

South Bucks Local Development Framework

Residential Design Guide - Supplementary
Planning Document

Regulation 18 (4) (b) Statement

October 2008

Purpose

This statement has been prepared and published in accordance with Regulation 18 (4) (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. It summarises the consultation taken in the preparation of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

Consultation undertaken in the preparation of the Residential Design Guide

1. The Council has amended the draft Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report, in view of the comments received in previous consultations.
2. The Council undertook a 5-week consultation on the Scoping Report from Friday 22nd June 2007 to Monday 30th July 2007.
3. The Council undertook a 5-week consultation on the draft SPD from Friday 21st December 2007 to Thursday 24th January 2008.
4. Consultation on the Scoping Report and draft SPD was carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
4. Copies of the draft SPD together with the Response Form were sent/emailed to:-
 - a. Each of the specific consultation bodies that the Local Planning Authority considered would be affected by the SPD. This included, English Heritage, English Nature and the Environment Agency; and,
 - b. Those general consultation bodies that the Local Planning Authority considered it would be appropriate to consult. A list of these is included in Annex A.
5. The draft SPD and Response Form were also made available on the Council's website during the consultation period, and indeed the Scoping Report still remains available on the website. The website also stated that should any other party wish to make comments then they may do so within the consultation period.
6. Responses to the consultation on the draft SPD could be sent to the Council either by:-
 - emailing it to LDF@southbucks.gov.uk, or
 - sending it to South Bucks District Council, Capswood, Oxford Road, Denham, FREEPOST SCE 9630, UB9 4BR, or
 - faxing it to 01895-837269.
5. The responses received have been available for inspection at the Council's office.

Annex A: Organisations/bodies consulted on the Draft SPD & SA

Statutory Consultation Bodies

<u>Organisation/Body</u>	<u>Response received?</u>
Natural England	Yes
English Heritage	
Environment Agency	Yes

Specific Consultation Bodies

<u>Organisation/Body</u>	<u>Response received?</u>
Buckinghamshire County Council (Transport Development Control)	
Buckinghamshire County Council	
Iver Parish Council	
Stoke Poges Parish Council	Yes
Fulmer Parish Council	Yes
Gerrards Cross Parish Council	
Thames Water Property Services Ltd	
Environment Agency (Thames North East)	
English Nature (Thames & Chiltern Team)	
Thames Water	
Beaconsfield Town Council	Yes
Taplow Parish Council	Yes
Burnham Parish Council	
Dorney Parish Council	
Farnham Royal Parish Council	
Taplow Parish Council	
Wexham Parish Council	
Highway Agency	Yes
South East England Regional Assembly	Yes
Government Office for South East	
Government Office for South East - Crime Reduction	
Dorney Parish Council	
Countryside Agency, South East Regional Office	
Environment Agency (Thames South East)	
Three Valleys Water	
Scottish and Southern Energy PLC	
SP Power Systems Ltd	
BT Property	
British Gas Properties	
Cable Corporation Ltd	
British Gas Connections Ltd	
Transco	
British Waterways	Yes
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	
Chiltern and South Bucks Area Office (Transportation)	
Southern Electric	
Thames Valley Area Team Planning GOSE	

Denham Parish Council	Yes
Hedgerley Parish Council	
London Borough of Hillingdon	Yes
Thames Valley Police	Yes
CABE	Yes
Bucks & Milton Keynes Biodiversity Partnership	Yes

General Consultation Bodies

<u>Organisation/Body</u>	<u>Response received?</u>
The (Burnham) Abbeyfield Society	
Elite Homes Ltd	
Hall Barn Estates Ltd	
Defence Estates (GVA Grimley LLP)	
Mono Consultants Ltd	
Bellway Homes Limited (North London Division)	
Martin Heath Associates	
DTZ Piedad Consulting (Pinewood Shepperton PLC)	
Dale Venn Associates	
RPS Planning (Fairview New Homes Ltd)	
NAI Fuller Peiser (Eton College)	
King Sturge	
Cluttons LLP on behalf of Portman Burtley Estate	
Charles Planning Associates (Swan Hill Homes Ltd)	
Home Builders Federation	
CSJ Planning (National Grid Property Holdings)	
Hives Planning (Square Foot Properties)	
Carter Planning Ltd	Yes
Stewart-Ross Associates	
James Butcher Housing Association	
Notting Hill Home Ownership	
Buckinghamshire Housing Association	
Warden Housing Association	
Paradigm Housing Group	
Guardian Housing Association	
Beacon Housing Association	
Anchor Trust	
R Clarke Planning Consultants	
Davies & Co (W H Baker Ltd)	
Network Housing Group	
Radian Group	
London & Quadrant HT	
Build Affordable Homes	
BOTRA	
RD Planning & Land Consultants(UK Land Investments)	
Housing Solutions Group	
Catalyst Housing Group Limited	
Padstones	
Abbeyfield (Gerrards Cross) Society	
The Housing Corporation	
King Sturge LLP (Watchword Ltd)	

