

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

### **Policy CLW7**

#### **Representations:**

Total received: 16

Number in Support: 12

Number neutral or outside scope of NDP: 2

Number of objections: 2

#### **Summary of Representations:**

Generally supportive although SDC considers policy too onerous as drafted.

#### **Modification Proposed:**

Numbering changed – will be Policy CLW5. Wording will be amended to address SDC concerns and make less onerous on developers.

## Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

Code Number	Full Name	Organisation represented (where applicable)	Policy CLW7	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
<b>Statutory Consultees' Comments</b>				
1001	Stratford District Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>In the 1st paragraph, “large-scale” is not defined.</p> <p>It is too onerous to expect all new development (regardless of scale) to demonstrate prioritisation of new walking or cycling opportunities. Planning permission could not be refused for a single dwelling just because the application has ‘failed to encourage’ a new cycling opportunity. The policy is aspirational in nature.</p> <p>Explanation: Expectation set out in final paragraph would seem unreasonable in most cases – should check with County Highway Authority that this is the appropriate mechanism.</p>	<p>This policy does not make reference to large-scale.</p> <p>Wording will be amended to: “New development must demonstrate how walking and cycling opportunities have been incorporated and connections made to existing routes. Proposals which either adversely affect existing walking and cycling routes or fail to incorporate new walking or cycling opportunities will not be supported.”</p> <p>Noted.</p>
1005	Natural England	Policy CLW7 Statutory Consultee	Support this policy	Supportive

<b>Residents' Comments</b>				
056	Martyn Luscombe	Stratford Voice	Support	Supportive.
057	Trevor Honychurch		Strongly agree	Supportive.
064	Richard Eden		E.g. Lucy's Mill Bridge	Supportive.
081	Nicholas Oliver		In agreement. However, the statement: "Proposals which either adversely affect existing walking and cycling routes or fail to encourage appropriate new walking and cycling opportunities will be resisted" does need to be properly applied whenever such proposals are being considered, and needs to be a grounds for successful appeals against approval of such developments.	Supportive.
086	Jenny Fradgley		Strongly support	Supportive.
091	Chris Houghton		Walking opportunities should be treated as distinct from cycling opportunities and afforded separate provision.	Noted
095	Eric Ward		Strongly agree	Supportive.
116	Thelma Bates		Cycling takes place on many pavements, in the town centre and particularly on Tiddington Road. Even when there is little or no traffic, they do not cycle on the roads. Hence cycle tracks would be a waste of money.	Noted.
139	Renny Wodynska		See previous comments on cycling - add more cycle paths. Prosecute / monitor motorists and bikers who make cycling on road so dangerous.	Supportive.
174	Sarah Eglin		strongly agree	Supportive.
201	Graham John Nicholson	The Inland Waterways Assoc. (Warks branch)	Agree	Supportive.

214	Anthony Mclsaac		I support this policy, in particular in connection with cycling. Together with INF3, it will enable Stratford's potential for cycling use to be much more fully realized.	Supportive.
228	John Campton		Yes	Supportive.
295	Cllr Charles Bates		I support the proposal that 20 mph speed limits should be introduced in the Town Centre and in residential areas. However, I question the lack of a more robust policy statement on the need for proper cycle routes and any suggestions on where they could be provided.	Noted