



- Other Chief Officers  .....
- District Councils  .....
- Health Authority  .....
- Police  .....
- Other Bodies/Individuals  .....

**FINAL DECISION**                      **YES/NO**      *(If 'No' complete Suggested Next Steps)*

**SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS :**

*Details to be specified*

- Further consideration by this Committee  .....
- To Council  .....
- To Cabinet  6th September 2007.
- To an O & S Committee  .....
- To an Area Committee  .....
- Further Consultation  .....

## Stratford on Avon Area Committee - 18th July 2007

### Stratford-upon-Avon Urban Design Framework

#### Report of the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy

##### Recommendation

That Members:-

1. Support the amended version of the Stratford-upon-Avon Urban Design Framework.
2. Ask Cabinet to approve the document, as confirmation of Warwickshire County Council's continuing commitment to World Class Stratford.

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 At their last meeting, Members considered a report on the draft Urban Design Framework (UDF) for Stratford-upon-Avon, which had been the subject of public consultation from December 2006–February 2007. Appended to the report was the list of Warwickshire County Council's (WCC's) officer comments and suggestions to improve and strengthen the document. Members considered the report and resolved to support the publication of the UDF, and noted the County Council's officers' response to the draft, whilst referring the Committee's comments and concerns to the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy.
- 1.2 The key issues of concern have been considered, as requested. As a result of these and officer comments, several further amendments have been made to the draft document. In particular the proposed new pedestrian and cycle bridge is now shown as a 'potential' proposal, whilst the references to the Honeybourne Railway Line have been amended to reflect more accurately the status of the proposal in the existing Local Transport Plan.
- 1.3 In addition to the work and input of the World Class Stratford (WCS) Strategy Group over the past 18 months, WCC has also had a significant input on regeneration and highway matters.
- 1.4 A summary of the key aspects of the UDF is attached as **Appendix A**. A copy of the revised schedule indicating the key areas of change, since the draft, is appended as **Appendix B**. Copies of the draft UDF can be viewed at [www.worldclassstratford.net](http://www.worldclassstratford.net). A limited number of copies of the 'final draft' have

been prepared and are available in Members' rooms. These copies however are **not** public documents at this stage, since the final version will only be published once Stratford on Avon District Council (SDC) have adopted the document as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG).

## **2. Function of the UDF**

- 2.1 The UDF will be adopted by SDC as SPG. It will therefore be a key consideration, in tandem with current approved planning policy, in shaping future developments and change in Stratford-upon-Avon. It is very much a blue print for helping to deliver the vision of WCS and as a key stakeholder on WCS, WCC are being asked to approve the document.

## **3. Process**

- 3.1 The WCS Strategy Group, on which WCC is represented by Councillors Saint, Atkinson, and Mrs Dill-Russell, considered the draft UDF at their meeting on 11th June 2007 and confirmed its support for the UDF document, as finally amended.
- 3.2 SDC's Avon Area Community Committee endorsed the UDF at its meeting on 21st June, (minute awaited). SDC's Executive considered the UDF at its meeting on 2nd July, and the document will now be recommended for adoption by the Full Council of Stratford on Avon District on 23rd July (after the drafting of this report).

## **4. Conclusion**

- 4.1 The UDF has been developed by key partners, including WCC. It has been the subject of extensive consultation and discussion over many months. Approval by WCC and formal adoption by SDC as Supplementary Planning Guidance is the final step, in order to translate ideas into a working framework. The UDF will help to promote and guide future development in Stratford-upon-Avon, in line with the vision of achieving a World Class Stratford. Members are asked to support the amended version of the UDF and request Cabinet to approve the document, as confirmation of WCC's continuing commitment to World Class Stratford.

