

APPENDIX 2



**Stratford-upon-Avon Gateway Site
Framework Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

Consultation on Draft SPD 19 October – 1 December 2023

Consultation Statement

Stratford-on-Avon District Council

April 2024

Components of consultation undertaken on the draft SPD

The draft SPD was published on Thursday 19 October for a six-week formal consultation period until 1 December 2023.

The consultation comprised the following:

1. A public notice in the Stratford Herald and the Stratford, Redditch and Leamington editions of the Observer newspapers, which circulate in the Stratford-upon-Avon, Redditch and Warwick/Leamington Spa areas;
2. A specific page on the District Council's website providing links to the consultation documents and interactive comments form;
3. Email and letters sent on 19 October to Parish Councils and District Councillors; agents and developers, agencies and organisations, and residents on the planning policy database that had previously requested communications on Policy matters;
4. Letters were also sent directly to landowners of the site as well as to properties adjoining or close to the site;
5. Paper copies of the Draft SPD made available for inspection at the District Council offices and libraries in the District;
6. Two drop-in sessions were held at Stratford-upon-Avon Library on 26 October 2023 1.00pm to 5.00pm and 4 November 2023 11.00am to 2.00pm
7. A press release was issued on social media channels and issued to local media. A newspaper article about the SPD and consultation was also published in the Stratford Herald.

These means of consultation are consistent with the provisions of the District Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

Responses to the draft SPD

A total of 78 responses were submitted from individual sources, including statutory agencies, specialist bodies, Parish Councils and members of the public.

In addition, a petition specifically objecting to the purported demolition of the St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party) was submitted with 279 signatures.

The following schedule provides an outline of the comments received through the consultation, together with an assessment of them. It also identifies changes to be made in the final version of the SPD in response to these comments.

Representations to public consultation:

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Alcester Town Council	Entire document	Wish to commend SDC on quality of the SPD document in terms of presentation and ease of reference. Look forward to seeing scheme built out.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Birmingham Airport	Entire document	Provides details of Tall Buildings Policy. Birmingham Airport requires all applications for tall buildings within a 15km radius around the airport to include an aviation impact assessment. Should a proposal, including any mitigation proposals be deemed unacceptable, the Airport Company will, as the Statutory Consultee on aerodrome safeguarding matters relating to Birmingham Airport, object to that proposal. Birmingham Airport encourages Local Planning Authorities and developers to seek pre-application advice from the Airport prior to considering any tall building application.	None.	Comments noted. The site does not appear to be within a 15km radius of the airport, but Birmingham Airport will be consulted on any planning application for tall buildings or structures on the site.	None
Mrs C Wilks	Entire document	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms	Clarify BTP building is not part of the redevelopment proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	<u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained.
Christopher Ironmonger	Entire document	Object to loss of St Gregory’s Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Clare Taylor	Entire document	Objects to demolition of Boston Tea Party.	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the	Clarify BTP building is not part of the

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Coal Authority	Entire document	No comments	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Elizabeth Dixon Accessible Stratford	Entire document	Requests that any changes in the SPD that are made to facilities for people with disabilities must be replaced and improved to meet current standards. Requests more blue badge parking to be provided and easy access for all pedestrians required.	None.	Changes made to the SPD to emphasize blue badge parking will be provided.	Noted in SPD. Further emphasis to be added to requirement to provide blue badge parking in SPD document (Section 5).
Environment Agency	Entire document	Confirms that area covered by SPD does not include any watercourses or areas of fluvial floodplain based on their Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea). Provides guidance to help guide	None.	Comments noted. These procedures outlined will be adhered to during progress of the site redevelopment	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		regeneration of the area in line with the Core Strategy. This includes comments on the need for land contamination investigation to take place before planning applications are determined. Representation also provides guidance on foul drainage, water protection, water efficiency, ecology and net zero carbon.		through the planning process.	
Harbury Parish Council	Entire document	Considers idea of SPD is good but needs further consideration and more joined up planning. For example, the train service is inadequate with no direct fast trains to Stratford. Appears that no thought has been given to the provision of local transport and car parking	More joined up planning e.g. provision of local transport and car parking.	<p>Transport services such as train and bus service provision are out of scope of this SPD, however existing policies in the adopted Core Strategy (e.g. CS Policy CS.26) and the emerging South Warwickshire Local Plan deal with these issues.</p> <p>Provision of car parking has been considered within the SPD, with it being proposed (subject to land transactions being agreed) for the car parking spaces at Windsor Street MSCP to be reprovided at Arden Street car park with the potential</p>	<p>New connectivity principles added to Section 5, with a new Objective 2: <u>“Objective 2: Connectivity - Improve access through the site and stitch the site into the ‘fabric’ of the town</u></p> <p>New Connectivity Principles as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Improve connectivity across Arden Street/Birmingham Road junction and onwards towards the Canal Quarter.</u> ● <u>Improving</u>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>provision of a single parking deck.</p> <p>In addition, pedestrian and active travel routes through the site have been considered to provide more joined-up routes through the site from the Canal Quarter to the town centre. Additional development principles on connectivity have been added to Section 5 of the SPD (Objective 2 – Connectivity)</p>	<p><u>the environmental quality of Windsor Street to make it more pedestrian and cycling friendly.</u></p> <p>● <u>Exploring options for coach management drop-off</u></p>
Historic England	Entire document	<p>Supportive of SPD.</p> <p>It is important to ensure that the implication of this policy document does not adversely affect or undermine the historic, physical and social value of the historic environment.</p>	None.	Comment noted.	None.
Historic England	Vision	<p>Welcomes the Vision for the Gateway Site and especially the opportunities for celebrating heritage that can be harnessed through the regeneration of this area of Stratford.</p>	None.	Comments noted.	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		Appreciate the liaison with the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust and note that the SPD has been informed by the scoping study for the World Shakespeare Study prepared by THE SBT.			
Historic England	Understanding Context	<p>Pleased to see a section on Historical Development in the document and that narrative on the development of the town in the medieval period has been included. Consider inclusion of historical mapping is particularly useful.</p> <p>Welcome that a Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been prepared.</p> <p>With regard to para 4.15, welcome the intention that future redevelopment will be sensitive to setting of the Stratford Conservation Area and the heritage assets but consider reference to the heritage significance of assets within the site and surrounding area should be made.</p> <p>Welcomes opportunities identified for the Gateway site.</p>	Insert reference to heritage significance of assets.	References to the importance of protecting the historic environment have been incorporated throughout the SPD. A new Objective has been added on Heritage.	<p>New Objective: <u>“Objective 5: Heritage</u></p> <p><u>“Moderating heights and massing will be key to ensuring future detailed proposals will not harm Stratford-upon-Avon’s heritage townscape, while also achieving an appropriate level of visibility.”</u></p>
Historic England	Masterplan Framework	<p>Welcome the Key Principles and Development Parameters.</p> <p>Would welcome further details of linkages between Gateway site and Canal Quarter as details emerge.</p>	None.	Proposed linkages between the Gateway site and Canal Quarter will be publicly shared as planning applications are progressed.	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		<p>Stresses that building heights will need to be appropriate to their wider setting and pleased to see acknowledgement of this in 'Heights and Parameters' section.</p> <p>Consider that public realm strategy for the town as a whole would be beneficial.</p> <p>Support commitment to addressing climate emergency in SPD</p>			
Historic England	Delivery	Welcome requirement that the proposed public realm connections that cross differing land ownerships are 'joined up'. Strongly support intention to commission integrated public realm and parking strategy.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Heather Shipley	Entire document	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained."</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	plan as retained
Jay Smith	Entire document	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained."</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Jen Wade	Entire document	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated</u>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	<u>and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
John Newcombe	Entire document	Agrees with concept but would like clarification on costs, funding and timescales. Requires clarification on options following demolition of Windsor Street car park – in particular replacement of public toilets. Clarification required on bus stops.	Clarification on timescales/funding, re-providing public toilets and bus stops.	Information on delivery is provided in Section 6. Exact details on funding and timescales have yet to be determined/agreed. A note will be added to the land use parameters to clarify that public toilets will be re-provided. Bus access will be retained to Windsor Street. There is currently a temporary bus stop on Windsor Street, however bus routes are outside of the scope of this SPD.	Wording added to land use principles on pg 41 <u>“Reprovide public toilets as part of a comprehensively planned development proposal”</u>
Julia	Entire	Objects to loss of Boston Tea Party.	Clarify Boston Tea	The Boston Tea Party	Clarify BTP

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Marriot	document	<p>Not supportive of concept of SPD. Town needs recreational activities for tourists and locals and nightlife. Do not need more cafes and restaurants.</p> <p>Objects to removal of public vehicle access on Windsor Street.</p>	Party will not be demolished/ altered.	<p>building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.</p> <p>The SPD proposes a mix of uses which could include for example, community and creative spaces and education facilities that would benefit both the local as well as tourist population.</p> <p>The northern end Windsor Street is</p>	<p>building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29</p> <p><u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u></p> <p>Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained.</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				proposed to be closed to through traffic with access for private vehicles/ bus and coach access only, in order to improve pedestrian connectivity to the site from the town centre.	
Lucie Ariss	Entire document	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD.	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained."</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained.
Maria GIBLIN Amos	Entire document	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the	Clarify BTP building is not part of the

