

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

Section 8 – Built Environment and Design – General Comments

Representations: Total received 3

Number in Support: 1

Modification Proposed:

In addition to the modifications in the Responses column, see individual Policies

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Section 8 – Built Environment - General	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
-------------	-----------	---	---	--

Statutory Consultees' Comments				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>Perhaps revise paragraph 3 to clarify the distinction between pre-application advice from the District Council and pre-application engagement with the Town Council and other local stakeholders?</p> <p>The appreciation of the importance of good design set out in this Objective is welcome.</p> <p>Policies BE11, BE12 and BE13 - The Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<p>Sensible suggestion which will be included.</p> <p>Supportive</p> <p>Addressed in explanatory</p>

			<p>is an opportunity to capitalise on the unique heritage of Stratford-upon-Avon. The three policies BE11, BE12 and BE13 are somewhat lost in the Built Environment section and arguably the Neighbourhood Plan would benefit from a separate Design and Historic Environment section comprising Policies BE1-BE5 and BE11-BE13. Notwithstanding this, reference is made in Policy BE13 to unregistered Historic Parks and Gardens. The Neighbourhood Plan could be more proactive and identify these along with any other non-designated heritage assets that the Neighbourhood Plan wishes to offer additional protection to.</p> <p>Objective C - It is unclear what a "non-conforming use" is and how this may be defined?</p>	<p>narrative</p> <p>Could be included in a Review of the NDP</p> <p>Uses that do not sit comfortably alongside other uses (eg unneighbourly). "Incompatible" is an alternative expression that will be used.</p>
1004	WCC - Public Health Warwickshire	Built Environment and design Consultee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly support policy BE6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted
1008	Historic England		<p>Historic England is supportive of the content of the document and we applaud the comprehensive approach taken to the historic and natural environment and the wide range of well justified policies that are clearly focused upon "constructive conservation".</p> <p>We are particularly pleased to see the emphasis on local distinctiveness including nondesignated heritage assets and upon the importance of design- whether relating to shop fronts or new build development, where requirements for</p>	<p>Supportive</p> <p>Note that Design Codes may have changed</p>

		<p>master planning and the use of “Building for Life 12”, Design Codes and a Design Review Panel are highly commendable.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>By contrast, we note the absence of any Policy related to archaeological remains, although the rubric of the Plan makes it clear that the core of Stratford-upon-Avon has its origins in a medieval planned town. The following policy may be appropriate and has already been adopted in a number of “made” West Midlands Neighbourhood Plans, viz:</p> <p><i>“New development must take account of known surface and sub-surface archaeology, and ensure unknown and potentially significant deposits are identified and appropriately considered during development. Lack of current evidence of sub-surface archaeology must not be taken as proof of absence”.</i></p>	<p>Retained to ensure Plan meets basic conditions and conforms with the NPPF</p> <p>Will be added to BE11 (now Policy BE10 in submission version)</p>
--	--	--	---