JOHN DEEGAN  
Strategic Director for Environment and Economy  
Shire Hall  
Warwick

5th July 2007

## Stratford on Avon Area Committee - 18th July 2007

### Stratford-upon-Avon Urban Design Framework

#### UDF Summary

1. The UDF provides a framework aimed at delivering positive change in the town over the next 20 years. This is in recognition that if Stratford is to realise its ambition of becoming 'world class' then physical change is required to accommodate improved facilities and a better environment, whilst safeguarding the town's key assets.
2. A key aim of the UDF is to enhance the gateways to Stratford – the tourists' "front door" – and as a result key proposals are included for Warwick Road and the Bridgeway areas, recognition made of the importance of the Birmingham Road gateway, as well as the Alcester Road corridor and the canal area, along with key proposals for the town centre.
3. The UDF comprises three sections or strategies:-
  - (i) Movement.
  - (ii) Landscape and public realm.
  - (iii) Development.
4. Key aspects of each comprise:-
  - (i) Movement – promote walking and cycling above other means; enhance cycle provision and cycle parking; improved pedestrian prioritisation, provide for a southern park and ride; potential new pedestrian cycle bridge and potential for implementing a mini tram system, recognition that buses could play a greater role within Stratford, proposed new bus/rail interchange on the Cattle Market site, address coach parking and drop off points, investigate vehicular movement across the river and around the existing Bridgeway gyratory and review parking provision. By addressing these and other issues of people movement, the UDF aims to create a platform for developing a high quality and world class transport system for the town, and recognises that the County Council has a key role to play in developing this aspiration further, through its current review of the Stratford Transport Strategy.
  - (ii) Landscape and public realm - the vision of the UDF is to help promote an 'exceptional network of public spaces and routes which set Stratford in the environment it deserves'. The thrust of this section is about enhancing the environment, creating better links and green spaces, including improving Stratford's distinctive landscape corridor along the river front and improving the town's streets and public spaces, with an

emphasis on high quality public realm and attention to lighting. In addition the UDF sets out ways to create and improve gateways and corridors into the town, enhance pedestrian walkways and create new public spaces both alongside the canal and as part of a major new wetlands area, based around the Warwick Road lands, west of the River Avon.

- (iii) Development – the UDF recognises that Stratford remains under increased competition and that there is a need to strengthen the economy through new developments on key sites. The UDF provides a coordinated framework for bringing forward key sites in the town, recognising the contribution of retail and tourism, and the need to broaden the range of attractions within the town, as well as support the evening economy and enhance the quality of leisure, hotel and conference offer in the town. Three areas are specifically identified:-
- (a) Bridgeway area and river corridor, offering a focus for major new development , establishing a key gateway and improved link between town and riverside.
  - (b) Town Centre- where smaller scale development can be accommodated.
  - (c) Industrial area around the station and canal, create a renaissance and a stronger integration with the rest of town.

Key redevelopment sites are identified including:-

- The Bridgeway area to the north of the historic core - opportunity for a major new cultural attraction, new access road, wetlands area and visitor centre, and mixed use redevelopment of existing multi storey car park, new formal gardens, new tourist welcome centre.
- Holy Trinity Church Hall site in Old Town- visitor centre, new church hall and housing.
- Within the Town Square area- Town Square Shopping centre site- new retail quarter.
- Rother Triangle and Market site – New Civic Hall and Arts Centre, improvements to Rother Market.
- Windsor St car park- improved gateway, enhanced coach facility and new commercial/ residential uses.
- Cattle Market and Arden St sites- public transport interchange, new residential and commercial/employment space.
- Canal quarter- commercial activity, including employment space, live work units and residential.

- NC Joseph site –create a gateway corridor, comprising employment/leisure site, residential and new pedestrian/cycle connection to rail station via canal.
5. Last but not least, the UDF recognises the significance of tourism and sets out key considerations for establishing a framework and strategy for tourism , to ensure key opportunities and needs are addressed and the long term sustainability of the tourism economy in Stratford is achieved.