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.</p>	<p>proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained</p>
Mary Keegan Watson	Entire document	Object to loss of St Gregory’s Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	<p>The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link</p>	<p>Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
National Highways	Entire document	The topic of the SPD does not appear to relate to our interests to any significant extent. We therefore do not wish to comment.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Natural England	Entire document	Topic of the SPD does not appear to relate to Natural England's interests to any significant extent therefore do not wish to comment.	None	None required.	None.
Paul Totterdell	Entire document	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained."</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Pauline Kemp	Entire document	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained."</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Petition (279 signatories)	Entire document	Object to SPD and in particular loss of St Gregory's Hall/ Boston Tea Party.	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished or altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated</u>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	<u>heritage assets are proposed to be retained.</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Robert Howe	Introduction and purpose	The gateways to the town centre are dysfunctional because of conflicting movement.	None.	Paragraph 6.9 of the SPD states as part of the next steps before delivery of the site: "Commission an integrated public realm and parking strategy including a coach management plan for the whole town centre. This would create a sense of cohesion between the Gateway site and the rest of the town."	None
Robert Howe	Vision	There is little opportunity to increase the housing stock. Should clarify where connections will be improved to.	Clarify where connections will be made to.	It is considered that there is an opportunity to contribute to affordable housing on the site. The SPD sets out opportunities to	Add text to end of paragraph 1.2: <u>"The SPD extends the town centre offer into and through the site towards the emerging</u>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				improve connectivity in the Opportunities section in Section 4, with connections through to the Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone to the north-west of the site and to Henley Street to the south-east.	<u>Canal Quarter (to the northwest), for which a separate masterplan has already been prepared.</u>
Robert Howe	Planning Policy	<p>Adopted Stratford-upon-Avon Area Transport Strategy 2018 is left out of this section.</p> <p>How do you square the intention to deposit coach visitors in Rother Street with the market and existing traffic only to face a different pedestrian/traffic confliction in Wood Street or Greenhill Street?</p>	<p>Add in Transport Strategy.</p> <p>Clarify coach/traffic strategy.</p>	<p>In relation to the coach/traffic strategy, Paragraph 6.9 of the SPD states as part of the next steps before delivery of the site:</p> <p>"Commission an integrated public realm and parking strategy including a coach management plan for the whole town centre. This would create a sense of cohesion between the Gateway site and the rest of the town."</p> <p>It is therefore considered that this matter is already addressed in the SPD.</p>	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				Although there are many potentially relevant policy documents that will or may be applicable to the proposal, the intention of this section is not to provide an exhaustive list of documents, but to provide the main Planning Policy context for the SPD.	
Robert Howe	Understanding Context	<p>Birmingham Road is being redesigned to include cycle provision so should not be included in 'traffic/pedestrian conflict'</p> <p>Extent of pedestrian/traffic conflict in Arden Street should be extended to junction with Mansell Street</p> <p>Para 4.3 should say "the SPD boundary has been extended westwards from the Gateway site" and "extended eastwards to encompass a smaller surface car park."</p> <p>There are other gateways in the town.</p> <p>The removal of both bus and coach parking is problematic in itself and the creation of a</p>	<p>Do not include Birmingham Road in section on 'traffic/pedestrian conflict'</p> <p>Extent of pedestrian/traffic conflict in Arden Street should be extended to junction with Mansell Street</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.3.</p> <p>Amend Constraints</p>	<p>Birmingham Road has been removed as an area of traffic/pedestrian conflict in Section 4.</p> <p>SPD recommends a comprehensive review of public realm and coach parking / management.</p> <p>The listing of potential heritage assets is not within the domain of the</p>	<p>The cycle ways and bus stops in the document have been reviewed and amended where necessary.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.3 amended: "The SPD boundary extends westwards from the Gateway site to encompass the existing surface car park fronting</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		<p>multi-storey car park in Arden Street just moves the problem across the road. One of the problems with the present car parks and with the draft SDP is that both are next to existing buildings. This is not shown correctly as "overlooking from and towards neighbouring buildings' on page 30` of the draft SPD.</p> <p>On page 16 the current multi-storey site, the houses recently constructed are not shown in outline on the south side of it but the former garages are. There is a potential overlooking problem here which should be shown on page 30.</p> <p>45 Birmingham Road should be listed and 37 to 43 should be restored.</p> <p>Cycle routes need to be shown correctly.</p> <p>Bus stops should be checked. Consideration of street closures needs to be made.</p> <p>Better linkages needed with Canal Quarter.</p>	<p>map on page 30.</p> <p>Pursue listing of 45 Birmingham Road.</p>	<p>Local Authority. The SPD seeks to secure the long term future of the Listed Buildings on the site, and this has been added as a new Objective 5 to the SPD.</p> <p>The accuracy of cycle ways and bus stops have been reviewed. There is provision for continued temporary bus stop on Windsor Street taking account of street closures.</p> <p>Links with the Canal Quarter redevelopment will form part of the public realm strategy.</p>	<p>Arden Street, and eastwards to encompass a smaller surface car park fronting Windsor Street.</p> <p>Birmingham Road has been removed as an area of traffic/pedestrian conflict in Section 4 Constraints Map.</p> <p>A new Objective has been added which states <u>"Objective 5: Heritage - Make a positive contribution to the historic context including securing the long-term future of the Listed Buildings."</u></p> <p>Add text to aerial image of site in Section 3: <u>"This</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<u>image shows the context of the site in relation to surrounding built form, with the site sitting in a prominent position at the junction of Birmingham Road and Arden Street to the north. The town centre is situated to the south of the site.</u>
Roger Harding	General	<p>Alternatives for Windsor Street car park should be provided before it is demolished.</p> <p>Proposed temporary drop-off for coaches on Rother Street is impractical. Coach drop-off at Arden Street car park is more practical.</p> <p>Safe pedestrian crossing required across Arden Street.</p>	<p>Clarify alternatives will be provided before WSCP is demolished.</p> <p>Remove proposal for coach drop-off at Rother Square.</p> <p>Include requirement for safe pedestrian crossing across Arden Street.</p>	Noted. Paragraph 6.7 clarifies that parking alternatives will be explored prior to demolition of the Windsor Street car park, and the Indicative Phasing of Development,, paragraph 6.15 clarifies that the parking facility at Arden Street will be built before other structures are demolished.	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>The idea to allow drop-off for coaches at Rother Square is only a proposal at this stage – paragraph 5.15 clarifies that this idea will be explored further by the Council. If it is decided to be infeasible, an alternative approach will be taken.</p> <p>The intention is for a Public Realm Strategy to take place prior to implementation of the SPD, this will include looking at pedestrian crossings across Arden Street. Para 5.20 clarifies “In addition to proposals for pedestrian access through the site, improved pedestrian connections linking the site to Henley Street via Windsor</p>	

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				Street and crossing Arden Street into the Canal Quarter, are also indicated. The latter will be subject to more detailed proposals."	
Severn Trent	Understanding Context	<p>Paragraph 4.31 – Flood Risk Supportive of an integrated water strategy incorporating SuDS on the Gateway site.</p> <p>Suggested wording provided for policies in relation to flood risk, wastewater strategy, surface water, sustainable drainage systems, blue green infrastructure, water quality and resources provided.</p>	<p>Provide Drainage Hierarchy Policy: "New developments shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, whereby a discharge to the public sewerage system is avoided where possible."</p> <p>Provide Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Policy "All major developments shall ensure that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for</p>	These matters are already addressed within Core Strategy policies CS.4, CS.6 and CS.7, and will be considered as part of the ongoing Local Plan Review (the South Warwickshire Local Plan). The SPD does not introduce new policy or alter existing policy, it only provides guidance to existing policy. Therefore no changes are required.	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
			<p>the management of surface water run-off are included, unless proved to be inappropriate. All schemes with the inclusion of SuDS should demonstrate they have considered all four areas of good SuDS design: quantity, quality, amenity and biodiversity. Completed SuDS schemes should be accompanied by a maintenance schedule detailing maintenance boundaries, responsible parties and arrangements to ensure the SuDS are managed in perpetuity."</p> <p>Provide Blue and Green Infrastructure Policy: "Development should where possible create and enhance blue green corridors to protect</p>		

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
			<p>watercourses and their associated habitats from harm.”</p> <p>Provide Green Open Spaces Policy: “Development of flood resilience schemes within local green spaces will be supported provided the schemes do not adversely impact the primary function of the green space.”</p> <p>Provide Protection of Water Resources Policy: New developments must demonstrate that they will not result in adverse impacts on the quality of waterbodies, groundwater and surface water, will not prevent waterbodies and groundwater from achieving a good status in the future and contribute</p>		

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
			<p>positively to the environment and ecology. Where development has the potential to directly or indirectly pollute groundwater, a groundwater risk assessment will be needed to support a planning application.”</p> <p>Water Efficiency Policy: recommend that the following wording is included for the optional higher water efficiency standard: “New developments should demonstrate that they are water efficient, incorporating water efficiency and re-use measures and that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, not</p>		

