

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

### Policy BE1

Representations: Total received 20

Number in Support: 17

### 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 BE1	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	--	------------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>In criterion (a) suggest replacing “functions” with “spaces”.</p> <p>Whilst the ability to move freely and effectively is supported, does criterion (a) require further thought and clarification as to whether this is just by foot, by a range of transport modes, or by all transport modes?</p>	<p>Agree to “functions” but retain policy otherwise.</p> <p>In theory this relates to all transport modes but in reality this depends on the nature of the scheme and the availability of links so really this is a matter the decision maker to interpret.</p>

			<p>Definition of large-scale development is set too low to be able to achieve many of the criteria identified. Suggest a more suitable threshold should be around 50 dwellings or 2,000sqm of business/commercial floorspace.</p> <p>As drafted, this only applies to “large-scale developments” defined as 10 or more dwellings. This implies that developments of 9 or fewer dwellings need not be of a high standard of design and layout.</p> <p>Objectives of Urban Design also include Character, Continuity and enclosure, Quality of Public Realm, and adaptability.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Criteria come from Gen Devl Procedure Order.</p> <p>It would be too onerous to apply it to all developments. You have to set the threshold somewhere so 10 dwellings or more is reasonable. Add something that says developments of 1-9 dwellings or floor space under 1000sqm are encouraged to follows these guidelines. Amend wording to ensure all developments are of a high standard.</p> <p>Not exhaustive in our list, could add Qual of Pub Realm, and adaptability</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>Residents' Comments</b>				
013	Rosanna Dymoke-Grainger		All sounds like a great idea. Continuing to keep residents engaged would be appreciated.	Supportive
022	Quentin Willson		We need to be much more architecturally sympathetic. Parts of Stratford already look like Milton Keynes. Every new building must respect the architectural tenor and be worth of inclusion in the town because its visually sympathetic.	Supportive

024	Michaela Willson		Stratford has become ugly, with inappropriate buildings little greenery and too many buses. Shakespeare would be horrified	Supportive
025	Jane Dodge		I agree	Supportive
038	Amanda Waters		Fully agree with all the proposals in the BE section, particularly bringing empty buildings back into use.	Supportive
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support. Unfortunately the term 'high standards of design and layout' is subjective. Developers should be called upon to explain how they have addressed this requirement and what alternatives they have considered.	Supportive Covered in Policy BE2
057	Trevor Honychurch		Yes but the wording is difficult. We do need a variety of design (all of good quality) to avoid the Town growing simply as a Medieval copy.	Supportive
063	Tony Goddard		There does not seem to be any comment on the maximum housing density of any new developments. This is important in order to maintain the character of the area. Densities seem to be getting higher and higher and this often seems to conflict with the density of housing in the surrounding area.	Density is referred to in BE8.
064	Richard Eden		All large scale developers should be involved in the wider traffic management solutions. They should not build developments to attract more traffic without offering solutions to the increased traffic load.	Supportive Infrastructure improvements covered elsewhere.
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree	Supportive
109	Richard Thomas		A complicated area but attention to this whole matter is so desperately needed, the proposals are too complicated for me to comment on though. I do generally support the whole section.	Supportive
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We applaud the desire to ensure that all large scale developments demonstrate a high standard of design and layout. This is something we have always endeavoured to provide in our capital programmes	Supportive

			and we know our audiences also value the heritage of the town.	
139	Renny Wodynska		To me as Jo public and not a civil servant or local government person this is full of meaningless words! We want limited development in this country and certainly in Stratford which has been ruined already. The numerous housing developers must be laughing at this section - some of the developments are shocking. Compare them to somewhere like Bourneville in Birmingham where thought was given properly to green space, gardens and so on.	This policy is seeking good design and there are other policies regarding green space
140	Alan George		Much more control required on all development, Stratford is being ruined beyond recognition.	Supportive Control is restricted by Government Policy
174	Sarah Eglin		agreed - but this is such a subjective judgement - the visitor centre at Shakespeare's birthplace is horrendous for example, as our many of the new hotels on the Birmingham road and some of the buildings around the canal between town and the Maybird centre are ugly too	Supportive
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree	Supportive
226	Debs Campton		Built Environment & Design Section - very thorough and well thought out.	Supportive
228	John Campton		Yes	Supportive
278	Joan Graham		All very good principles and should help the town keep its unique market character.	Supportive