**STRATFORD UDF FORMAL CONSULTATION - SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS & AMENDMENTS**  
2 July 2007; Version 11

**Development Strategy - Key sites**

Consultation findings	Amendments made to draft UDF	Page
<b>Birmingham Road / NC Joseph site</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large majority agree with objectives and approach</li> <li>Number suggest NCJ site would be good location for a new Leisure Centre (and associated parking)</li> <li>Concerns about the amount of residential development proposed (part of general concern about residential growth across the District)</li> <li>Whilst the idea of a new route from Cattle Market to Birmingham Road via NCJ site is seen as potentially positive, it is problematic given the location of existing dwellings and the protected status of the Village Green</li> <li>Consultees generally keen to enhance green nature of Birmingham Road with linked concerns about degree of building set back</li> <li>Concerns about approach corridor proposals being too vague and general</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New layout prepared for NCJ site taking into account existing and approved dwellings</li> </ul>	p. 151 plan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Park and Ride route to be shown via Western Road with possible route via Wharf Road (inbound) and Maybrook Road (outbound) to be indicated as preferred aspiration</li> </ul>	Plans on p.45 and p.37 show routes via both Wharf Road and Maybrook Road – this will be amended to show solid line along Western Road and dotted line along Wharf Road and Maybrook Road
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian and cycle only route to be shown running adjacent to rail line</li> </ul>	Plans on p. 43 and p.37
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No proposals to be shown on Village Green – to be kept as existing</li> </ul>	p.151 plan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape and public realm proposals for Birmingham Road revisited - (incl. showing new cycle lane under construction)</li> </ul>	Plans on p.72 shows 3m pavement which could accommodate a cycle and a pedestrian lane.
<b>Canal Quarter</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large majority agree with objectives and approach</li> <li>Support for development of this site as a quick win</li> <li>Possible issues of viability of the proposed canal bridge need to be resolved</li> <li>Some concerns over success of proposed shared space on Western Road given level of traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal change to graphics, text changes to reflect that this is an option rather than a strict layout</li> </ul>	New paragraph added on p.147
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UDF to keep alignment of proposed canal bridge and confirm nature of the crossing, i.e. bus, cycle and pedestrian. Text to reflect that bridge has merit but funding sources and location would need assessment.</li> </ul>	New paragraph added on p.147 alongside plan



Consultation findings	Amendments made to draft UDF	Page
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some suggestion that this proposal will need to consider how the site can be better integrated with the town centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Park and Ride route shown via Western Road with possible route via Wharf Road (inbound) and Maybrook Road (outbound) to be indicated as preferred aspiration (wording to be agreed with WCC to resolve any issues and concerns)</li> <li>Integration and links to town centre to be explored via more ambitious proposals for Windsor Street site</li> </ul>	<p>Plans on p.45 and p.37 show routes via both Wharf Road and Maybrook Road – this will be amended to show solid line along Western Road and dotted line along Wharf Road and Maybrook Road</p> <p>See Windsor Street plan on p.131</p>
<b>Cattle Market and Arden Street</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong support for the transport interchange function, but need to be clear what it is and what it is seeking to perform</li> <li>Civic Hall option is generally preferred, but need to consider viability and role of such a venue more</li> <li>Strong objection to Civic Hall option from site owners</li> <li>Some concern about the residential component (part of general concern about residential growth across the District)</li> <li>Significant number keen that housing component should be mixed and affordable</li> <li>Need confirmation and clarity about the Park and Ride route</li> <li>Parking numbers were queried, particularly in relation to the Station car park</li> <li>Some consultees suggested other venues/uses should be considered apart from the Civic Hall</li> <li>Concern from SDC Planning over the embankment building and impact on trees</li> <li>SDC Planning keen to confirm access on to main roads and to show pedestrian crossings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited changes to the proposed form of development shown</li> <li>Partial development of embankment to be explored – quality of landscape not considered particularly good (tree frontage to Alcester Road to be maintained) but issues re. rail agreements need to be resolved</li> <li>Suitability of linear office building reconsidered</li> <li>Station Approach drawn showing bus layout</li> <li>Right turn in and left turn out bus movement from Alcester Road has been confirmed by WCC as feasible</li> <li>Overall parking number provision reviewed</li> <li>Cottages on link to Arden St removed</li> <li>Arden Street – hospital building added to base plan and housing proposals adjusted in south west corner to take account of this</li> </ul>	<p>See plan and annotations on p.140</p>
<b>Windsor Street</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong support for redevelopment and completion of street</li> <li>General feeling that long term aim should be for removal of short stay coaches</li> <li>Some concerns proposals are not large enough to facilitate coach turning and drop-off</li> <li>Number feel the proposals should be more ambitious and comprehensive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More ambitious options presented</li> <li>Coach facility retained</li> <li>Retail unit on Windsor St (possible ground and first floor)</li> <li>Entrance archway for coaches and retail car park</li> <li>Coach park/turn around decked over, together with retail car park.</li> <li>Residential units around courtyard above decked parking</li> <li>First floor above archway overlooks Windsor Street</li> </ul>	<p>See plan and annotations on p.131</p>