RD Planning & Land Consultants(UK Land Investments Group)	
Alliance Environment and Planning Ltd.	
Fairview New Homes Ltd	Yes
Defence Estates	
Pro Vision on behalf of Chalfont Christian Trust	
King Sturge LLP (Town Talk)	
Trehaven Group Ltd	
Caldecotte Consultants	
Savills Commercial Limited	
Iceni Projects	
ColladoCollins Architects & Masterplanners	
Housing Unit, SBDC	
David Ames Associates	
Defence Estates - South East and Germany	
BOTRA	
Laing Homes Ltd	
Development Land & Planning Co	
George Wimpey South Midland Ltd	
Smith Stuart Reynolds	
The Planning Bureau Ltd	
Jones Day	
Tim North & Associates Ltd	
Gardham Bowerman & Bocock	
White Young Green Planning	
CSJ Planning Consultants Ltd	
Bidwells	
English Courtyard	
Mentmore Homes Ltd	
Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd	
Chiltern Hundreds Housing Association	
Alliance Environment & Planning Ltd	
Firstplan	
George Wimpey UK Ltd	
Burnham Beeches Estate Office	
Post Office Property Holdings	
Cluttons LLP	
Bidwells Property Consultants	
Raylands Mead Management Ltd	
David Little Phillips	
UK Property Investments	
Savills Commercial Limited	
Peacock & Smith on behalf of Wm. Morrison Supermarkets plc.	
Levvel Ltd	
GKA	
Beacon Tenants Forum	
Bucks Federation of Master Builders	Yes
White Young Green Planning	
GVA Grimley	
DevPlan UK	
Savills Planning Department	

Woolf-Bond Planning
 Bromford Housing Group
 Framptons
 LQ Beacon
 Guinness Trust, Chiltern Area Office
 Stoke Wood Residents Estate Management Ltd
 Slough Estates plc
 Varney Investments Limited
 Tetlow King Planning
 CABE
 Savills Commercial Ltd-Land Securities Bishop Ctr
 Hitcham & Taplow Preservation Society
 Ellington & District Residents Association Yes
 Hillmead Court Residents Association
 Wood Lane Close Residents Association
 Templewood Womens' Institute
 Neighbourhood Watch(Burnham Parish)
 Beaconsfield Town Residents Association
 Implementation & Monitoring Group, Taplow Parish Plan
 Richings Park Residents Association
 Gerrards Cross Community Association
 Buckinghamshire Community Action
 Beaconsfield Conservative Association
 Beaconsfield Town Residents Association
 Cedar Chase Residents' Society Limited
 Stockwells Residents Association
 Community Matters Bucks
 Camp Road Residents Association
 Swallow Street & Love Lane Residents Association
 Bulstrode Way Residents Association
 Wexham Parish Residents Association
 Beaconsfield Old Town Residents Association
 Moreland Drive Residents Association
 Baring Road Residents Association
 Brokengate Lane Residents Association
 Higher Denham Community Association
 Tatling End Residents Association
 Wood Lane Close Residents Association
 Denham Green Residents Association
 Burnham Community Association
 Marsh Lane Residents Association
 Neighbourhood Watch (Burnham)
 Living Streets (Formerly Pedestrians Assoc)
 The Beaconsfield Society
 Theatres Trust Yes
 Beaconsfield Campaign Group
 Farnhams Society
 Hitcham and Taplow Preservation Society
 Age Concern
 Age Concern Denham group
 Leonard Cheshire - Thames Valley