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
			exceeding 110 litres/person/day.		
Steve Albon	Entire document	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained."</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Stratford Cycle Forum	Vision	Community benefits - Improving connections should also include improving active travel and making it easier to get around on foot.	Include improving active travel under community benefits.	Agreed, text will be added to this section.	Amend 'Improving connections' on page 8 to "Making it easier for people to get around on foot <u>and by active travel"</u>
Stratford Cycle	Understanding	Need to add more to paragraph 4.41 e.g. cycle parking	Bolster paragraphs on enhancing	Paragraph 4.41 (now 4.44) already notes	New paragraph 4.53 added under

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Forum	Context	Could change summary of opportunities to include improving active travel facilities and enhancing cycling infrastructure .	pedestrian and cycling infrastructure Add to summary of opportunities "Potential to improve active travel facilities, particularly by enhancing cycling infrastructure and joining it up with existing routes and other key areas of the town"	opportunity to enhance cycling infrastructure, this included cycle parking. Further text will be added to SPD in Section 4 and 5 to note need to improve active travel.	'Opportunities' to state " <u>Potential to improve active travel generally, including provision of cycle parking.</u> " Bike symbol added to 'Increasing accessibility' on page 22.
Stratford Cycle Forum	Masterplan Framework	Would want more detail on active transport and harder proposals. Cycle infrastructure should be included regarding closure of northern end of Windsor Street	Paragraph 5.4 should read "...impermeable to pedestrians and cyclists..." Add following to section about closing Windsor Street: "examine a cycle route from the railway station to Henley Street. This could be via the Arden Quarter using Stephenson Row, Gresley Close – down to Arden Street, enhanced pedestrian/cycle crossing, Mansell	Agreed re: paragraph 5.4 Provision of cycle routes outside of the site is not within the scope of the SPD. However a Public Realm Strategy is anticipated to be commissioned prior to implementation of the SPD.	Paragraph 5.4 amended to state "It is impermeable to pedestrians <u>and cyclists...</u> "

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
			Street, Windsor Street, to the top of Henley Street and on Birmingham Road”		
Stratford Town Council	Entire document	<p>Considers SPD is largely underwhelming, and much more could have been done to enhance the appeal and potential.</p> <p>SPD lacks visionary approach for a site of such significance. Deserves a plan that inspires and reflects unique character of our town rather than just meeting requirements.</p> <p>Urge SPD to be revisited so that it serves as beacon of innovation and sustainability. If SPD is delivered, will SDC consider pursuing collaboration agreement that ensure land owners are not solely driven by the goal of maximising their land holdings?</p>	Revisit SPD to enhance appeal and serve as beacon of innovation and sustainability.	<p>SPD is aligned with SDC’s Climate Change SPD and proposed viewing tower is provided for in Heights Parameters (subject to detailed planning application), in order to act as a ‘beacon’. Proposals therefore will provide for, and encourage, a beacon of sustainability to be delivered.</p> <p>Vision Statement will be amended and formation of Objectives to be inserted in SPD to bolster requirements for the site.</p> <p>In addition, the SPD has been reordered so that it is easier for users of the Plan to use and understand the document. For</p>	<p>The Vision Statement is amended as follows: “Stratford-on-Avon District Council seeks to encourage the regeneration of land to the northwest of Stratford-upon-Avon town centre to form a new ‘gateway’ into the town centre through the provision of high quality public realm and built form. The gateway site offers the opportunity to further expand the cultural and tourism offer of the town through the provision of a</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>example, Section 3 re-ordered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Description • Local site context • Site History • Planning <p>Policy Context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Context <p>Section 4 has been reordered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access and Connectivity • Open Space and Active Travel • Cultural Offer • Topography and Flood Risk • Built Form (new section) • Built Heritage • Building height • Land Use and Ownership • Challenges • Opportunities <p>Chapter 5 re-</p>	<p><u>'World Shakespeare Centre' to celebrate the life and work of William Shakespeare,</u> while extending the town centre offer into and through the site towards the emerging Canal Quarter, for which a separate masterplan has already been prepared. The Gateway site has been identified by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust as a suitable location for a new visitor attraction celebrating the life and work of William Shakespeare. The proposed World Shakespeare Centre (WSC) will anchor a broader mix of town</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>ordered, restating the objectives on Pg 37. The chapter then follows the structure of those objectives. Each objective plan is accompanied by the design requirements (renamed Design Principles).</p>	<p>centre uses, and provide a complementary addition to Shakespeare's Birthplace, the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC), and other cultural attractions around the town."</p> <p>New section on Objectives added to the SPD at pg 8, as well as pg 37. These Objectives are expanded on within pgs 38-43.</p> <p>The Objectives are as follows: <u>"Objective 1: Transition - Maximise the regenerative opportunities this site provides by virtue of its location between the</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<p><u>town centre and Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone</u></p> <p><u>Objective 2: Connectivity - Improve access through the site and stitch the site into the 'fabric' of the town</u></p> <p><u>Objective 3: Revitalisation - Regenerate an underused and underutilised area of land and improve the built form through the provision of high-quality buildings</u></p> <p><u>Objective 4: Attraction - Achieve significant improvements to the public realm in and</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<p><u>around the site to promote walking and visitation.</u></p> <p><u>Objective 5: Heritage - Make a positive contribution to the historic context including securing the long-term future of the Listed Buildings”</u></p> <p>Section 3 re-ordered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Site Description •Local site context •Site History •Planning Policy Context •National Context <p>Section 4 reordered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Access and Connectivity

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Open Space and Active Travel •Cultural Offer •Topography and Flood Risk •Built Form (new section) •Built Heritage •Building height •Land Use and Ownership •Challenges • Opportunities <p>Chapter 5 re-ordered, restating the objectives on Pg 37. The chapter then follows the structure of those objectives. Each objective plan is accompanied by the design requirements (renamed Design Principles).</p>
Warwickshire County Council	Vision	Welcomes SPD and support vision. Believes scope to broaden sustainable aspects of vision to recognise importance of responding to climate change. Would like to	More emphasis on parts of SPD which focus on the people using the space.	Noted. Climate change and sustainability are integral to the SPD	The Vision Statement amended as follows:

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		<p>see more emphasis on parts of SPD which focus on the people using the space. Believe vision would benefit from greater clarity on what is the primary use of the site.</p>		<p>and the need for the development to address these issues is woven throughout the document. In addition, there is a specific section on 'Responding to the Climate Emergency'.</p> <p>The site is primarily driven by the proposed WSC, however the other proposed uses such as housing, nighttime uses and community uses are considered equally important to create a sustainable development for the whole community.</p> <p>The Vision Statement has been amended to provide greater clarity as to what the SPD aims to achieve.</p> <p>In addition, Objectives have been added and the SPD has been reordered so that it is easier for users of the Plan to</p>	<p>"Stratford-on-Avon District Council seeks to encourage the regeneration of land to the northwest of Stratford-upon-Avon town centre to form a new 'Gateway' into the town <u>centre through the provision of high quality public realm and built form. The gateway site offers the opportunity to further expand the cultural and tourism offer of the town through the provision of a 'World Shakespeare Centre' to celebrate the life and work of William Shakespeare,</u> while extending the town centre</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>use and understand the document. For example, Section 3 re-ordered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Description • Local site context • Site History • Planning Policy Context • National Context <p>Section 4 has been reordered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access and Connectivity • Open Space and Active Travel • Cultural Offer • Topography and Flood Risk • Built Form (new section) • Built Heritage • Building height • Land Use and Ownership • Challenges • Opportunities 	<p>offer into and through the site towards the emerging Canal Quarter, for which a separate masterplan has already been prepared. The Gateway site has been identified by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust as a suitable location for a new visitor attraction celebrating the life and work of William Shakespeare.</p> <p>The proposed World Shakespeare Centre (WSC) will anchor a broader mix of town centre uses, and provide a complementary addition to Shakespeare's Birthplace, the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC),</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>Chapter 5 re-ordered, restating the objectives on Pg 37. The chapter then follows the structure of those objectives. Each objective plan is accompanied by the design requirements (renamed Design Principles).</p>	<p>and other cultural attractions around the town.”</p> <p>New subsection titled “Objectives” added to follow the Opportunity subsection, as follows:</p> <p>“ The current offices and multistorey carpark make a poor contribution to the fabric of the town. They are non-descript at best. This SPD provides a positive framework to significantly improve the built form as well as deliver a new tourist destination. To achieve the vision, successful implementation of the SPD will</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<p>deliver the following objectives:</p> <p><u>Objective 1: Transition</u></p> <p><u>Maximise the regenerative opportunities this site provides by virtue of its location between the town centre and Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone</u></p> <p><u>Objective 2: Connectivity –</u></p> <p><u>Improve access through the site and stitch the site into the 'fabric' of the town</u></p> <p><u>Objective 3: Revitalisation - Regenerate an underused and</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<p><u>underutilised area of land and improve the built form through the provision of high-quality buildings</u></p> <p><u>Objective 4: Attraction –</u></p> <p><u>Achieve significant improvements to the public realm in and around the site to promote walking and visitation.</u></p> <p><u>Objective 5: Heritage - Make a positive contribution to the historic context including securing the long-term future of the Listed Buildings”</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<p>Section 3 re-ordered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Site Description •Local site context •Site History •Planning Policy Context •National Context <p>Section 4 reordered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Access and Connectivity •Open Space and Active Travel •Cultural Offer •Topography and Flood Risk •Built Form (new section) •Built Heritage •Building height •Land Use and Ownership •Challenges • Opportunities <p>Chapter 5 re-ordered, restating the objectives on Pg</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					37. The chapter then follows the structure of those objectives. Each objective plan is accompanied by the design requirements (renamed Design Principles).
Warwickshire County Council	Context	<p>Encourage colleagues at SDC to engage with WCC Transport Planning at the earliest opportunity to help develop this aspect of the plan and mitigate the overall impact on the network. Any traffic modelling to support the development of the proposals should consider the full implications of the masterplan rather than assessing individual components in isolation, and we would look to agree the methodology and scope for the traffic modelling and Transport Assessment with you during pre-application discussions.</p> <p>There is also potential to better utilise the Stratford Park and Ride to provide transport to and from the new site, and answer some of the issues around parking. We would recommend consultation with the coach companies to address this, if they have not already been engaged in the process.</p> <p>We welcome the improved connectivity this would provide for Stratford Hospital from</p>	<p>Reference the following documents: National: Decarbonising Transport: A Better, Greener Britain; The National Bus Strategy; Gear Change - A Bold Vision for Walking and Cycling Local: Local Transport Plan; Bus Service Improvement Plan; Warwickshire Rail Strategy; Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan</p>	<p>Although there are many potentially relevant policy documents that will or may be applicable to the proposal, the intention of this section is not to provide an exhaustive list of documents, but to provide the main Planning Policy context for the SPD.</p> <p>We have consulted with the coach companies and they have provided a response to the SPD public consultation.</p> <p>Transport</p>	<p>Reference to park and ride accessibility to site will be added to Section 4 of the SPD: <u>"The town is also served by the existing Park and Ride facility adjacent to the train station at Stratford-upon-Avon Parkway."</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		<p>the town but are concerned that the SPD has not addressed the question of ensuring infrastructure meets the challenge of the demographic so it is accessible to the community as a whole. We would like to see a commitment on co-production to ensure that what is delivered is of benefit to the whole community.</p> <p>We would suggest a greater consideration of the opportunities for wider connectivity, particularly to the train station, to build on the 'Welcoming' theme. Further detail on connected cycle routes, a more attractive bus arrival/departure area, and a greater emphasis on how the new site would connect to the Canal Quarter SPD could help to present a coherent vision of the town.</p> <p>We encourage attempts to integrate SUDS wherever possible (new buildings or retrofitting to the current landscape), particularly multi-benefit SUDS which will help improve the area and the drainage. We suggest looking to use the urban greening factor metric within Natural England's Green Infrastructure framework in addition to the mandatory biodiversity net gain metric for ecological development, to ensure that the new development presents a significant improvement on the existing site. It also seems worthwhile to consider the possibility of some element of energy generation for district heat provision.</p>		<p>connections outside the SPD area are out of scope of the SPD, however existing policies in the adopted Core Strategy (e.g. CS Policy CS.26) and the emerging South Warwickshire Local Plan deal with these issues. However a Public Realm Strategy for the town is expected to be commissioned before the SPD is implemented.</p> <p>We are exploring the potential to connect the site to the District Heat network.</p>	

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
WCC	Masterplan Framework	<p>Generally supportive of principles.</p> <p>We would like to see more detail on the wider use of the site beyond the World Shakespeare Centre and wonder if the development of the site may pose a risk to the wider town offer – if visitors will come to the Gateway, “see Shakespeare” and leave again, without connecting with the rest of the town. A particular emphasis on visitor journeys and wayfinding may be of use to mitigate this and consider how visitors will experience the town as a whole. We also suggest an additional principle be added, relating to a mix of uses for the site to create a diverse space, supporting active frontages and a vibrant public realm.</p> <p>We would highlight that this site is in an area of significant archaeological potential. A detailed archaeological assessment of the site should be undertaken by appropriately qualified and experienced archaeological specialists.</p> <p>We would also highlight that the red dashed circle on the first plan on page 19 of the draft Supplementary Planning Document incorrectly suggests that the site lies further to the north than it does.</p> <p>We would also note that it is not clear what the ‘archaeological interest zone’ referred to in para. 4.57 is, where it is located, and where further information on this zone can</p>	<p>More detail on use of the site.</p> <p>Add new principle relating to mix of uses on site.</p> <p>Move red circle on Medieval Grid Pattern Map in Site History section to correct location</p>	<p>Matters such as traffic modelling and detailed junction / crossing arrangements are subject to detailed planning application proposals depending on mix of uses, quantum and densities that may come forward. Therefore it is out of scope of SPD.</p> <p>Archaeological assessments will take place during the planning application stage.</p> <p>There is already a Key Principle relating to providing a mix of uses on the site.</p> <p>Archaeological interest zone means that the site is within an area of archaeological interest (Grades 2 to 4)</p>	<p>Red circle on Medieval Grid Pattern Map moved to correct location.</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		be obtained. It is also not clear on what information this presumably defined zone is based.			
Cassandra Highley	Introduction and purpose	Fully supports proposal	None	Comments noted.	None.
Cassandra Highley	Vision	Commend the proposal on its vision for a mix of retail, food & drink, cultural, entertainment, space, greenery and residential uses. I implore the planners to make good on their vision for the Gateway to be a green space as we have lost a lot of greenery with the removal of the old rose garden and a green space here will have multiple benefits including improved wellbeing for residents and the creation of a modern space.	None	Comments noted.	None
Cassandra Highley	Planning Policy	I feel that the proposal is entirely in sync with relevant local policies, frameworks and plans.	None	Comments noted.	None
Cassandra Highley	Understanding Context	Council could not have picked a better site for the Gateway as I agree that it is high time that this eyesore area was regenerated.	None	Comments noted.	None
Cassandra Highley	Masterplan Framework	I fully endorse the concepts set out in this section and feel that the proposal is thorough in its examination of these concepts and potential issues.	None	Comments noted.	None
Cassandra Highley	Delivery	I take no issue with any point made in this section.	None	Comments noted.	None
Elaine Blatcher	Introduction and purpose	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the	Clarify BTP building is not part of the

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.</p>	<p>proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained</p>
Jane Meehan	Introduction and purpose	Object to loss of St Gregory’s Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	<p>The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link</p>	<p>Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Rebecca Vanni	Introduction and purpose	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained."</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
David Brown	Introduction and purpose	Fully agrees with purpose of development. There should be a pedestrian crossing from Windsor Street to town and clear signposting. Public conveniences inadequate. Should consider Warwickshire is a rural	Include provision in SPD for pedestrian crossing from Windsor Street to town and clear signposting.	The SPD includes the pedestrianisation of the northern end of Windsor Street which will allow for a safe pedestrian access from the Gateway site to town.	New Objective 2 added to SPD to Section 2: <u>Objective 2: Connectivity - Improve access through the site and stitch</u>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		county so parking must be maintained. The alternative car park proposed must consider the weight of electric vehicles and charging requirements & should increase overall parking capacity. A pedestrian route from the car park should give level & easy access for elderly or disabled visitors.		<p>Comments noted, the proposed reprovision of car parking will be subject to a study determining how many parking spaces need to be provided before Windsor Street CP is demolished. Access to the elderly and disabled will form part of any future proposals.</p> <p>Reference to reproviding public toilets to be added to the SPD.</p>	<p><u>the site into the 'fabric' of the town.</u></p> <p>Wording added to land use principles on pg 41 "<u>Reprovide public toilets as part of a comprehensive y planned development proposal</u>"</p>
David Brown	Vision	<p>Mostly agrees with Vision.</p> <p>Practical considerations such as public conveniences, car parking and easy attractive pedestrian access into the town should be prioritised over cafes and open spaces in the development. This would encourage residents in local villages to visit the Stratford regularly and would benefit existing cafes & other businesses in the town.</p> <p>The pedestrianisation of streets in town should be considered in parallel with this</p>	<p>Considerations such as public conveniences, car parking and easy attractive pedestrian access into the town should be prioritised over cafes and open spaces in the development</p>	<p>It is agreed that reference to reproviding public toilets should be added to the SPD.</p> <p>Providing good access through the site is a key objective of the SPD and will be added as Objective 2: Connectivity.</p>	<p>Wording added to land use principles on pg 41 "<u>Reprovide public toilets as part of a comprehensive y planned development proposal</u>"</p> <p>New Objective 2 added to SPD to Section 2:</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		<p>consultation to provide green spaces and reduce vehicle traffic the town centre.</p> <p>Proposed extended car park should contain sufficient spaces to accommodate vehicles displaced from the Windsor St car park and also those related to reduced parking on Bridge St and other streets which may be pedestrianised. There must be a joined-up approach to transport and access.</p>			<u>Objective 2: Connectivity - Improve access through the site and stitch the site into the 'fabric' of the town.</u>
Debbie Trueman	Entire Document	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained."</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Professor Lynn Martin	Introduction and purpose	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the	Clarify BTP building is not part of the

