

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

Policy BE4

Representations: Total received 16

Number in Support: 9

Modification Proposed:

The substance of this policy will remain relatively unchanged.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE4	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	------------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	This policy goes further than Core Strategy Policy CS.9 in that it sets a threshold for the use of the Design Review Panel for all applications of 10 or more homes. It is unclear as to the degree that a Neighbourhood Plan can seek to apply more onerous policy requirements. Having said that, the issue may be one of justification and whilst at District level it would not be appropriate to set such a requirement, it may be the case that it is wholly appropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to set such	It is believed that if they are justified, reasonable, relevant etc. a NDP can do this. This issue is not a strategic issue after all. Agreed.

			<p>a requirement, provided it was supported by robust justification.</p> <p>Local Design Review Panel – will this be seen as objective and how will such a panel make use of relevant urban design expertise? Who will select the makeup of the Panel and how would it be regulated?</p>	This is covered in the Explanation
--	--	--	--	------------------------------------

Agents and Developers' Comments				
507	JLL re: Gateway One	Developer's Agent	<p>Although the principle of a Design Review Panel, particularly for larger schemes, is in principle supported, the draft wording of Policy BE4 should be redrafted to state: '<i>will be encouraged</i>' rather than '<i>must go</i>' and '<i>will be necessary</i>'. This would allow flexibility in the Neighbourhood Plan as required by the NPPF.</p>	<p>We believe that it is essential that large scale developments go through this process to ensure that quality design is uppermost in the preparation of development that will materially affect the appearance of the town. There is adequate discretion retained in the framing of this policy by qualifying the use of the panel in the case of smaller developments only where there is particular sensitivity.</p> <p>No change to the policy is proposed.</p>
512	RPS re Taylor Wimpey and Miller Homes		<p>The policy outlines the mechanism for a design review panel, undertaken and monitored by the Town Council which will apply to all large developments. These have previously been defined as sites of 10 or more.</p> <p>The Plan cites paragraph 62 of the NPPF as the relevant policy, however it should be noted that this</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>While SDC is not inclined to commit</p>

			<p>paragraph applies to reviews undertaken by Local Authorities, who are normally better resourced to manage such a task. As the principal centre for growth in the District, a number of large sites can be expected to come forward after the adoption of the Core Strategy and the Town Council needs to be satisfied that suitable arrangements are in place to provide advice in a consistent and timely manner. To be consistent with paragraph 62 of the NPPF, it would also be advised to adjust the wording of the policy to indicate that the Local Authority “should have regard to the recommendations of the design review” rather than a material consideration as currently drafted.</p> <p>Whilst Design Reviews can assist in the process, it is not clear what expertise the Town Council have in this particular field, given the expertise of the LPA and other groups such as MADE who already undertake such reviews in the West Midlands.</p>	<p>to administering this policy due to the costs involved, the Town Council believes it to be a necessary function and a mechanism needs to be put in place. It is accepted that the SuA TC will need to have regard to the financial implications and the administrative responsibilities.</p>
516	Framptons re ROSCONN Group		<p>The requirement of this policy is similarly absurd in the context of imposing unnecessary costs upon applicants for small housing schemes. Local design review arrangements enabling comments to be made on applications may be established without imposing the burden upon applicants to coerce the requirements for large scale developments to be subjected to a local design review process.</p>	<p>This will not apply to small housing schemes. It will currently only apply to major development as defined in the DMPO 2015.</p>
519	Daniel O'Donnell		<p>Requiring a design code and master plan for all developments over 10 dwellings is excessive and unjustified given the scale of these proposals.</p>	<p>See above comments.</p>
520	Charles Vickery		<p>The requirement of a design code and master plan</p>	<p>See above comments.</p>

			for all developments over 10 dwellings is excessive and unjustified for such relatively modest schemes.	
--	--	--	---	--

Residents' Comments				
025	Jane Dodge		I agree	Supportive
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support, subject to the local Design Review Panel including residents who specifically do not have a professional background in planning and development but are interested in preserving the quality and character of the built environment.	Supportive The precise constitution of this panel has yet to be decided but it will be broadly based.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Agreed	Supportive
095	Eric Ward		Good idea	Supportive
139	Renny Wodynska		Who is going to be on this panel? What about some normal people like me who are a bit more critical than politicians?	Supportive The precise constitution of this panel has yet to be decided but it will be broadly based.
140	Alan George		The panel needs to represent local people like me not just politicians and housing developers.	Supportive The precise constitution of this panel has yet to be decided but it will be broadly based.
174	Sarah Eglin		agreed as long as not expensive for tax payers	Supportive
228	John Campton		Yes	Supportive
253	Daniel O'Donnell		Requiring a design code and master plan for all developments over 10 dwellings is excessive and unjustified given the scale of these proposals.	See response to BE3
278	Joan Graham		All very good principles and should help the town keep its unique market character.	Supportive