South Bucks & Chilterns Access Group	
Burnham Access Group	
South Bucks Association for the Disabled	
Bucks Association for the Blind	
Recycling Officer, South Bucks DC	Yes
Environmental Health Unit, South Bucks District Council	Yes
The Chiltern Society	
CPRE Penn Country District	
Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)	Yes
Conservation and Design Officer, SBDC	Yes
Buckinghamshire & Milton Keynes Fire Authority	
South Bucks Association of Local Councils	
Chiltern Vale Partnership	
House of Commons	
Tatling End Police Station	
Police Architectural Liaison Officer	
Thames Valley Police	Yes
Chiltern Conservation Board	Yes

Annex B: A summary of the main issues raised in the consultations and how those issues have been addressed in the SPD

Section SPD	Issues/comments	Response
How to use this guide	a) The definition of well-designed and sustainable residential development should be expanded to include reference to them being safe	a) Noted, but wording not changed. This is a Residential Design SPD not a Crime and Safety SPD.
Flow chart	a) Site Design Box should read "Sustainable <i>and Safe</i> design and Construction	a) Noted, but wording not changed. This is a Residential Design Guide not a safety guide.
1. Introduction	<p>a) Saved policies should not be endorsed as new policy and used as they always have been - saved policies need to be used in context with other national guidance (sections 1.2 & 1.4)</p> <p>b) Section 1.4 does not include key quotes on crime prevention and safety</p> <p>c) 1.4 fails to refer to several important policies and plans such as the South East Plan, Safer Places - The Planning System and Crime Prevention and the Sustainable Community Strategy for the District</p>	<p>a) Noted, wording has been changed</p> <p>b) Section 1.4.7 quotes PPS3 and refers to developments being safe</p> <p>c) Noted, SPD has been amended to refer to other guidance within section 1.4 and also in references section at end of the document.</p>
2. Principles of Urban Design	<p>a) The principles of serial vision should be applied in both urban and rural areas</p> <p>b) The layout ticked in 2.4 represents a situation where traffic will pass through where as the layout marked with a cross is advantageous having limited passing traffic and safer for children</p>	<p>a) Serial vision is covered by legibility and ease of movement principles</p> <p>b) Diagram has been replaced with suitable alternative</p>
3. Selecting the site	<p>a) Applicants should be directed to BMERC to check for existing nature conservation designations and species records</p> <p>b) Section 3.5 should include a diagram to demonstrate the principle to be applied.</p> <p>c) Wording of 3.6 is misleading in suggesting that infrastructure may only be required for "some large residential developments". All new residential developments can lead to additional community infrastructure, including police infrastructure and resources</p> <p>d) South Bucks could accommodate and expansion of existing communities into the Green Belt</p> <p>e) 3.1 Green Belt policies should be clear and fair</p>	<p>a) Noted and action taken</p> <p>b) Noted and action taken</p> <p>c) Noted and action taken</p> <p>d) This issue is not for the Residential Design Guide SPD</p> <p>e) This issue is not for the Residential Design Guide SPD</p>

	f) 3.2 second paragraph should be clearer i.e. it is important to find out whether there are any listed buildings within 10m or on the development site.	f) Section re-worded
4. Site analysis	a) Potential wildlife habitats should be considered not only in the site itself but in the surrounding area b) 4.2. It is important to note landscape features around the site as well as in the site itself	a) Noted and action taken b) Noted and action taken
5. Site Design		
5.1 Urban structure and layout	a) 5.1.1 This point is not made clear. Smaller blocks represent a haphazard arrangement in terms of traffic b) 5.1.3 More emphasis needed on provision of cycle and pedestrian routes between and across estates into open space. SBDC should review where the creation of such routes could be carried out in existing built up areas c) 5.1.4c. This layout is popular and shouldn't have been used to demonstrate a feature to be avoided. A better example of poor boundary definition is required d) 5.1.5 Towpaths should be treated in the same way as footpaths in design terms e) 5.1.6 This section could also refer to reducing crime at waterside sites f) Gated developments should be discouraged and open fronted developments should be encouraged g) More detail on designing against crime is needed h) 5.1.7 The Grad Union Canal should be considered as public space and landscape features which should be seen as an integral part of development i) 5.1.8 No figures are provided for the size of "private gardens for dwellings" or "communal garden space". A table with specific standards based on the number of bedrooms would provide more clarity j) 5.1.10 Larger residential developments	a) This diagram has been moved to section 2 and explained more clearly b) The design guide can only encourage pedestrian and cycle routes within new residential development sites c) Not only is this layout demonstrating poor boundary definition but one where the road is dominant. It is therefore a good diagram to illustrate poor layout of development d) This is a generic Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into detail about waterside development e) This is a Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into detail about waterside development f) Noted and action taken g) Noted and further detail added throughout section 5, but this is a Residential Design SPD and not a Crime and Safety SPD. h) This is a Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into specific detail about waterside development i) Noted, but difficult to stipulate size. Guidance will refer to what garden areas should include, i.e. children's space, sunlight, private area, washing. The larger the house the greater the garden area. j) This is a Residential Design SPD and