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Professor Lynn Martin	Vision	Object to loss of St Gregory’s Hall (Boston Tea Party). Gateway plan should be focused on how to revive the dead areas on Wood St and the High St rather than removing the few thriving areas. A better candidate for demolition may be current SBT building on Henley Street. The coaches might then approach a car park directly from the Birmingham Road, a more elegant solution than having coaches inching towards the current Windsor St car park.	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered. Consider demolishing current SBT building.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.</p> <p>The current SBT building on Henley Street is outside of the scope of the SPD.</p>	Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained.
Allan Cavanagh – AC Installations	Introduction and purpose	Agrees with context and proposals and potential the project has.	None	Comments noted.	None.
Allan Kavanagh – AC Installations	Delivery	Local contractors and businesses should be provided with an opportunity to bid for all levels of work.	Create portal for local contractors to bid for the project	The tendering process will follow the normal procurement process of the Council.	None.
Tim Bailey	Introduction and purpose	<p>Important that vehicle access remains along Windsor Street for access to local services. Closing access will have impact on traffic congestion and pollution to neighbouring routes.</p> <p>Directing coaches to Rother Street will cause congestion, noise and pollution. Better location for coaches would be Arden Street.</p> <p>Pedestrians will be put at risk from increased traffic.</p>	Move coaches to Arden Street.	<p>Windsor Street will remain open for vehicle access and bus/coach drop-off.</p> <p>The SPD has been subject to consultation with WCC Highways. WCC Highways will also be consulted on future planning applications.</p>	None.
Richard	Introduction	Object to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston	Clarify Boston Tea	The Boston Tea Party	Clarify BTP

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Pearson	Introduction and purpose	Tea Party).	Party will not be demolished/ altered.	building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Mrs Olwen Kelly	Introduction and purpose	Object to loss of St Gregory’s Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD,	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets</u>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	<u>are proposed to be retained.</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Jon Knight	Introduction and purpose	On page 5 there is a diagram saying it will draw people in from the canal quarter, station and town centre to the town centre. How can you draw people to the town centre from the town centre? The development would appear to draw visitors away from the existing town centre, which is already struggling.	Amend text relating to diagram on page 5.	Agreed that text should be amended. The development is intended to draw people in to the town centre from the Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone by providing enhanced linkages and pedestrian access.	Edit text below figure on page 5: "It can also draw people in into the town centre from multiple directions: the Canal Quarter, Town centre and Station Quarter."
Jon Knight	Vision	Homes and cultural sites are fine but Stratford doesn't have demand for more shops and cafes. Lack of demand for these on site.	Remove shops and cafes from proposal	It is considered that shops and cafes would complement the proposed offering of uses on the site, however agreed that the Community Benefit should be amended to include other commercial uses.	Amend Community Benefit 'Creating jobs' on pg 8 to the following " New shops, cafes <u>A mix of complementary commercial uses, including shops and cafes,</u> and the proposed

