

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

### Policy E4

Representations: Total received 10

Number in Support: 4

### 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 E4	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	-----------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>Whilst acceptable in principle, as worded here the policy is looking to control the different elements of use by specifying separate access points and the requirement of certain types of internal accommodation. The policy as drafted is too restrictive and clause (e) is attempting to control certain elements which can be achieved through permitted development rights.</p> <p>Add to end of 2nd paragraph "...and assessed accordingly."</p>	<p>Disagree. We are aware of other councils' policy documents referring to this requirement. It is necessary to ensure genuine work/live schemes and avoid this policy being used as an excuse to get a house in the countryside.</p> <p>Agreed</p>

1004	WCC – Public Health		Policy E4 should also make specific reference to access of Green Space for the Work/Live Units. Standards set by Fields in Trust and Natural England can be found within our Neighbourhood Development Planning for Health Document 3.4.1.	Review the referenced document, but the requirement is covered elsewhere in the NDP (see CLW Section 11).
------	---------------------	--	--	---

<b>Residents' Comments</b>				
003	William Bruce Horton		Replace "Be in reasonably accessible locations to service facilities by means other than a private vehicle" with "Be in locations accessible to service facilities by means other than a private vehicle and where alternative means of transport (walking, cycling) are given priority"	Disagree the necessity for this. Existing wording to be retained.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	We would like to see the addition of a criterion along the following lines: Would not cause nuisance or disturbance to nearby residents through noise, odours, movements (e.g. of customers, agents), or unsocial working hours	Other legislation covers this.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agreed. We need a new "artisan" quarter to attract small businesses, artists etc. That approach minimises travel and ensures that housing, small businesses, shops, restaurants etc. can exist side by side.	Supportive
086	Jenny Fradgley		Very much support providing small units aimed at local start-ups, cost is a major consideration, we need to structure start up units to be affordable	Supportive
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	I think this is a great idea, would encourage smaller businesses to be able to open	Supportive

170	Peter Emmerson		Remove the reference to independent service facilities in Section C.	Criterion c) to be reworded for clarity.
180	Evelyn CONN		I am appalled by the lack of coordinated, and integrated development of the Town's future. Why can't you take a leaf out of Holland/France/Germanys books and have small, housing units above EVERY SHOP. If you walk along the town, it is a sad testament to the old days of having to keep stock above the shop but in an era of JIT deliveries, direct home delivery and holding very little stock - a huge number of these shops as left waste and underutilised. Younger people often work in these shops and restaurants but have to travel miles away when we would much rather "live above the shop".	This is covered in the TC Section
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Fully support home/work units	Supportive