	<p>should make a financial contribution towards canal-side enhancements</p> <p>K) 5.1.11 Public art along the waterways can help contribute to a sense of place</p> <p>I) 5.1.13 Parking should be sited away from the canal-side</p> <p>m) 5.1.13 Parking guidance should refer to Appendix 6 of Local plan and interim guidance</p> <p>n) 5.1.13 More detail needed on parking/reducing crime picking up on other national policy</p> <p>o) 5.1.13 Parking cars is not a sensible way to bring activity to a street</p> <p>p) 5.1.15 Bin stores should not be sited near the canal-side, unless a barge is used to carry away household waste and recyclables from the site</p>	<p>therefore cannot go into specific detail about waterside development</p> <p>k) This is a Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into specific detail about waterside development</p> <p>I) This is a Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into specific detail about waterside development</p> <p>m) Noted and action taken</p> <p>n) Noted and action taken</p> <p>o) Noted, wording changed to ensure on-street parking isn't excessive and detracts from the street scene</p> <p>p) This is a Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into specific detail about waterside development</p>
<p>5.2 Building Design</p> <p>(Now changed to section 6)</p>	<p>a) 5.2.1 The positioning of buildings needs to be dealt with more comprehensively</p> <p>b) 5.2.3 & 5.2.4 Guidance should advise that repro design should be authentic in all ways. The LPA should also encourage the pursuit of contemporary designs</p> <p>c) 5.2.6 Guidance on dormer windows is too restrictive. Sentence 2 should be deleted</p> <p>d) Redevelopments of canal-side sites set buildings back from the canal/towpath to open up views and allow for surveillance</p>	<p>a) Noted and action taken</p> <p>b) Noted and action taken</p> <p>c) Noted and action taken</p> <p>d) This is a Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into specific detail about waterside development</p>
<p>5.3 Natural Environment</p> <p>(Now changed to section 7)</p>	<p>a) This section appear to restrict it's consideration of biodiversity to "the habitat of protected species" but biodiversity is much broader than that (see PPS9)</p> <p>b) Advice on biodiversity terminology from BBOWT & BMKBP</p> <p>c) To say district has small no. of know protected species habitats is subjective - should mention SAC and local wildlife sites</p> <p>d) Should include info on how some protected species, particularly bats and birds may use existing buildings - this is of particular relevance when the proposal involves the demolition or alteration of buildings</p>	<p>a) Noted and wording changed</p> <p>b) Noted and action taken</p> <p>c) Noted and action taken</p> <p>d) This section has been altered to include habitats of species</p>