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					World Shakespeare Centre will generate employment for local people."
Jon Knight	Understanding Context	It says that the site is not currently served by public transport, but it should be noted that in the past the coach park has also been used as a bus terminal.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Jon Knight	Masterplan Framework	Unconvinced by idea site is Gateway to the town. Most visitors won't arrive that way.	None.	Most visitors arriving by coach arrive via this route.	None.
Jon Knight	Delivery	The parking plan should be done irrespective of this scheme and should be including ways to reduce the amount of vehicular traffic into the town centre. This should include ways to make the existing P&R offering more attractive, possibly by making public car parking in the town far more difficult/expensive to use for non-blue badge users.	Include ways to make the existing P&R offering more attractive.	This is outside of the scope of the SPD, however it is anticipated that a Parking Strategy for the whole town will be commissioned prior to delivery of the SPD.	None.
Sam Green	Introduction and purpose	Waste of money. Why always spend on Stratford. Studley needs spending on infrastructure.	Disagreed with premise of SPD	The redevelopment of the SPD has been a long standing ambition of the District Council. Funding will be dependent on several sources including private and public funds.	None.
Mr Peter	Introducti	The project is missing one golden	Provide bus station.	The Brief for the SPD	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Bartlett	on and purpose	opportunity, a BUS STATION , the Windsor Street Car Park is past it's sell by date , the bays are too small for the modern cars, it's not safe for people on their own , If it was knocked down and smaller one built , a welcome Bus Station could be built with the one way entrance off the main road . It would mean we could remove all the buses waiting on Wood Street, and Bridge Street and Coaches would be handy for the new Shakespeare centre for the drop off		included providing a new World Shakespeare Centre, a new Bus Station would not be possible to also provide on the site due to space requirements.	
Phil Smith - Confederation of Passenger Transport UK (CPT)	Introduction and purpose	<p>The Confederation of Passenger Transport UK (CPT) is the primary trade organisation that represents the UK coach industry. Many of our 500 coach operator members are Small Medium Sized Enterprises (SME'S) that rely heavily upon the transportation of tourists to historic towns & cities and of course Stratford Upon Avon is an iconic destination in this regard. Coach travel contributes greatly to the reduction in traffic congestion and emissions.</p> <p>Whilst the proposals outlined in this Gateway Masterplan framework should enhance the overall visitor experience to Stratford Upon Avon and therefore further increase its popularity which in turn ought to virtuously increase the volumes of business our members experience.</p>	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Phil Smith - Confederation	Vision	a) Coach Parking provision for "long stay" must be provided. Preferably free of charge. b) Central area pick up & drop off	Clarify coach parking/pick-up/drop-off	A comprehensive Coach Management Plan for the town is	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
on of Passenger Transport UK (CPT)		facilities within the town centre (historic zone) must be maintained.	arrangements.	anticipated to be commissioned prior to implementation of the SPD (see para 6.9 of the SPD) which will consider these matters. The SPD proposes for coach parking to be provided at Arden Street car park, with pick-up and drop-off at Rother Square.	
Phil Smith – Confederation of Passenger Transport UK (CPT)	Planning Policy	CPT would draw attention to Warwickshire County Council Local Transport Plan (LTP) https://api.warwickshire.gov.uk/documents/WCCC-630-116 which specifically states the following on page 93: "The need to provide better facilities for coaches to encourage them to stop in the town instead of driving through without stopping;"	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Phil Smith – Confederation of Passenger Transport UK (CPT)	Understanding Context	The context of the proposals are clear. However, CPT would reiterate that visits by coach must remain efficient to deliver and cognisant to coach passenger access to the key sites of interest.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Phil Smith Confederation of Passenger Transport UK (CPT)	Masterplan Framework	5.15 page 35: Coaches will be allowed to drop-off visitors on Windsor Street north, and potential for drop-offs at other locations such as Rother Market Square and Arden Street will be explored by the Council. The above is essential to	None.	Comments noted.	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		ensuring that coaches can lead on enabling Stratford's tourism offer to be sustainable.			
Phil Smith - Confederation of Passenger Transport UK (CPT)	Delivery	There should be no overall reduction in the total number of coach pick & drop off points nor any reduction in available coach parking spaces as a consequence of this scheme.	None.	The aim is to reprovide the same number of coach parking and pick-up/drop-off points as there are existing.	None.
James and Christina White	Introduction and Purpose	<p>The demise of Stratford town centre as a functioning centre of commerce has little to do with the lack of a Gateway to the town. Whilst some areas of the redevelopment are in need of refurbishment other areas are not and some of the sites are culturally and historically important to the town and should not be destroyed.</p> <p>The original master plan frequently mentioned an area bounded by Arden Street, Birmingham Road and Windsor Street but the more recent documentation seems to have extended this to places that are not necessarily in need of redevelopment.</p> <p>Majority of Shakespeare Birthplace properties are usually now closed and offer nothing to encourage tourism to our town. Opposed to ratepayers' money being spent on what is already an industry in decline.</p>	<p>Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.</p> <p>Disagreed with extent of redline.</p> <p>Objects to taxpayer money being spent on SPD.</p>	<p>The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the SPD has been a long standing</p>	<p>Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained."</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained.</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>ambition of the District Council. Funding will be dependent on several sources including private and public funds. Tourism is a very important source of income to the town, however the site will be designed to appeal to both local and tourists and provide a range of uses including affordable housing and community spaces.</p> <p>The redline of the SPD has been chosen in order to ensure that the redevelopment of the Gateway site integrates with the wider surroundings, from the Canal Quarter through to the town centre.</p>	
Martin Liddament	Introduction and purpose	The plan makes no reference to any evidence that there is sustainable long-term demand that it will meet. Would have expected a link to a well-evidenced tourism	Reference to evidence that there is demand for the project.	The SPD has been prepared on the basis of a Scoping Study for the site,	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		and marketing strategy that would be the main driver for the plan.		prepared on behalf of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, as set out in Section 1 of the SPD. Further data on requirements is currently being prepared to inform the project.	
Martin Liddament	Vision	<p>These are all good things to wish for, but need quantifying as solid objectives that have their own sets of measures. It is vital that the development does not become an attractive, but expensive, vanity project.</p> <p>Would also like to see more thought given to the creation of space and facilities for the creative industries.</p>	<p>Rewrite 'Community Benefits' as Objectives with measures to meet.</p> <p>More information on creation of space and facilities for the creative industries.</p>	<p>Agreed. Objectives have been added to the SPD, with their own set of development principles that development must adhere to.</p> <p>Further details on spaces for the creative industries would be provided as part of a detailed planning application.</p>	<p>New section on Objectives added to the SPD at pg 8, as well as pg 37. These Objectives are expanded on within pgs 38-43.</p> <p>The Objectives are as follows: <u>"Objective 1: Transition - Maximise the regenerative opportunities this site provides by virtue of its location between the town centre and Canal</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<p><u>Quarter Regeneration Zone</u></p> <p><u>Objective 2: Connectivity - Improve access through the site and stitch the site into the 'fabric' of the town</u></p> <p><u>Objective 3: Revitalisation - Regenerate an underused and underutilised area of land and improve the built form through the provision of high-quality buildings</u></p> <p><u>Objective 4: Attraction - Achieve significant improvements to the public realm in and around the site to promote</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<p><u>walking and visitation.</u></p> <p><u>Objective 5: Heritage - Make a positive contribution to the historic context including securing the long-term future of the Listed Buildings"</u></p>
Martin Liddament	Masterplan Framework	The illustration above 5.1 is quite important. I agree that there is a wider visitor experience to be had. I would like to see more thought given to how the site would link up with the routes to Holy Trinity church and how the environment around the church, especially the paths, could be improved and preserved. 5.2 This may be optimistic. It is something of a walk from the southern area to the proposed Gateway site and it might be difficult to persuade visitors, especially the elderly and families with children, to go beyond Shakespeare's birthplace and the restaurants and cafes on Henley street in order to reach it. There is also a need to decide what kind of visitor offer is being made at the southern part of town, around the river and the RSC as this will affect the numbers visiting the Gateway	<p>More thoughts given to routes to Holy Trinity Church.</p> <p>Clarify what will happen to the existing SBT building</p>	Routes to Holy Trinity church and the existing SBT building on Henley Street are outside the scope of the SPD.	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		<p>site. I think the current mix of uses and offers is confused and confusing, that the purposes and goals of different types of visitor are currently not combining well in terms of the facilities they have and the overall impression one gets of the town, and that there is not much that gives visitors who are looking for the "Shakespeare experience" obvious cues as to the way to go, or how Stratford thinks about them and is proactively catering for them. 5.14 Anything that reduces the number of cars parked on town centre streets would be welcome. Visually, Stratford suffers badly from poorly conceived architecture that clashes with the older buildings (as at the top of Sheep Street, for example) and especially the lines of cars and associated street furniture, all of which severely reduce the impression one receives of an historic town. It is not clear what would happen to the current Shakespeare Centre. I think the plan should make reference to that, even though it sits outside the site boundaries.</p>			
Martin Liddament	Delivery	<p>A project like this needs to be strongly managed and needs to anticipate and make provision for obstacles and setbacks of many kinds. I would prefer this section to be titled "Implementation" and to address how each phase would be reviewed before progressing to the next.</p>	<p>Change title of section to 'Implementation'</p> <p>Provide details of how each phase will be reviewed before progressing to the next phase.</p>	<p>Delivery is considered to be an appropriate section title.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Iona Webberley	Introduction and purpose	Potential to improve area, however should consider residents as well as visitors. Balance needs to be struck between needs of locals and visitors e.g impact of traffic and visitor numbers as locals live here permanently.	More consideration of residents in SPD.	The SPD has sought to strike a balance between enhancing the tourism offer of the town with meeting the needs of local residents. For example, the proposal site will include affordable housing, spaces for creative/community enterprises, and employment opportunities. The proposed WSC will also provide educational facilities and exhibits designed to appeal to a range of ages.	None.
Iona Webberley	Vision	Consideration also needs to be given to local traffic flows, for example this will now all be forced onto Arden Street if it wishes to go from one side of the town centre to the other with Windsor Street no longer being an option.	Consideration of local traffic flows	WCC Highways have been consulted on the SPD proposals and will be consulted on future planning applications.	None.
Iona Webberley	Masterplan Framework	Building multi-storey car park on Arden Street will have potential detrimental effect on visual landscape and will slow down traffic flows on Arden Street. Improved pedestrian/cycle access to the north of the town is to be welcomed.	None	The car park on Arden Street is envisioned to be one deck only rather than multi-storey. Provision of this would be subject to	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>the usual amenity/visual considerations of planning applications.</p> <p>Traffic consideration will be taken account of during the planning application phase.</p>	
Jason Lupton	Introduction and purpose	Use a local architect/landscape consultant that has experience living/working and using Stratford-upon-Avon.	None.	Appointment of contractors will be subject to the normal tendering process of the Council.	None.
Jason Lupton	Vision	<p>Little or no reference to recent development/ refurbishment in Stratford upon Avon e.g. Bell Court. The vision doesn't go far enough, the connectivity is limited and stops at the redline.</p> <p>Queries what is being done with junction at Arden Street obscuring views and pedestrian/ cycling improvements.</p>	<p>Refer to other recent developments e.g. Bell Court.</p> <p>Improve connectivity to and out of the site in the SPD.</p> <p>Clarify proposal for Arden St junction.</p>	<p>The SPD sets out opportunities to improve connectivity in the Opportunities section on pg 31, through to the Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone to the north-west of the site and to Henley Street to the south-east.</p> <p>The junction at Arden Street is outside of the scope of this SPD, however it is anticipated that a Public Realm Strategy for the</p>	<p>The Vision Statement will be amended as follows: "Stratford-on-Avon District Council seeks to encourage the regeneration of land to the northwest of Stratford-upon-Avon town centre to form a new 'Gateway' into the town centre through the provision of high quality</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				<p>entire town will be commissioned before the SPD is implemented (please see para 6.9 of the SPD)</p> <p>The Visions Statement will be amended and new Objectives added.</p>	<p><u>public realm and built form. The gateway site offers the opportunity to further expand the cultural and tourism offer of the town through the provision of a 'World Shakespeare Centre' to celebrate the life and work of William Shakespeare,</u> while extending the town centre offer into and through the site towards the emerging Canal Quarter, for which a separate masterplan has already been prepared. The Gateway site has been identified by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust as a suitable location for a new</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<p>visitor attraction celebrating the life and work of William Shakespeare. The proposed World Shakespeare Centre (WSC) will anchor a broader mix of town centre uses, and provide a complementary addition to Shakespeare's Birthplace, the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC), and other cultural attractions around the town."</p> <p>New section on Objectives added to the SPD at pg 8, as well as pg 37. These Objectives are expanded on within pgs 38-43.</p> <p>The Objectives</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<p>are as follows: <u>Objective 1: Transition - Maximise the regenerative opportunities this site provides by virtue of its location between the town centre and Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone</u></p> <p><u>Objective 2: Connectivity - Improve access through the site and stitch the site into the 'fabric' of the town</u></p> <p><u>Objective 3: Revitalisation - Regenerate an underused and underutilised area of land and improve the built form through the</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
					<p><u>provision of high-quality buildings</u></p> <p><u>Objective 4: Attraction - Achieve significant improvements to the public realm in and around the site to promote walking and visitation.</u></p> <p><u>Objective 5: Heritage - Make a positive contribution to the historic context including securing the long-term future of the Listed Buildings”</u></p>
Jason Lupton	Planning Policy	More green strategy focus would be useful, green and blue infrastructure, BNG - one 'green wall' along a car park doesn't do much for this.	More details on green strategy	Comments noted. Green Strategy will be considered as part of the comprehensive planning application.	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Jason Lupton	Understanding Context	Not enough consideration given to recent developments in Stratford upon Avon. Where are the green infrastructure strategies and connections, links with the Welcome Hills the Greenway, Bancroft Gardens, the Recreation Ground. How does it connect with riverside development? Improvements to the Birmingham Road have been proposed for a number of years, what links/improvements/connections is this doing to link with that.	More details on green infrastructure strategy and links to green areas/roads outside of the site.	Many of these matters are outside of this SPD, however it is anticipated that a Public Realm Strategy for the entire town will be commissioned before the SPD is implemented (please see para 6.9 of the SPD)	New Objective added to Section 2: <u>"Objective 4: Attraction - Achieve significant improvements to the public realm in and around the site to promote walking and visitation."</u>
Jason Lupton	Masterplan Framework	Layout wouldn't work. Should pedestrianise all of Windsor Street. There is too much focus on the buildings and structures in the document, let the landscape architect lead and the built form fitting around suitable open/public spaces rather than public realm and landscape filling the gaps. Wide streets are historic to Stratford – has this been considered. Less focus on vehicles and more on town centre improvements, pedestrianised streets improve footfall and being more revenue to businesses. How will the coaches turn around on Windsor Street if it's blocked off? Has the visual impact of the coaches been considered in this new gateway area? Has the interaction of coaches and pedestrians/cyclists been considered with this approach?	Pedestrianise all of Windsor Street. SPD should be landscape/public realm led. More details on how coaches will be managed.	It is not considered feasible to pedestrianise the whole of Windsor Street, as access is required. The SPD has had input from a landscape designer. A new objective will be added to emphasise the need for the SPD to deliver public realm improvements to the site. Access to Windsor	New Objective 4 to Section 2: <u>"Objective 4: Attraction - Achieve significant improvements to the public realm in and around the site to promote walking and visitation."</u>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				Street for coaches will remain as a result of the proposals.	
Jason Lupton	Delivery	More work needed at plan/concept stages before delivery is being proposed.	More work on planning before proposals are delivered.	The proposals will be subject to planning applications before being delivered. Planning applications will be subject to public consultation as set out in our Statement of Community Involvement .	None.
Sophie Davies – Royal Shakespeare Company	Introduction and purpose	We welcome the proposals set out in the Stratford Gateway Masterplan. We believe they have enormous potential to positively impact the town in areas where regeneration is needed most. Wholeheartedly support the proposals and look forward to playing our part in developing it. Believe that the Stratford-upon-Avon Strategic Partnership, and Town Transport Group, have vital roles to play in realising the potential of the Stratford Gateway. An effective public transport infrastructure is key to enabling Stratford to fulfil its potential as an environmentally responsible place of welcome, learning and enjoyment for people of all ages.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
George Whiteouse	Introduction and purpose	Broadly impressed, approved of part pedestrianisation of Windsor Street to provide walkable connection. Important to	None.	Comments noted.	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		consider character of new buildings, to contribute to town's heritage in modern, new and bold way.			
George Whitehouse	Vision	<p>Important for there to be visual texture expressed in these new buildings. As the 'gateway' to the town centre it should express the towns place and belong confidently and take inspiration from the historic towns existing fabric in a way that typical modern developments can't, in order to create an area everyone can be proud of and happy in.</p> <p>The development should blend in but innovatively express its own identity and location. The addition of trees, attractive street furniture and flower displays would elevate site.</p>	None.	Comments noted. Paragraph 6.14 sets out that the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust will launch a competition for the design of proposed World Shakespeare Centre.	<p>New page on 'Built Form' added to SPD, to set out existing urban grain/building footprints and character of built form in SPD area.</p> <p>Further details as to existing local site context added to SPD in Section 3, annotating photographs.</p> <p>New Objectives added to SPD.</p>
George Whitehouse	Planning Policy	This section is making a positive move in the right direction, and I generally have high hopes for the prospects of this area.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
George Whitehouse	Understanding Context	Fine balance to be made with building heights.	None.	Building heights have been carefully considered within the Parameters, taking into account the results of the Heritage and Town Visual Impact	New Design Principles added: <u>"- Provide a height gradation (i.e. height storeys get less as the building</u>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				Assessment that was commissioned for the SPD. Further design principles to be added regarding building heights.	<u>ascend).</u> <u>- Use of set backs on the upper floors."</u>
Mary Jane Donaghue	Vision	St Gregory's Hall is neither underused nor unattractive, and already provides considerable 'vibrancy and activity' within Henley Street. It is important that those buildings which currently 'work' in the context you propose, should not be altered so as to lose their charm. Otherwise you are working against your expressed aims.	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained."</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Mary Jane Donaghue	Planning Policy	St Gregory's Hall is a key building, being precisely at the point of entry shown on Image 7 of the Gateway Development Brief. So it is has more significance in the plan than its present non-listed status would suggest.	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Mary Jane Donaghue	Understanding Context	HTVIA supports objection to redeveloping St Gregory’s Hall.	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Alex Soans	Vision	<p>Supports Plan's vision.</p> <p>However, concerned that there would be difficulty attracting sufficient commercial interest (cafes, shops) to make the gateway viable given the inability of higher footfall areas (BHS, Debenhams, Bell Court) to attract development and tenants. Would rather see improvements to the existing town centre locations before creating a new 'destination'.</p>	<p>Improve town centre before creating a new destination.</p>	<p>the BTP fronts onto.</p> <p>It is anticipated that a comprehensive Public Realm Strategy for the entire town will be commissioned before the SPD is implemented. This will provide for improvements to the town as a whole.</p> <p>In respect of the Vision for the SPD, it is an opportunity to regenerate an underused area in need of improvement, whilst providing a World Shakespeare Centre and a mix of other uses such as housing, community and creative spaces and hotels as well as cafes and shops. It is considered that the WSC as well as the proposed housing would contribute towards demand for shops and cafes on</p>	<p>Amend Community Benefit 'Creating jobs' to the following "New shops, cafes A mix of complementary commercial uses, including shops and cafes, and the proposed World Shakespeare Centre will generate employment for local people."</p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				the Gateway site.	
Dr Rosalind Baker-Frampton – Gordon Moody	Vision	It is great to reduce the number of car parks and get people to use active travel when accessing our town.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Dr Rosalind Baker-Frampton – Gordon Moody	Delivery	It is really important to have designated cycle routes that are not on pavements. When you cycle on the pavement, pedestrians wander into the path, and you also have to stop at every road that joins as cars have priority. Cycle routes should be independent or on roads, which would stop pedestrian collisions and stop cyclists having to stop every 200 metres to let a car out.	None.	Cycle routes are outside of the scope of the SPD.	None.
Michael Mann	Introduction and Purpose	I totally agree with the purpose of this section	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Michael Mann	Vision	It's important to compete with our surrounding towns and cities such as Oxford, Birmingham and Warwick, with the rail links from Birmingham are an opportunity to encourage visitors, Wellington terrace is an eye sore giving visitors a poor image of Stratford-upon-Avon	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Michael Mann	Planning Policy	I agree with planning policy and artists impressions look worthy	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Michael Mann	Understanding Context	No concerns here.	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Michael Mann	Masterplan	Totally agree with master plan, sooner the work is started the better Stratford-upon-	None.	Comments noted.	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	Framework	Avon will be			
Michael Mann	Delivery	Obviously subject to funding and investment	None.	Comments noted.	None.
Morgan Powell	Vision	Document does not detail how many additional visitors it would bring into the town and what the economic and cultural benefits actually are. This needs to be substantiated and tested.	Further detail on visitor numbers and economic and cultural benefits.	The SPD has been prepared on the basis of a Scoping Study for the site, prepared on behalf of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, as set out in Section 1 of the SPD. Further data on this is currently being prepared to inform the project.	None.
Anne Prior - Wellesbourne and Walton Parish Council	Vision	Feel that there is a lack of vision in what is being proposed. The new centre for the Shakespeare centre is fine but the surrounding development is unimaginative, providing more of the same when already there are too many coffee shops, too many empty units and a lack of provision of interesting and vibrant things to do or see. We would have liked to have seen a whole focus, looking at the provision of interesting units in the town as a whole looking at who comes to the town and how much it is used by residents. We are concerned about the proposal to	More imaginative proposals and cohesive Plan. Concerned about MSCP at Arden Street.	The SPD provides parameters for development only, planning application stage will provide further details and design of the proposals. The car park on Arden Street is envisioned to be one deck only rather than multi-storey. Provision of this would be subject to	Amend Community Benefit 'Creating jobs' on pg 8 to the following " New shops, cafes <u>A mix of complementary commercial uses, including shops and cafes</u> , and the proposed World Shakespeare Centre will

