

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

Policy TC5

Representations:

Total received: 26

Number in Support: 10

Summary of Response:

There are a variety of views which, on the whole, support the re-invigoration of this site. The cinema had adverse comments, though it must be borne in mind that at the time of preparation of the plan it was included within a planning application already granted. What is now proposed is considered to be a significant improvement to the scheme approved earlier by reason of scale and detailed treatment of design.

Modification Proposed:

Policy will be re-numbered TC3. The wording will be changed to focus on phase 2 of the policy and will be modified to reflect planning permissions granted while still seeking to achieve further enhancements.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

| Code Number | Full Name | Organisation represented (where applicable) | Policy TC5 | Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response |
|-------------|-----------|---|------------|--|
|-------------|-----------|---|------------|--|

Statutory Consultees' Comments

| | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| 1001 | Stratford District Council | Statutory Consultee | <p>The first bullet point should read “Rother Street” not “Rother Market”.</p> <p>Should second bullet point read “spaces” rather than “streets”?</p> <p>Under ‘Phase 2’, replace the word “inclusion” with “demolition” and the final sentence should read “Proposals for its replacement should:”</p> <p>As there is no opportunity to vary the manner in which an extant planning permission can be implemented, it perhaps should be more evident that the policy will require a fresh application to secure the changes sought.</p> | <p>Will be amended.</p> <p>Will be amended.</p> <p>Will be amended.</p> <p>The policy will be amended to focus on phase 2.</p> |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|

