

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

Policy BE16

Representations: Total received 15

Number in Support: 10

Modification Proposed:

The substance of this policy will remain relatively unchanged. It will be renumbered to Policy BE13 due to the deletion of earlier policies.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE16	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	-------------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	The use of the term "empty or unused spaces" (which requires definition in order to prevent misuse and/or unintended consequences), is queried. Would the term 'vacant plots and buildings' be more appropriate and still achieve the same policy aim? In respect of upper floors above shops, whilst the accompanying explanation provides some clarity, should Policy BE16 specify what the appropriate uses are in order to encourage them e.g. office,	Wording will be amended to reflect SDC suggestions.

			<p>residential? Is it appropriate to include reference to upper floors in this policy about empty spaces? It may be that the upper floors are not empty but simply underused. Reference to vacant upper floors may resolve any potential policy tension.</p> <p>In final paragraph suggest “and other uses” is inserted after “shops”.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Residents' Comments				
018	Stephen Wreford		Tiddington MUST be able to use the unused spaces within the BUAB i.e. the Garages and Gravel Pit. They should be release for the village to decide on the type and quantity of housing required.	This would be allowed under Policy H1
025	Jane Dodge		I agree	Supportive
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support	Supportive
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly support bringing back living space above shops (and the Town Square development)	Supportive
095	Eric Ward		Very strongly agree	Supportive
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 extensive parking and utilities are already connected.	New permitted development rights introduced by the Government would allow this in many cases
139	Renny Wodynska		This must seriously be prioritised. For examples I'm aware of empty houses on Birmingham road for at least the last 12 years. That's ridiculous!	Supportive
140	Alan George		This should be overall priority due to no of empty properties e.g. those on Birmingham road... empty	Supportive

			for several years.	
174	Sarah Eglin		good idea	Supportive
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Support	Supportive
202	Mr Mark Rowlands		Such spaces should form part of a Council administered register of potential brownfield sites for redevelopment. Until all such sites have been exhausted, there should be no approval for new greenfield developments.	Such an approach would be in conflict with the NPPF. This policy provides sufficient caveats
210	Rachel Syson		In practise, housing above shops and offices is a tricky one. Noise nuisance, either way, can cause trouble.	Any conversion would have to meet Building Regs standards, and normal planning restrictions on unneighbourliness.
228	John Campton		Support	Supportive
278	Joan Graham		Have my support as long as they really improve conditions for everyone.	Supportive