Consultation findings	Amendments made to draft UDF	Page
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential pedestrian route through to the Canal Quarter</li> <li>Housing above front retail block</li> </ul>	
<b>Town Square</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General feeling proposals should be more ambitious and radical</li> <li>Potential for following suggested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Market</li> <li>Cover</li> <li>Residential at upper levels</li> <li>Multi-level retail</li> </ul> </li> <li>Need for improved design and variety indicated</li> <li>Need to encourage small and independent retailers highlighted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current aspirations for redevelopment of the site reviewed in the light of developer's architects views</li> <li>Principle of joint redevelopment of the car park generally supported</li> <li>More comprehensive car park and redevelopment of Somerfield along lines of what is proposed by developers.</li> <li>Plans to incorporate residential on upper floors</li> <li>Plan to show how entrances and routes can be widened, improved and activated</li> </ul>	See plan and annotations on p.133
<b>Rother Triangle and Market</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support for proposals</li> <li>Open and green space considered important</li> <li>Confusion over need for new route</li> <li>Confusion over re-provision of civic uses</li> <li>Potential for new venue here was highlighted</li> <li>Potential for covered market within Triangle suggested</li> <li>Possibility of pedestrianising north side of Market rather than south suggested</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given Civic Hall option not being pursued on Cattle Market, option to re-provide Civic Hall at western edge overlooking gardens is included</li> <li>UDF will now revert and propose broadly what the Town Trust feasibility report recommends, i.e. that the Civic Hall is re-provided to the south of the site which in turn releases land for redevelopment. Urban design objectives of draft UDF and Town Trust schemes are broadly complementary, so no other significant changes required.</li> <li>Text to indicate flexibility of proposal to accommodate alternative arrangements within design principles stipulated.</li> </ul>	See plan and annotations on p.127
<b>Holy Trinity Church Hall site</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site not considered a priority by consultees</li> <li>General approach supported and need for better facility acknowledged</li> <li>General feeling such a proposal is linked to proposed foot and cycle bridge issue</li> <li>English Heritage keen to discuss opportunities</li> <li>Parking considered a key issue here which needs dealing with generally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change to proposal</li> <li>SDC to discuss detail with English Heritage following adoption of UDF</li> </ul>	Text has been updated, but no major change (p.115)
<b>Other sites suggested</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waterside</li> <li>SBT Museum site</li> <li>Guild Hall</li> <li>Lucy's Mill bridge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunities for Waterside now highlighted in UDF with buildings for potential redevelopment indicated</li> </ul>	See plan and text on p.169
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SBT Museum site to be highlighted as opportunity site within UDF</li> </ul>	See plan on p.107