Agents and Developers' Comments

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------|--|---|-------------|
| 502 | Stratforward BID | | We support the current plans for the Town Square Re-development, including retaining the existing | Supportive. |
|-----|------------------|--|---|-------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | parking provision. We recognise that a residential content may not be appropriate for this site. This site provides the best opportunity for the town centre to address existing gaps in its retail and leisure offer for the 18 - 35 age group that are currently lost to competing centres, eg. Leamington Spa. | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| Residents' Comments | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| 013 | Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger | | Think this is a great idea - there is an existing shopping "centre" in the centre of town, linking Debenhams, with the zebra crossing on wood street. This is hardly used and deserted. Time and effort needs to be spent identifying a new use and getting more people to use it. | Supportive. |
| 018 | Stephen Wreford | | Another cinema is NOT required. This will simply kill off a much loved and supported Picture House cinema. It will be to our detriment. | The cinema has gained full planning permission. The developers have modified the original scheme but have chosen to retain the cinema. Because of an existing planning permission it is not possible to secure any change to this decision without the agreement of the developer. Their scheme should achieve an objective of maintaining life in this part of the town during the evening and will provide a facility with attraction for younger people |
| 038 | Amanda Waters | | support | Supportive. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|--|---|---|
| 049 | Gillian M. Hayward | | <p>I attended the display in Town Square, I consider there is little planned for locals, we need green grocers, fishmongers, a supermarket better than the Sainsbury's we have. We don't need a multiplex cinema as we have an excellent cinema already, and it would be a pity if that was forced to close. We need more individual, independent retailers. At the moment our High Street looks like a myriad of others, at least Worcester's has individuality. A good department store like John Lewis would be fab, we don't need BHS and Debenhams, they try to improve and always fail.</p> | <p>The cinema has gained full planning permission. The expectation is that the partnership (Policy TC1, to be renamed TC Project 1) will work towards encouraging independent traders. Unfortunately, it is not within the remit or competence of land use planning to determine the users of specific sites.</p> |
| 054 | Nick Asbury | | <p>The permission seems already to have been given for a corporation with no real interest in the town coming in and developing the area, turning it into a bottom line driven, bland, nondescript area. How do we circumvent this once it has been built? What do you put in there? My vision would be to promote, foster and support a 'Borough Market' style Market. (http://boroughmarket.org.uk) Being in the centre of the country, we could easily attract suppliers/farmers nationwide. This would create fresh footfall, promote more local business and increase Stratford's identity as an interesting cultural attraction. It is important that it be run by a local business as the import of Geraud Markets (UK) Ltd to run the markets in Stratford has proved such a disaster. Witness the desecration of the Farmer's Market at the expense of the bottom line as an example. This 'Borough Market' could take place all through the environs of the Town Square and the Rother Triangle creating a vibrant, living Countrywide market, an answer to the capital's monopoly, and would be not only a Tourist Attraction, but create jobs</p> | <p>The cinema and associated shopping and restaurants scheme has gained full planning permission and it is not possible to introduce this alternative scheme without the developer's agreement.</p> <p>However, the NDP supports a vibrant market area on Rother Street.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | and raise Stratford-upon-Avon's name still further in terms of quality and taste. It may also take away the need for things like a 'Multiplex' cinema, which will be a huge white elephant, and leave the Town Square deserted once more in a few years' time. Even with the projected increase in housing, Stratford cannot support even the Picture house, let alone another few screens. It is a sweetener from the developers that we do not need. | |
| 056 | Martyn Luscombe | Stratford Voice | We strongly support the stated policy. We do not support the plans for which permission has been granted and would like to see the sentence "The first priority is to ensure that the scheme for which permission has been granted is implemented..." removed from the Explanation. A new scheme has been proposed, which would surely require a new planning application. This is a much better scheme, although we are not convinced that a cinema is the best way to anchor the scheme. | Supportive. Wording will be amended to focus on phase 2 |
| 057 | Trevor Honychurch | | Support redevelopment of the Town Square but not cinemas- why not 10 pin bowling to attract all age groups? There would need to be closure by 11pm to avoid noise for residents. Make sure that public toilets are kept. Reference is made to "The scheme for which permission has been granted.." - I thought that a new scheme was coming forward? | See Response to Rep 018 above |
| 064 | Richard Eden | | The multi-story car park is a unfortunate eyesore. Can the bottom floor of the car park between Rother Street and Town Square be improved to assist the pedestrian link between the two areas? Ideally with | Supportive of phase 2. |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | shops along that walk way? This would create a parallel shopping zone to Wood Street all the way through to High Street. | This is a proposal that needs to be and will be raised with the freeholders and leaseholders of the car park . Otherwise it will not be achieved before phase two of the Town Square scheme. |
| 069 | Judith Benney | | I think it is important that the Town Square is redeveloped ASAP. The vistas should be more open to encourage footfall. The development should be very high quality and in keeping with the historic surroundings. | Supportive. This is the objective of the policy. |
| 086 | Jenny Fradgley | | Town Square is missed opportunity now as plans are moving forward. I regret lack of a residential element. Care must be exercised to ensure secondary trading areas in the town do not suffer with increased competition, i.e. Greenhill Street, Union Street, Church Street and the shopping arcades. | Other policies in the plan are designed to promote and protect existing shopping. |
| 092 | Suzanne Helen Bower | | I agree full with the proposals set out in the Neighbourhood Plan but do not think the proposed multiplex cinema is a good fit with Stratford. We already have a high quality independent cinema. | See Response to Rep 018 above |
| 095 | Eric Ward | | OBJECT to NCP car park. If retained, serious conditions must be imposed to regularise charging system - e.g. display prices before entrance. | Noted |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------|--|---|---|
| 108 | Cheryl Aubrey | Work at The Fourteas, 24 Sheep Street. | Anything is better than the eyesore we have been left with since the lovely Bell court was developed. Agree with this policy. If the carpark could be made cheaper too, that would help | Supportive |
| 125 | Mandy Last | | Why is the council wasting more money on Town Square, it's a white elephant. Thousands was spent on the consultation and planning of the current design. At first we were to have a covered mall but then it was left uncovered. Most of the shops came and went and most is left empty because of high rates. Now again money has been spent on consultation, talk of a covered area and again this idea has been rejected. The plan is for the square to be filled with cafes and restaurants - surely we have more than enough, and a cinema to put the other out of business. Can the council not give a premises to charities such as Springfield Mind that works to reduce the stigma of mental health etc. | The cinema has gained full planning permission. The Council and other freeholders are expected to achieve a financial benefit when the scheme is completed. |
| 139 | Renny Wodynska | | I am totally against a 2nd cinema - we cannot manage to fill the Picture house half the time. | See Response to Rep 018 above |
| 143 | Chris Strangwood | | The town square development needs to ensure that it gives something that the residents require and will be able to use. The car parks must be accessible and at a reasonable cost. | Noted |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| 147 | Cllr Tony Jackson | | I am concerned at the proposed loss of the Rother St car park as part of phase 2. Parking within the town is already limited and this particular car park is ideally situated to service the increased number of people who will be making good use of the enhanced facilities provided by Phase 1. This loss of car parking becomes even more acute if the Windsor St car park is to be lost as part of the proposals in TC10 | Policy INF1 requires a thorough reappraisal of off- street car parking to the west of the town centre with the objective of increasing capacity. Car parking provision would be kept under constant review- see policy TC14, and if at the time of a possible phase 2 development there is considered to be a continuing need then under the terms of this policy suitable alternative provision would have to be made. |
| 173 | Neil Williams | | I don't understand why there is a car park on Rother Market. It is the centre of town, yet people get to see a car park and taxi rank. I appreciate the need for disabled parking, but the rest is unnecessary and is too small to make much difference. There must be a more suitable, attractive use for the area when the market is not there. | The small amount of parking here, being open. Is a popular addition to the total on non-market days. |
| 174 | Sarah Eglin | | I don't understand the comment saying phase 2 will be reserved - does this mean it will or won't happen? | Policy will be re-written to focus on phase 2. |
| 201 | Graham John Nicholson | The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch) | Agree | Supportive. |
| 205 | Trevor Bruce | | There needs to be safe segregated cycle access to this new development, along with adequate cycle parking. | Noted. see cycling policies. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------|--|--|--|
| 217 | Karen Wild | Stratforward Business Improvement District Ltd | We support the current plans for the Town Square Re-development, including retaining the existing parking provision. We recognise that a residential content may not be appropriate for this site. This site provides the best opportunity for the town centre to address existing gaps in its retail and leisure offer for the 18 - 35 age group that are currently lost to competing centres, e.g. Leamington Spa. | Supportive. |
| 228 | John Campton | | Hope they make a better job of it this time. Town Square currently a disgrace. | Supportive. There has been consultation with the NP team on the detail of the design. |
| 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. | There are policies in TC7 which promote housing in the town centre. |