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		<p>build a multi-level car park on Arden Street, blocking the light from the medical centre and potentially impacting on the hospital itself.</p> <p>The plan should include a look at everything that is on offer and put a cohesive imaginative plan together that address the issues of the whole town.</p>		<p>the usual amenity/visual considerations of planning applications.</p> <p>It is anticipated that a comprehensive Public Realm Strategy for the entire town will be commissioned before the SPD is implemented. This will provide for improvements to the town as a whole.</p>	generate employment for local people.”
Karen Stevens – Bishop’s Itchington Parish Council	Vision	Whilst we understand the benefits of the regeneration of the gateway to Stratford Town, we would like to see similar opportunities for investment outside the immediate environment of Stratford	None.	Comments noted, this is outside of the scope of the SPD.	None.
Jo	Planning Policy	Wondered if any detailed consideration has been given to developing bus services in the area and outlying areas in order to reduce car use?	Consideration of bus services.	Bus services are outside of the scope of the SPD.	None.
C Wheeldon	Understanding Context	There is very little information in the consultation documents regarding the plan to reprovide public car parking lost from Windsor Street at Arden Street. There needs to be a more joined up transport strategy such as improved park and ride, bus and train transport. Proposed parking	Provide more information on relocation of car parking to Arden Street,	The SPD sets out that it will be necessary to ascertain the appropriate quantum of parking to be re-provided at Arden Street, and to	Reference to park and ride accessibility to site will be added to ‘Access and Connectivity’ Section 4 of the

