

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

### **Policy TC10**

Representations: Total received 20

Number in Support: 15

### **Summary of Representations:**

There is general support for this policy in these responses. There is a detailed response from Gateway 1, a developer of part of the site. These include incorporating some residential within the site and otherwise some minor changes which do not affect the general purpose of the policy. Comments have been made below.

### **Modification Proposed:**

The policy will be renumbered policy TC7. Only 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 TC10	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	-------------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>The policy appears to be quite prescriptive in terms of the uses and aspirations for this general area. Should the policy not be more flexible/proactive to include other uses such as retail and residential uses which may be required to make any scheme financially viable and would be an acceptable town centre use?</p> <p>Given the number of landowners in the area the production of a wide ranging master plan for schemes may be difficult to achieve and may potentially put off smaller projects that may have some real regeneration potential. Would it be beneficial to remove reference to piecemeal development?</p> <p>It is unclear what is meant by "higher education". Is there evidence to support this?</p> <p>The cultural quarter is also bounded by Mansell</p>	<p>Residential uses will be added but otherwise the mix is considered to be correct for this location even if it is prescriptive.</p> <p>Noted. However, Gateway 1 is leading this and should be encouraged to undertake this exercise. "Resisted" will be changed to "discouraged" in the last sentence.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Will be amended</p>

			Street and the first sentence of the Policy should be amended to reflect this. The issues outlined in Policy TC9 relating to the wish to prevent piecemeal development apply here, too.	
1008	Historic England		Finally, on a minor point we note that Policy TC 10 (by contrast with Policy TC 9) suggests in the final sentence that piecemeal development “should” be resisted rather than “will” be resisted- the latter wording would seem to be entirely justifiable in our view.	Noted but see SDC representations above

<b>Agents and Developers' Comments</b>				
502	Stratforward BID		We generally support this policy.	Supportive
507	JLL re: Gateway One	Developer's Agent	<p>This designation seeks to support the evolution of the cultural quarter on the site bounded by Birmingham Road, Arden Street and Windsor Street. This designation seeks to safeguard the area principally for a hotel, higher education and office uses, including an open ground floor frontage for shopping or other uses with public access.</p> <p>The Gateway opportunity site falls within this Environmental Improvement Area designation. Accordingly, we have several comments on this policy which are set out in the paragraphs that follow.</p> <p>Whilst the intention to improve this area is in principle supported, there are several uses that are not included in Policy TC10 which will be fundamental to ensuring the delivery of the development and ensure</p>	<p>It is agreed that residential should be included in the appropriate uses for the reasons stated in the response. The policy will be amend accordingly</p> <p>It is recognised that the development proposals should provide for car parking to meet the site user requirements. Proposals that would involve the use of the existing public car park on the site should not be discouraged so long as any alternative parking was available to meet assessed contemporary need. The policy will</p>

		<p>that any future scheme is viable. For example, residential uses will be required to drive value in the scheme to deliver the environmental change envisaged by Policy TC10. Residential uses at the site will also meet the other objectives in the Neighbourhood Plan, such as Policy TC7 (i.e. will add to the business and prosperity of the town, as discussed above). Including the potential for residential uses at The Gateway site will also alleviate the pressure on greenfield land to deliver housing over the plan period. Residential use should therefore be included within Policy TC10.</p> <p>In addition, The Gateway opportunity site has a significant area of existing car parking (both public and private) which serves the town and the businesses currently present. Any future scheme will need to carefully consider the level of car parking that is provided in future proposals. At present, this use is not included in the list of uses anticipated in Policy TC10. The policy text should therefore be refined to include car parking use.</p> <p>The policy also does not include the potential to re-provide the coach drop off area which is currently adjacent to SDC's Windsor Street Car Park (and serves the Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, SBT). There may be potential to re-provide this element with the proposals for The Gateway scheme, to enhance the visitor experience by those visiting the Birthplace Trust. This potential should be referenced in Policy TC10 to provide flexibility to incorporate this use.</p>	<p>be amended accordingly.</p> <p>The retention of the SBT coach park is reasonable and consistent with the purpose of the policy to “support the evolution of the cultural quarter” No specific amendment to the policy is considered to be necessary.</p> <p>Leisure and niche uses are an exemplification of the reference to “shopping “in the first paragraph of the policy and in the explanation. It is not therefore considered necessary to make specific reference to them.</p> <p>There is no reason why part of the whole site should not be brought forward for consideration. The main purpose of the requirement for a master plan is to ensure that any application for a partial development is considered against a plan for the whole site which shows how the policy may be realised and how the particular application helps fulfil it.</p> <p>Given that we are proposing changes relating to car parking and residential use the impact study would appear to be supported.</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>There is little reference to leisure/niche retail uses in Policy TC10 which are likely to form a significant element of the proposals,</p> <p>particularly at ground floor level (subject to market demand). Flexibility will therefore be required for such uses in Policy TC10 to enable any leisure/retail offer to differentiate itself from, and indeed complement, retail/leisure uses found both in the town centre and at the Maybird Shopping Centre.</p> <p>Policy TC10 also requires that a comprehensive master plan addressing scale, layout, land uses and links to the surrounding area and transport implications will be required (presumably for the whole development block identified by the Neighbourhood Plan) and that 'piecemeal' development without a master plan should be resisted.</p> <p>Whilst The Gateway site includes only part of the block identified in Policy TC10, it has taken a significant period of time to assemble the site to create a viable and deliverable development (over 10 years). Policy TC10 should therefore be flexible enough to allow The Gateway opportunity site to come forward as a standalone development within the wider development block. The areas of land outside The Gateway are in fragmented ownership with high value uses. In addition, many of the areas outside The Gateway site comprise historic buildings which, whilst having limited redevelopment potential, will be well placed to benefit from the improved</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>environment when The Gateway scheme is delivered. This flexibility should ensure that The Gateway site can be brought forward, which should organically 'kick-start' the regeneration of the wider area which is outside the joint land owner's control but within the proposed red line boundary of Policy TC10.</p> <p>Policy TC10 seeks an impact study to justify the need and demand for any uses not mentioned in the proposals. This is in principle acceptable provided that both residential and car parking are included in the list of uses (as set out above).</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