Consultation findings	Amendment made to draft UDF	Page
<b>Bridgeway</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall preference for Option C (Gateway)</li> <li>Floodplain concerns voiced by a number of consultees</li> <li>Clopton Bridge capacity and associated impact of traffic on Bridgeway is a common concern</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Strategy to put forward one preferred option for the site</li> <li>Preferred option is a hybrid with elements of each option in response to comments received</li> <li>Two-way working of Bridgeway will be promoted</li> </ul>	See p.108-113 – plan on p. 110 shows main revisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need for enhanced crossing capacity and to divert traffic away from Bridgeway highlighted</li> <li>• Opportunity and impact of new attraction in Bridgeway recognised</li> <li>• But need for and viability of arena (and/or arts centre) questioned</li> <li>• Parking provision highlighted as key issue</li> <li>• Listed buildings should be retained in preferred option</li> <li>• Concern that the removal of the gyratory should be tested in transport terms</li> <li>• General support for redevelopment of hotel, but, as a minimum, façade should be improved</li> <li>• A redeveloped hotel should be more related to river</li> <li>• Concern re. capping of landfill related to creation of wetlands</li> <li>• Significant number suggest proposed axis route should be 2 way throughout</li> <li>• Overall the proposed garden was thought to be unviable and excessive given Bancroft Gardens enhancement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This and other movement aspects reviewed in discussion with WCC as part of wider movement strategy updates</li> <li>• Axial route is re-introduced in final option but not illustrated as a through route</li> <li>• New major visitor attraction will be located on the leisure centre site leaving most of the Bridgefoot car park site available for open space/gardens</li> <li>• The need for Bridgefoot car park for RSC audiences is acknowledged and parking is therefore also incorporated as part of a mixed use block on the northern half of the existing Bridgefoot car park site</li> <li>• Concern was expressed at the proposals for a new hotel and high quality residential 'villa' type units between Warwick Crescent and the new 'avenue' road – these are now removed</li> <li>• New lanes/Cox's Yard type attraction leading to enlarged marina and adventure playground incorporated</li> <li>• Retained (but refurbished) Holiday Inn with new frontage to address new route</li> <li>• Landscaped coach and surface parking to north of new visitor attraction on either side of new access road</li> <li>• Wetlands and meadows landscape with visitor and education centre to be located closer in if possible</li> </ul>	
---	--	--

## Development Strategy - General

Consultation findings	Amendment made to draft UDF	
<b>Evening economy</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of consultees mentioned the lack of evening economy focus</li> <li>• Waterside is seen as a key missing link in this</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan to be produced highlighting evening attractions and foci</li> <li>• Opportunities on Waterside to be explored as part of final UDF</li> </ul>	See plan and text on p.169
<b>Security</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some general concerns re. security and lighting (related to evening uses as well as generally)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be reviewed – but no significant changes envisaged</li> </ul>	No changes
<b>Orientation</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of consultees commented on the difficulty of understanding locations of sites, a street map was suggested as an essential addition to the final UDF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street map to be produced as part of final draft</li> </ul>	Inside front cover opposite contents page

## Movement Strategy

Consultation findings	Amendment made to draft UDF	
<b>Clopton Bridge</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant concern relating to general traffic volumes in the town centre, focusing on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic management options for Clopton Bridge are being considered in detail by WCC</li> </ul>	No new text added

