

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

Policy BE15

Representations: Total received 11

Number in Support: 8

Modification Proposed:

The substance of this policy will remain relatively unchanged and only the minor modifications noted in the responses below and any needed to remain consistent with the Core Strategy and the NPPF are proposed.. It will be renumbered to Policy BE12 due to earlier policy changes.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE15	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	-------------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	Should the scope of the policy be expanded to include a presumption against demolition of existing buildings capable of restoration, reuse and conversion? Why for example, does Policy BE15 not support conversion and significant extension? There appears to be nothing in the Neighbourhood Plan to prevent an applicant proposing an alternative means to achieve the same end result, i.e. the demolition of	Remove the reference to the need to extend. Capability of conversion is still important and should remain. Suggest that we include reference to the role of these in contributing to the annual windfall supply of homes. Wording changes

			<p>existing and erection of a larger building. Arguably, this alternative approach would be far less sustainable and contribute far less to sense of place.</p> <p>As written, the policy is too restrictive, particularly if applied to buildings in the urban area.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Agents and Developers' Comments				
507	JLL re: Gateway One	Developer's Agent	This policy is supported in principle; however, we do not understand the last line of the policy, which states that buildings must be ' <i>genuinely capable of being converted without significant rebuilding, or the need to extend</i> '. This phrase should be removed from the policy.	While the reference to need to extend can be removed, capability of conversion is still important and should remain.

Residents' Comments				
025	Jane Dodge		I agree	Supportive
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support	Supportive
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed	Supportive
095	Eric Ward		Delete the 2nd sentence	No – this is there to prevent flimsy, insubstantial buildings being converted , or effectively newly built, without specific permission and is standard wording
125	Mandy Last		There are so many offices that have either never been let or have been empty for a long time, could these not be converted into apartments. So reducing the need for new developments. Most have	Generally Supportive New permitted development rights introduced by the Government would allow this in many cases.

			extensive parking and utilities are already connected.	
174	Sarah Eglin		agree if building is historic	Supportive
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree	Supportive
228	John Campton		Support	Supportive
278	Joan Graham		Have my support as long as they really improve conditions for everyone.	Supportive