<b>Residents' Comments</b>				
038	Amanda Waters		<p>Somewhere we need to have a 'gateway ' to the town. Currently tourist coaches can offload here. There needs to be something either here or (preferably) at the railway station which creates a transport hub for tourists, with tourist information here perhaps as well as at the bottom of town.</p>	Supportive
048	David Bowie		<p>There should be proposals for tree planting and green 'oases'</p>	Noted
049	Gillian M. Hayward		<p>Well some work also needed here, only yesterday on Birmingham Road area in the mid-afternoon there was a pretty horrific incident, involving a group of "unfortunates", one of whom I believe lost his life in the incident. This is not the first violent assault in this area, which I believe is the preferred location for a group of drug addicts.</p>	Supports concept of improvement. Detailed comments outside scope of NDP

056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support. For clarity, Mansell Street should be included in the boundaries. Designs which would impact adversely upon the visual amenity of Henley Street should not be permitted. This would preclude buildings of more than a given (to be specified) height and would encourage the use of traditional materials.	Supportive
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agree with Cultural Quarter	Supportive
064	Richard Eden		It would be great if Birmingham Road could be turned in to a tree lined boulevard with wide paths.	Supportive
078	Melanie Jane Forse		This area on the Birmingham road is an eyesore of boarded up buildings. These offices/dwellings need to be brought back into public use asap. It is a shocking sight when driving into affluent Stratford.	Supportive
086	Jenny Fradgley		Commented on Gateway in TC8	Supportive
095	Eric Ward		Include residential use, with parking, and parking for all the uses listed	Supportive
108	Cheryl Aubrey	Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street.	Agreed, this leaves a terrible first impression of the town when arriving from the station	Supportive
143	Chris Strangwood		The Birmingham road is a mess and need more than prettying up.	Supportive

147	Cllr Tony Jackson		The potential development of the new Gateway proposal may mean the loss of the Windsor St car park and we must have some contingency to protect any remaining car park space. As such I would suggest that the potential loss of Rother St in TC5 should be removed from phase 2 (see comment under TC5	The NDP calls for a strategic review of all off street car parks with a view to increasing capacity where possible
173	Neil Williams		Currently the area is a bit of an eyesore, so it is good to see the plans to redevelop the area. It needs to be sympathetic to the town, with proper consideration taken for potential traffic issues.	Supportive
217	Karen Wild	Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd	We generally support this policy.	Supportive
278	Joan Graham		All these areas need to be improved, and I think increasing housing in the town centre would enhance the feeling of a market town. People like being close to shops and amenities. We don't all have cars.	Supportive
295	Cllr Charles Bates		There's no mention of Windsor Street Car Park in Policy TC10. However, the vision set out in the policy seems to have little in common with a car park. The need for car parking close to the Town Centre has been emphasised within the Neighbourhood Plan, and as such TC10 seems to be at odds with policy TC14. Page 56 & 57.	The NDP calls for a strategic review of all off street car parks with a view to increasing capacity where possible