

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

Policy SSB2

Representations: Total received 19

Number in Support: 5

Modification Proposed:

Only the minor modifications noted in the responses below and any needed to remain consistent with the Core Strategy and the NPPF are proposed.

Individual Representations and Steering Group Responses

| Code Number | Full Name | Organisation represented (where applicable) | Policy SSB2 | Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response |
|--------------------|------------------|--|--------------------|---|
| | | | | |

| Statutory Consultees' Comments | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| 1001 | Stratford District Council | Statutory Consultee | <p>The policy is generally consistent with Proposal SUA.2 in Core Strategy but it makes no reference to intention that 10 hectares is allocated for new businesses to the town and a further 10 hectares would be made available for companies to relocate from the Canal Quarter. It is unclear what is meant by "at least 20 hectares" as this is the amount of land identified on Figure 13.</p> <p>Note: the Council has proposed some further modification to this Core Strategy proposal.</p> | This will be corrected to take account of the Core Strategy |
| 1003 | WCC - Flooding | | Pg 120 - The words 'through the provision of | Add wording to show sustainable |

| | | | | |
|------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | permeable parking areas' should be removed. This is not the only technology that could / should be used to achieve this result; including it here may limit developer's ideas / options? | drainage solutions 'such as |
| 1004 | WCC – Public Health | | Consideration should be given regarding ease of access to the proposed new employment development (close to A46 and Stratford Parkway Station). If units are relocated the impact on current employees should be assessed. | para f) covers this |
| 1006 | Highways England | Policy SSB2 Statutory Consultee | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment of the development impacts on our asset will be undertaken for this development in due course | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted |

| Agents and Developers' Comments | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|--|---|
| 506 | JLL re: Alscott Estate | Policy SSB2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocated for B1 development only • Not suitable or deliverable for B2 or B8 uses displaced from SSB1 | The land allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy, which includes use of businesses relocating from the canal quarter. This SSB merely sets parameters that the NDP would wish to see implemented in any future design and development. |

| Residents' Comments | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| 025 | Jane Dodge | | I agree | Supportive |
| 048 | David Bowie | | While I understand that this follows from SSB1 I don't agree that it is the only, or a preferred, solution. I object to greenfield land being taken up, when other brownfield sites exist. Atherstone is not far away, and | SUA2 may be the only potential site for re-location of car dealerships from Western Road because of the proximity to |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | there is Long Marston (with a rail link please!) | Stratford. Plans have yet to be made for the relocation of other businesses and the sites mentioned are potential candidates The land allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. This SSB merely sets parameters that the NDP would wish to see implemented in any future design and development. |
| 056 | Martyn Luscombe | Stratford Voice | Support, subject to linkage to improvements to improve the safety of the A46 and make it suitable for the additional traffic it would need to carry. | Supportive The Highways issue will be taken into account by the Local Highway Authority and/or the Highways Agency in the detailed planning phase. |
| 057 | Trevor Honychurch | | Strongly agree | Supportive |
| 064 | Richard Eden | | Taking a strategic overview, a west side ring road between Alcester Road and Evesham road is essential. Decisions in Town should be based on this happening. An east side ring road is ultimately essential and plans should be drawn up and made available for consideration. Between these two major new bypass roads, traffic in to Town will reduce significantly. A traffic planning consultation will show the costs and benefits of each road. | The District Council is pursuing this through its allocations within the Core Strategy. Whilst the NDP would agree with and support this comment, it is outside the remit of the NDP to require or deliver. |
| 080 | Roger Francis Harris | Friends of Lucy's Mill Bridge | This development of greenbelt area should not be considered until all existing commercial properties are in full usage [Masons Road, Timothy's Bridge Road]. There are many empty units at present. | There are no plans to develop within the Green Belt. The land allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. This SSB merely sets parameters that the NDP would wish to see implemented in any |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | future design and development. |
| 095 | Eric Ward | | What is Town Square Land? I am very uncomfortable about any proposed use of greenfield land. | There are no plans to develop within the Green Belt The land allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. This SSB merely sets parameters that the NDP would wish to see implemented in any future design and development. Fig 13 Title is incorrect and will be amended. |
| 124 | John Brennan | | It seems to me that there is insufficient land allocated for industrial and commercial activities to match the growth of population envisaged for Stratford. Allocated industrial land should be increased and minimum employment densities jobs per ha. should be specified, to discourage low density employment like warehousing. Tourism is declining so no more Hotels to be allowed in this area. It might be a good idea to correct the spelling mistake in this policy. | The land allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. This SSB merely sets parameters that the NDP would wish to see implemented in any future design and development. |
| 143 | Chris Strangwood | | This proposal will increase traffic on this side of the town again. Move it near to Waitrose. | The land allocation is the responsibility of SDC in the Core Strategy. This SSB merely sets parameters that the NDP would wish to see implemented in any future design and development. |
| 182 | David White | | No to this for reasons previously explained. | If the reasons referred to are those for SSB1 then the same response applies – viz: The policies within the NDP aim to achieve this, along with the SDC CS policies. |
| 198 | Mr Laurence Moran | | I think the present trees from Birmingham Road to Timothy's Bridge line the canal effectively for the most | These comments relate primarily to SSB1. Nevertheless, these |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>part and hide the industrial premises, giving the feel of a rural canal-side walk, despite being within a built-up area. While I would be happy if new buildings replaced the industrial premises, I would want them to be hidden by the trees from the canal and towpath. I would definitely require that they were no higher than 2 storeys where they were nearest to the canal, and could only be higher further back from the canal (i.e. set back like the floors of the Bridgefoot car park.) Thus they wouldn't cast shadows on the canal. I would also prefer there to be gaps between new buildings that were at least as wide as the canal frontages of the buildings. I presume that the Premier Inn was only allowed its height because it replaced a similarly high warehouse, so I would hate to see the height of the hotel being used as a precedent for 4-storey buildings equally close to the canal.</p> | comments will be addressed in the detailed planning phase of the Regeneration Project. |
| 202 | Mr Mark Rowlands | | There should be statements relating to noise abatement to prevent disruption to nearby residents | The siting of any uses that could cause noise would be captured at the detailed planning stage |
| 212 | David Tucker | | See SSB1 above | Supportive As for SSB1, this is a recognised concern – however, the site allocations and implementation are within the Core Strategy, and will be actively pursued by SDC as the relevant planning authority. |
| 226 | Debs Campton | | Yes support proposal | Supportive |