

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

Policy H9

Representations: Total received 19

Number in Support: 11

Modification Proposed:

This policy will be deleted as it is considered that other policies, particularly Policy H6 and Policy H7, will cater adequately for the needs of young people and families

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy H9	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	--	-----------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>What is meant by 'priority' in the first line of the Policy?</p> <p>The explanation states that 2 bed developments should be via apartments if near the town centre but not by apartments elsewhere. There is no mention of what 1 bed units should comprise of (surely apartments) and there is a disconnect with the desire to have 42% 1 bed affordable units, which if provided via apartments would only be allowed near</p>	<p>This policy is not adding to the plan anything that is not in the housing mix policies. It will be deleted to assist in shortening the plan and reduce any repetition. The text could be put in the explanation of Policies H6/H7.</p>

			<p>the town centre thus there would be a high concentration of 1 bed units in the town centre and none elsewhere which would result in an unbalanced mix of people in developments.</p> <p>How is the statement 'close to the town centre' to be interpreted? It may be more appropriate to say "Proposals for housing sited and designed to attract single people and occupiers with young families will be supported".</p> <p>Whilst supporting the sentiment of this Policy, it would appear to be impossible to apply operationally. There is no explicit prioritisation as between this Policy and Policy H8: the practical effect is to make implementation of both policies unworkable.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

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

Residents' Comments				
----------------------------	--	--	--	--

013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		Housing for young people and families is important to us. We see the ageing population and it's nice but we feel it can lead to activities in the areas being driven by those who don't work.	Supportive
018	Stephen Wreford		I support this policy	Supportive
025	Jane Dodge		I agree	Supportive
036	Kathleen Margaret Dews		Excellent. Homes, especially bungalows, for older people and affordable homes for young families - yes!	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 NBD 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 young people and families in Alveston	Supportive but response to remainder of comment given under Pols H1-H3.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support	Supportive
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed. The main developments should be along the canal and close to schools and shops and the train stations to provide sustainability.	Supportive
074	Roger & Lesley Read		Agree	Supportive
086	Jenny Fradgley		Concern re Key Worker developments that do not take reasonable car ownership into account. The town does not have good transport links so car ownership is seen as important by key workers.	Comment not directly related to this Policy

125	Mandy Last		Any new housing MUST have parking for at least 1 car per household. Most families have 2 cars so what is the point of building properties with little or no parking e.g. the new development proposed for the site on the corner of Clopton Rd and Birmingham Rd.	Comment not directly related to this Policy
143	Chris Strangwood		The attraction of younger people into the town is a good idea but a review of schools is a priority.	Supportive
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		I mildly disagree with this policy. I was unable to afford to live in Stratford upon Avon myself when I originally took a job in the town as a single 26 year old. There was such a wealth of options for nearby towns where I could afford to live that it didn't bother me at all. I saw it as a perk that I had a job in such a desirable location that I couldn't afford to live here! I think there is a risk that too much affordable accommodation would dilute the character of the town. Better transport links to nearby towns seems more desirable to me.	The NDP seeks to cater for the needs of Stratford residents without the need for recourse to transport links
173	Neil Williams		Young people need to be attracted to the town as a whole. This does not just mean housing. Too much consideration is being paid to the older demographic in comparison with younger people.	Supportive the NP Policies attempt to provide a balance to address this concern.
174	Sarah Eglin		don't agree - Stratford is full of new housing estates suitable for first time buyers with young families and the primary schools are all full	It is the view of the NDP Steering Group that there is not adequate housing for young people and families and this will be surveyed in a Housing Needs Study
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		I disagree with this policy. There is no justification to have such a policy to change the profile of Stratford residents.	The NDP seeks to cater for the needs of all Stratford residents
210	Rachel Syson		agree	Supportive