freeing up family homes?	
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree	Supportive
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree	Supportive
102	Mike Storey		I agree with the provision of housing to meet the needs of an ageing population	Supportive
103	Joy Hawker		I fully support the provision of providing housing for an ageing population as part of the plan. Such provision would encourage older residents (who are most likely to be one or two people size units) to downsize thus freeing up larger houses for family units - win: win.	Supportive
116	Thelma Bates		I think a large number of bungalows should be available for the large retired number of people living in Stratford. This could possibly for up larger 3 bed houses for families.	Supportive
125	Mandy Last		There is a danger of Stratford becoming a town for older people partly because of lack of affordable housing.	NP Policies elsewhere are attempting to provide a balance.
131	Clive Alan Griffiths		More high quality housing is required for individuals within the area, wishing to downsize for their retirement to be able to move in to. Individuals with large houses and significant gardens and land should be encouraged to in fill with smaller, purpose built properties, specifically targeted to fulfil this need.	Supportive
143	Chris Strangwood		You need to be careful that you do not agree to old age ghettos. Any housing development should include	NP Policies elsewhere are attempting to provide this balance.

			small bungalows and accommodation suitable for both the elderly and starter homes.	
173	Neil Williams		Larger developments (and all the developments put together) require proper facilities. Currently schools are over-crowded and I am not aware of plans to build new ones, there are few shops available and too few car parking spaces. Developers are completely unrealistic when they consider how many cars families require.	This comment does not relate directly to this Policy. Infrastructure provision such as schools is outside the remit of a NP. Development standards are in the CS or in other policies within the NP.
174	Sarah Eglin		don't agree - older people have plenty of provision from my perception	Opposed NP Policies elsewhere are attempting to provide a balance.
210	Rachel Syson		Disagree for Tiddington - we have ample provision of retirement accommodation already.	Opposed NP Policies elsewhere are attempting to provide a balance.