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(environmental) capacity of Clopton Bridge</li> <li>Strong message that options for Clopton Bridge should be explored more</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New text added as agreed with WCC, highlighting the scope of further work to be undertaken in relation to this issue</li> <li>This issue is inextricably linked to the issue of the relief road, but final UDF will not include relief road (this will be dealt with in the Vision doc)</li> </ul>	following discussions with WCC
<b>Relief Road and railway line extension</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Divided opinion on relief road, but clear message that status of proposal should be made clear in UDF to avoid planning blight</li> <li>SDC Planners make clear that any references to new relief road as a proposed policy cannot be included in the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential relief road removed from movement strategy plan in UDF but be included in the 'Vision' / 'guide' Document, highlighted only as 'Public Aspirations'</li> <li>South West Relief road will remain on the movement strategy plan.</li> <li>Railway extension to be retained on the strategy plan in the UDF to reflect current SDC Local Plan Review policy re. protection of the route.</li> </ul>	Potential relief road removed from all plans. Text on p.52 (second para) indicates status as a public aspiration
<b>Southern Park and Ride</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location of the southern Park and Ride was questioned by a number of consultees</li> <li>Suggestions that the Onion Fields site (north of junction) would be more workable and avoid destroying existing Community Woodland</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Southern P&amp;R site moved to the segment between the disused railway line and the Shipston Road, but is not shown as site specific, more a general location</li> </ul>	Plans on p.37 and p.59 show revised location
<b>Parking</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong consensus from consultees that the parking strategy is not strong enough</li> <li>Consultees feel the root of the problems with parking is not addressed</li> <li>Divided opinion on whether the provision of parking should be further reduced or increased</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall balance of the parking strategy retained, i.e. to reduce in a managed way the long stay spaces and seek to broadly retain the number of short stay spaces in the centre is appropriate for a study of this type and scope.</li> </ul>	Minor changes to wording as per WCC comments – last para. on p.45
<b>Proposed foot/cycle bridge</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major concern over footbridge</li> <li>Potential role of Lucy's Mill bridge raised by many consultees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New foot/cycle crossing is shown as 'potential proposed' in movement strategy section.</li> </ul>	Wording on p.41 section altered to reflect
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lucy's Mill Bridge annotation added to the plans – making clear this is part of a longer recreational circuit</li> </ul>	New para. added at end of walking section on p. 41
<b>Buses</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant concern that the issue of buses on Wood Street and Bridge Street has not been addressed</li> <li>Nature and role of transport interchange questioned – need to be clear on what this interchange will be (interchange between what modes and why)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buses on Wood Street and Bridge Street are an integral component of the Movement Strategy – and a key part of the good quality public transport spine running through the centre and are therefore retained but with a note to reflect the implications if they were removed.</li> </ul>	New sentence added at end of sub section on Quality bus Partnerships on p.44
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearer guidance given on the nature of the interchange at Cattle Market.</li> </ul>	Revised text on p.136 under key components

<b>Walkable core</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some concerns about nature of proposal – physical extent questioned, clarity on what vehicles are permitted required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scope/area of walkable core reduced and next-steps illustrated in action plan. Greater clarity on potential traffic management arrangements is given, but noting that implementation of this initiative would require its own study and consultation.</li> </ul>	Arden Street, Western Road and Guild Street now street route rather than shared space. Material treatment text adjusted on p.87
<b>Cycling</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General concern that both leisure and commuter cycling should be recognised</li> <li>Tramway bridge is not a permitted cycle route</li> <li>Canal tow path not suitable for cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cycling plan amended to show dotted line over Tramway Bridge</li> <li>Suitability of cycling along canal tow-path reconsidered</li> <li>Former rail line cycle route to be added</li> </ul>	See plan on p.43

### Landscape and Public Realm Strategy

<b>Consultation findings</b>		<b>Amendment made to draft UDF</b>
<b>Approach corridors</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Style and quality of approach corridor proposals questioned</li> <li>Consultees would like stronger concept and more detailed guidance</li> <li>Concern that proposals are generic solutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gateways and approach corridors section reviewed and supplemented with new graphics and text – further layer of detail added to Birmingham Rd section</li> </ul>	Gateways section revised with new plans (p.68-p.77)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key spaces are considered to be Rother Triangle and Station Approach/Cattle Market. Clarity of proposals for these sites has been reviewed</li> </ul>	Plans updated and enlarged on p.139 and p.129
<b>Materials</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriateness of design and materials in relation to local context questioned</li> <li>Concern that proposals are generic solutions which are inappropriate to Stratford's historic and unique context</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Material pallet reconsidered with less specific mention of materials – more information on quality and unit size etc.</li> </ul>	Materials text altered to be less specific – p.83, 85, 89 and 91
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced cost of maintenance relative to insertion of high quality (and higher cost) materials is highlighted</li> </ul>	New text added on p.80
<b>Shared Space</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of consultees questioned the feasibility of some of the shared space proposals, particularly those on “heavily trafficked routes”</li> <li>Consultees have requested a stronger evidence base for the shared space proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of the shared space has been reviewed – Arden Street, Guild Street and Western Road no longer shown as shared space routes</li> <li>More detail on design principles for shared space routes is included</li> </ul>	Changes on p.84-87