

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

### Policy E2

Representations: Total received 20

Number in Support: 6

### Modification Proposed:

Only the minor modifications noted in the responses below and any needed to remain consistent with the Core Strategy and the NPPF are proposed.

### Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy E2	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	-----------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>The second paragraph refers to development proposals on site SUA.2 being considered against the criteria set out in the Site Specific Brief. What is this document, and who is responsible for producing it?</p> <p>Final point – there needs to be some acknowledgement of scale/proportionality?</p>	<p>This is included in SSB2.</p> <p>Agreed. Refer to CS on quantum of scale (22 ha).</p>

**Agents and Developers' Comments**

506	JLL re: Alscott Estate	Policy E2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy E2 is too restrictive and does not accord with the recommendation of the CS Inspector</li> <li>• Policy E2 should reference Atherstone Airfield as a potential alternative employment allocation</li> <li>• No justification for employment sites to be only allocated to the north of the river</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy E2 will be reviewed in light of the Inspectors Interim Conclusions. SUA 3 will be enlarged and SSB2 will need to be amended to align with SUA 3.</li> <li>• Reference to Atherstone Airfield may be appropriate but this plan cannot allocate this site for development because it is outside the NDP area</li> <li>• SSB3 is the chosen site for employment growth in and around SUA</li> </ul>
-----	------------------------	-----------	---	--

**Residents' Comments**

003	William Bruce Horton		<p>Promoting new employment areas outside town centre (Alcester Road/Wildmoor roundabout) will inevitably increase traffic around these areas. Priority should be given to employment in town centre which would benefit town centre shops and (in conjunction with other policies in the Plan) increase likelihood of people commuting by foot, bike, etc.</p>	<p>The objective of the Regeneration Zones is to accommodate new housing near to the town centre with the intention of avoiding the use of cars. Traffic improvement schemes along the A46 are currently under consideration, but these are outside the scope of the NDP.</p>
-----	----------------------	--	---	---

038	Amanda Waters		Strongly Support moving existing employers in town (other than associated with the tourist industry and therefore with a need to be in town) to the A46 to avoid traffic going into town. Suggest provision of essential retail facilities (e.g. sandwich shop, petrol station, cash point, etc. close by to service employees.	Supportive
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	While we support the proposals for the Land South of the Alcester Road, we are concerned about traffic safety on this already busy and dangerous stretch of the A46 and we would like to see the development linked to road improvements in the area.	Strategic implications of the location are the responsibility of the Stratford District Council and the Highways Authority.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed that new employment site should be provided off Wildmoor, but why drop the Langley Farm proposal? Even if the Planning Inspector felt it was unsound, if the People of the town feel it is right, then it should go back into the proposals. Major commercial development south of the river makes no sense.	The Planning Inspector was not prepared to allow Green Belt to be used for development. This decision cannot be overturned. There are various sites south of the river which would depend on the provision of a Western Relief Road in order to be viable for commercial development. However these are outside the scope of the NDP.
081	Nicholas Oliver		Not appropriate for policy to support locations as yet unknown.	Not agreed
086	Jenny Fradgley		Support exploring the DEFRA land to provide possible extra land for business attraction and relocation	This has been put to SDC which is responsible for proposing it formally.
095	Eric Ward		Agree	Supportive
109	Richard Thomas		Developing this land with its better transport infrastructure is a sound idea.	Supportive

124	John Brennan		It would seem that large amounts of house building has occurred and will occur south of the river. Corresponding amounts of employment provision should be made even without infrastructure improvements it may well reduce bridge congestion. More provision is needed north of the river.	Supportive
143	Chris Strangwood		The support for employment near the A46 should not be considered until a clear traffic management strategy is in place. The current delays on this road would cause problems for both current road users and the new businesses	Strategic implications of the location are the responsibility of the Stratford District Council and the Highways Authority.
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		I have a nimby concern about this one. Over recent years, as employment at Timothy's Bridge Road has increased, traffic along Bishopton Lane has increased dramatically. My quiet, peaceful garden is now mainly just on Sundays. I worry that the use of Bishopton Lane as a rat run would increase yet further as a result of this development, particularly for people moving between Timothy's Bridge Road and the new site.	Design of the Regeneration areas will be the responsibility of the Stratford District Council and will take account of the traffic infrastructure implications.
182	David White		I strongly oppose this scheme. There is sufficient scope for industrial units on existing sites without another ill-considered development. Count the number of industrial units which have been empty for some time and use them for their original purpose. If they are not wanted for business, reallocate them for housing.	The precise role of SUA-2 in accommodating relocated businesses has yet to be worked out. The principal is to enable businesses to be relocated from the Regeneration Areas around the canal. The overriding purpose is to provide additional housing for Stratford upon Avon.
205	Trevor Bruce		Any new development for employment should have a compulsory segregated cycle path included in the plan linking in to the existing cycle network.	Other policies in the NDP promote cycle paths in new developments

212	David Tucker		It would be appropriate to develop new employment opportunities to the north of the Town, served by the A46 and possibly to the east with the additional development considered around Wellesbourne Airfield, which has appropriate north/south links running to the east of Stratford.	Supportive
228	John Campton		Support	Supportive
256	Valerie Ansfield		Employment opportunities on the edge of town won't work unless efficient transport into town is available to connect people with their homes.	Other policies in the NDP promote improvements in transport infrastructure
282	Anne Marian Kiely		There is already concrete evidence that the A46 at this location is extremely dangerous, due to idiotic way in which people drive - some sort of change will be necessary to accommodate extra traffic created by this Policy E2.	Strategic implications of the location are the responsibility of the Stratford District Council and the Highways Authority.
295	Cllr Charles Bates		Page 31 There seems to be some confusion between various sites on the outskirts of the Town, where land for employment use could be made available.	Not clear what confusion is expressed, or what the representation is concerned about. This policy is attempting to avoid preventing development where appropriate infrastructure is being proposed.