

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

### Policy BE9

Representations: Total received 13

Number in Support: 8

### Modification Proposed:

The substance of this policy will remain relatively unchanged. It will be renumbered to Policy BE8 due to the deletion of an earlier policy.

### Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy BE9	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	------------	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>Criterion (c) is not appropriate. There should be room for variety and innovation depending on context and the sensitivity of the building or area affected.</p> <p>Combined information boards as listed at criterion (d) have significant visual impact. Ideally they should be avoided.</p>	<p>Use the expression 'signposts'</p> <p>They can also reduce clutter. Proposed to leave this as it is subjective.</p>

<b>Residents' Comments</b>				
025	Jane Dodge		I agree	Supportive
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support. There should also be a strong presumption against signs using moving pictures (whether created by phased lighting effects or video)	Supportive
057	Trevor Honychurch		Bit weak. Why not ban all external signage within the Town- by merely saying Strictly Controlled this relies on someone (District Council already down to bare minimum of staff) making a decision and then enforcing compliance.	This policy seeks to achieve a balance.
070	Matt Sharpe		I would prefer advertising (aside from shop frontage) to be prohibited entirely	This policy seeks to achieve a balance.
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree	Supportive
119	Liz Thompson, Director of Communications	Royal Shakespeare Company	We support the broad principles here and assume the policy in relation to illuminated signs applies to all new advertisements, not retrospectively applied.	Supportive
168	Mrs Anna Louise Gregg		I think Stratford's pretty good with respect to advertising and signage but it's a relatively small thing which can have a huge impact, so I wholly support this proposal.	Supportive
170	Peter Emmerson		I agree with the references to controlling untidy signage. However, there is no reference to working with businesses to remove and prevent temporary, poorly designed signage, which evades planning control because of its moveable nature. This should be written into this policy.	This policy seeks to achieve a balance.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree	Supportive

228	John Campton		Support	Supportive
282	Anne Marian Kiely		"A" - Boards proliferate all footpaths throughout the town which, combined with "outside dining" chairs and tables, litter bins, wooden blocks on e.g. High Street, all make walking along the footpaths in a crowded area a nightmare, especially if you are pressed for time. Holiday-makers obviously are not, but even they must find this clutter of obstacles irritating and unnecessary?	This is not a land-use matter and cannot be controlled by a Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is covered by the Highways Act with the power to act held by Warwickshire County Council.
296	Kate Rolfe		Signage in our towns - agree we remove unnecessary signage including any repetitive signs.	Supportive