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		at Arden Street would add to congestion.		<p>determine whether it may also be appropriate to provide for coach parking at this location. Para 6.8 sets out that it would be possible to re-provide an equivalent number of spaces, a lower number, or an increased number, however this will be subject to assessment and recommendations by specialist transport consultants and subject to detail design.</p> <p>Transport strategy is outside of the scope of the SPD however the SPD notes that the site is accessible by bus (including park and ride), train and walking/cycling. Existing policies in the adopted Core Strategy (e.g. CS Policy CS.26) and the emerging South</p>	SPD.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				Warwickshire Local Plan deal with these issues.	
Simon Tagg-Wilkinson	Understanding Context	The HTVIA does not consider as yet undiscovered, undesignated buried remains of archaeological interest. Areas of previous development such as car parks may as yet contain further archaeology and it is also a requirement that the Historic Environment Record be consulted, which is not mentioned. Another area not considered is that of community engagement which would enable the public to be engaged with the development and would be a lost opportunity for Stratford Upon Avon.	HTVIA should acknowledge archaeology and HER. More reference to community engagement.	The HTVIA follows Historic England guidance and the methodology has been approved by Historic England. It is expected that assessment of any archaeological remains would form part of a pre-commencement condition for future planning applications on the site. The SPD has been the subject of community engagement and any planning applications relating to the site would also be subject to public consultation.	None.
Peter Donaghue	Understanding Context	Entire building of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party) should be retained in current state and design.	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Morgan Powell	Understanding Context	It would be helpful to know what alternative uses for the site have been considered and why this has been determined to be the best option. For example, the Council could have used much more of its land to build housing	None.	The SPD provides further guidance to the existing planning policy. This includes the Stratford upon Avon Neighbourhood Plan at Policy TC5 which already allocates the Gateway site for a mix of uses. This is set out within Section 2 of the SPD.	None.
Sue Sutton	Understanding Context	Most domestic visitors to Stratford would not be interested in a WSC, they come for the river and green space around it. Only avid Shakespeare scholars would visit, and	None.	The vision for the WSC is that it will be designed to appeal to a wide range of	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		this whole plan is obviously being planned around the SBT.		visitors including children and the local community, it will not be aimed only at Shakespeare scholars. This is set out under the Community Benefits section of the SPD.	
Sue Sutton	Masterplan Framework	Disagrees with proposal to use lay-by in Rother Street as temporary car park. I am a Blue Badge guide and at busy times the Windsor St coach park is full, with up to 3 more coaches queuing to get in.	Remove Rother Square as use for temporary car park.	Rother Square would be used as a coach drop-off area, not a temporary car park.	None.
Sue Sutton	Delivery	Disagrees with proposals. Considers it waste of money, will not enhance life of local people. Stratford should have ring road.	Disagrees with proposals in general.	The SPD proposed a mix of uses for the site that will contribute to the lives of local people, for example, enhanced pedestrian connectivity through the site, affordable housing, new public realm and green infrastructure. Wider transport infrastructure relating to the town is not within the scope of the SPD.	None.
Gerard Buckel	Understanding	Objects to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party)	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be	The Boston Tea Party building does not	Clarify BTP building is not

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	Context		demolished/ altered.	form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained
Matt Peel	Understanding Context	Please can you additionally consider the acoustic impact on neighbouring properties, for example, Bell Court can get quite loud at times with its concentration of parallel hard surfaces. Please can you additionally consider artificial light pollution on neighbouring properties and ensure lighting fixtures are fitted with appropriate louvres to eliminate glare from light sources. The new street lighting in Stratford is particularly bad in this regard.	Include need to consider acoustic impact on neighbouring properties and light pollution	Agreed, text will be inserted into the Land use principles section of Objective 3.	New land use principle added <u>“Consider and mitigate where necessary noise and light pollution impact on neighbouring properties”</u> to Objective 3 – Revitalisation.
Patricia Roberts	Understanding Context	Page 30, point 4.48 “The sense of arrival into the town from Birmingham Road is underwhelming, and lacks ‘gateway’	Windsor Street should be pedestrianised.	Most coach parties arrive from this direction to park at	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		<p>quality". My question is, who is arriving into Stratford from this direction and by what means of transport? • Visitors to Stratford come from the local towns and villages and from further afield (worldwide). • They may arrive by bus, car, train, coach, bicycle or on foot. • By far the majority of people visiting Stratford and coming into the town from the Birmingham Road direction are on foot.</p> <p>Page 30, point 4.56 "Traffic/pedestrian conflict along Birmingham Road, Arden Street and along Windsor Street." The traffic/pedestrian conflict is the main problem. The junction of Birmingham Road and Windsor Street is dangerous to pedestrians and cyclists who are coming into town. Traffic should not be coming into Windsor Street. It should be pedestrian only. If a coach station and car park are needed here, then it should be moved out of that tight junction, perhaps with entrances from Arden Street.</p>		<p>Windsor Street coach park.</p> <p>Access to properties is required for vehicles on Windsor Street, however the SPD proposes for the north end of Windsor Street to be pedestrianised with only private vehicle access and coach/bus drop-off maintained.</p>	
Chris Malam	Masterplan Framework	Disagrees with proposal, concerned about loss of historic buildings	Generally disagrees with proposal.	All listed buildings and buildings of historic note will be retained as a result of the proposal.	None.
Liz Nicholson	Masterplan Framework	Displaced parking should not be replaced with more car parking at Arden Street. Parking provision should be reduced in town to encourage greater use of Park and Ride. Development should have no private	Remove proposal to transfer car parking to Arden Street car park.	There is a need to ensure sufficient car parking to replace the parking proposed to be lost from the	None.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
		parking spaces, or accessible parking spaces only. The Windsor Street environment could be transformed through pedestrianisation, which could co-exist with coach access and drop-off.	Remove private parking from proposal.	<p>demolition of Windsor Street car park. However, the proposal will provide pedestrian and cycle links through the site which will encourage the use of walking and cycling into the town centre.</p> <p>Private car parking will be provided in accordance with our existing car parking standards, or any future replacement: https://www.stratford.gov.uk/doc/208508/name/PART%20%20clean%20version%20Cabinet%20June%202019.pdf</p>	
Caroline Noble	Masterplan Framework	Pg 37 – could service access also be required for access to car park to rear of offices at 4, 5 and 7 Mansell Street.	Include requirement for service access to rear of offices 4, 5 and 7 Mansell Street.	The SPD already includes a requirement to 'maintain service access to rear of existing properties', this includes the properties mentioned by the respondent.	None.
Tony Underwood	Masterplan	Objects to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party)	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be	The Boston Tea Party building does not	Clarify BTP building is not

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
	Framework		demolished/alterd.	form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained.
Patricia E Roberts	Masterplan Framework	Objects to loss of St Gregory’s Hall (Boston Tea Party). Seeks clarification why building is in development area and why it is being purchased. Where is the data to back up the claim that many visitors arrive from the north and use this approach into town?	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/alterd.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to</u>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	<u>be retained.</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained.
Fr. Alexander Austin OSB – St Gregory the Great Catholic Church.	Masterplan Framework	Masterplan lacks a considerable amount of necessary site information especially Development Parameters section. Objects to loss of St Gregory’s Hall (Boston Tea Party).	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered. Add site information.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>“Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained.”</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained. Development Principles have been added to and made available in new Appendix to the SPD.

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
Con McHugh	Masterplan Framework	<p>Objects to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party)</p> <p>Is more parking really needed? Sort out park and ride. The document set are at best confusing and worst grossly incompetent.</p>	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	<p>Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29</p> <p><u>"Designated and non-designated heritage assets are proposed to be retained."</u></p> <p>Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained.</p>
Vincenzo Cusolito	Masterplan Framework	Objects to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party)	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/ altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on	<p>Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29</p> <p><u>"Designated and non-designated</u></p>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	<u>heritage assets are proposed to be retained.</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained.
Bryan Cottrell	Masterplan Framework	The closure of the northern end of Windsor Street to most traffic would displace more vehicles on to Birmingham Road, Arden Street and Greenhill Street. This would slow traffic speeds and increase distances driven, resulting in worse congestion, higher carbon emissions and more serious air pollution. The closure of Henley Street to traffic has already contributed to the regular gridlocks in Guild Street. Unless and until a complete by-pass for the town is built, any further pedestrianisation of town centre streets should not be considered.	Remove proposal to close northern end of Windsor Street to private transport.	Proposals would be subject to transport assessments at the planning application stage, which would assess the likely impact of pedestrianisation.	None.
Ian Clegg	Delivery	Objects to loss of St Gregory's Hall (Boston Tea Party)	Clarify Boston Tea Party will not be demolished/altered.	The Boston Tea Party building does not form part of the proposals and will not be demolished or altered as a result of the SPD. The BTP is included within the redline of the SPD, as the area to the rear (car park) that forms part of its curtilage could be improved on	Clarify BTP building is not part of the proposals and identify clearly as non-designated heritage asset on page 29 of SPD. Wording added to page 29 <u>"Designated and non-designated"</u>

Respondents	Section/Subsection	Summary of Comments	Changes sought	Officer response	Proposed revisions
				the back of the SPD, as well as there being a proposed link up of improved public realm along Windsor St where it meets Henley Street, which the BTP fronts onto.	<u>heritage assets are proposed to be retained.</u> Building clearly indicated on page 40 illustrative plan as retained.
Leticija Petrovic	Delivery	SPD should provide focus on urban growing e.g. community gardens or urban farms. These have multiple benefits including sustainability, community engagement, environmental and health benefits, economic opportunities and educational value.	SPD should provide more focus on urban growing.	The SPD includes requirement for new green infrastructure. There is potential for community gardens within this green infrastructure.	None.

