

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

Policy BE12

Representations: Total received 16

Number in Support: 6

Modification Proposed:

This Policy will be deleted and the references to Conservation Areas will be included in a new all-encompassing policy entitled Designated Heritage Assets (Policy BE10). There will be minor modifications to the wording of this policy to reflect the NPPF test and the responses below.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE12	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>It would be helpful to include maps indicating the Stratford Town and Alveston Conservation Areas.</p> <p>The policy needs to be worded more positively. The wording of the second sentence does not strictly adhere to the wording of the NPPF, since the NPPF does potentially allow for some harm to heritage assets. NPPF para's 128-134 should be utilised to</p>	<p>The CAs are shown on the Policy Map.</p> <p>This is agreed and Policies BE11 and BE12 will be combined and amended to reflect the NPPF.</p>

			ascertain any requirement for re-drafting and look to replace the word “preserve” with “protect” for consistency with national policy.	
1008	Historic England		We would, however, question the utility of Policies BE11-12 since these designated heritage assets are already stringently protected by specific legislation, such that the inclusion of policies in the Neighbourhood Plan would seem to offer no additional benefit.	Policies BE11 and BE12 will be combined and amended to reflect the NPPF.

Agents and Developers' Comments				
513	Stansgate planning re Mr C Swan		This policy is at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 129-134 where significance of the asset and level of harm is assessed and weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. As written, any harm would preclude development.	See above Responses to Reps 1001 and 1008.
514	Stansgate Planning re Town Trust		This policy is at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 129-134 where significance of the asset and level of harm is assessed and weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. As written, any harm would preclude any proposals.	See above comments.
516	Framptons re ROSCONN Group		This policy fails to accord with the provisions of Statute (Section 72 (1)) and fails to have regard to the approach set out at paragraphs 133 and 134 of the Framework.	See above comments.
519	Daniel O'Donnell		These policies are not in accordance with the cost / benefit approach of the NPPF and are not in	See above comments.

			accordance with statute.	
520	Charles Vickery		These policies are neither in accordance with the cost / benefit approach of the NPPF or statute.	See above comments.

Residents' Comments				
025	Jane Dodge		I agree	Supportive
053	Geoffrey Prince	Several local residents	We object to this policy as currently worded as it does not reflect the guidance set down in the NPPF. We propose that the policy should read as follows: 'To be acceptable proposals for development within and adjacent to the Stratford-on-Avon and Alveston Conservation Areas should clearly demonstrate that they will sustain and enhance the Conservation Area, its setting and setting of any heritage assets within the Conservation Area. All proposals should be accompanied by a Heritage Statement which assesses the impact of the proposals on the Conservation Area and heritage assets. Proposals which will lead to substantial harm or total loss of designated heritage assets will not normally be granted planning permission. Where a proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm, the harm will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.' In summary the NDP policies in so far as they relate to Alveston represent a NIMBY agenda with no regard to the real housing needs of the community.	Policies BE11 and BE12 will be combined and amended to reflect the NPPF.
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Strongly support	Supportive
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed	Supportive
095	Eric Ward		Reword: substitute "refused" for "resisted".	Policies BE11 and BE12 will be

				combined and amended to reflect the NPPF.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Strongly agree	Supportive
228	John Campton		Support	Supportive
253	Daniel O'Donnell		These policies are not in accordance with the cost / benefit approach of the NPPF and are not in accordance with statute.	Policies BE11 and BE12 will be combined and amended to reflect the NPPF.
278	Joan Graham		Have my support as long as they really improve conditions for everyone.	Supportive