	<p>e) Could give more examples of habitats i.e. ponds - great crested newts, native trees - birds</p> <p>f) 5.3.1 should state that the outcome of ecological survey should be used to influence design of residential development</p> <p>g) Council should consider in-house ecologist</p> <p>h) Surface treatment for waterside development should take guidance from the setting and maintenance requirements</p>	<p>e) Agreed that potential habitats could be talked about but not particular species</p> <p>f) Stated elsewhere</p> <p>g) This is not an issue for the Residential design guide</p> <p>h) This is a Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into specific detail about waterside development</p>
<p>5.4 Sustainable design and construction</p> <p>(Now changed to section 8)</p>	<p>a) 5.4.11 - suggested text on pollution control from environmental health</p> <p>b) Could include details on designing security into developments i.e. external lighting, door/window locks</p> <p>c) Floodable areas could provide opportunity for experimentation with flood-proof residential development</p> <p>d) Design guide should advise on the need to avoid hard surfaces for the on-site parking of cars etc.</p> <p>e) It should be compulsory that new development is carbon neutral</p> <p>f) The LDF should give recognition to the role of the waterways for reducing traffic congestion and providing alternative non-cars modes of transport. This applies to the transportation of construction waste</p> <p>g) Residential development close to a canal should consider various sustainability options (see BW comments)</p> <p>h) 5.4.2 & 5.4.4 should be deleted as they do not supplement existing local planning policies and therefore contravene the function of SPDs as set out in PPS12</p> <p>i) 5.4.2 & 5.4.4 The introduction of the energy hierarchy and particularly the inclusion of small-scale renewables in developments could affect the viability of housing schemes</p>	<p>a) Wording changed</p> <p>b) Noted and further references to crime and safety guidance included within the document.</p> <p>c) Flooding section refers to guidance from PPS25 (now moved to section 7)</p> <p>d) Consideration to surface material porous to allow for water drainage (This is covered in hard landscaping section)</p> <p>e) The SPD could not advise this as that would in effect be a change in local policy rather than further guidance to existing policy.</p> <p>f) This is a Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into specific detail about waterside development</p> <p>g) This is a Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into specific detail about waterside development</p> <p>h) Section 5.4 (now section 8) should be read as advice not guidance. The remainder of the document complies with PPS12</p> <p>i) Section 5.4 (now section 8) should be read as advice not guidance. The remainder of the document complies with PPS12</p>
<p>6. Submitting a Planning Application</p>	<p>a) 6.4 should refer to designing for safety and crime prevention</p> <p>b) Biodiversity survey and report can be</p>	<p>a) This is a Residential Design SPD and not a Crime and Safety SPD.</p> <p>b) The Council have adopted a Local list</p>

(Now changed to section 9)	adopted as a local requirement for validation of planning applications	which will be referred to in this section
7. References	a) Should include Safer Places: the planning System and Crime Prevention (2004)	a) Agreed
SA	<p>a) Target figure for new housing of 94 per annum is too low and will continue to drive young people and first time buyers away from the area</p> <p>b) Target for affordable homes is still to low</p> <p>c) Do the figures need updating?</p> <p>d) SA report could have been more compact and used less jargon</p> <p>e) 4.5.2 Inclusion of an additional indicator of number of "major" housing schemes achieving secured by design awards would help drive up design quality.</p> <p>f) 4.1.18 It should be left to building control to achieve the overall energy efficiency of a building. Builders need freedom of design; they do not want planning to dictate how they achieve energy savings</p>	<p>a) Noted, but this target is set by the South East Plan. The Panel's report into the Examination has recommended that the figure be raised to an average of 94 dwellings per year.</p> <p>b) Noted. This is a corporate target set by the Council. The Council's annual requirement for all dwellings is 94 per annum, so 20 affordable units' amounts to just over 20%. The figure is under review as part of the work on the Core Strategy.</p> <p>c) Figures have been updated to follow most recent AMR and current targets set by the Council</p> <p>d) A glossary have been made</p> <p>e) The quality of design will be driven up by implementation of the SPD rather than the inclusion of an additional indicator.</p> <p>f) This section refers to policy in the South East Plan</p>
General Comments	<p>a) Consultation period too short</p> <p>b) Typing errors</p> <p>c) Tables with black font on a dark blue background are not easy to read</p> <p>d) It is critical that local land use development strategies take full consideration of opportunities to reduce the need to travel etc. (PPG13)</p> <p>e) SPD should include glossary - needs to be more understandable for layman</p> <p>f) The document needs to be more substantial and should extract more material from other</p>	<p>a) The consultation period complies with the Regulations. Comments received right up to reporting to members will be considered.</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Noted and action taken</p> <p>d) It does take full account of this.</p> <p>e) Agreed and action taken</p> <p>f) The document has to be as succinct as possible, whilst providing good advice.</p>

	<p>national design guidance</p> <p>g) It is surprising that few consultees have responded, including many local parish councils</p> <p>h) More illustrative diagrams with annotations would aid understanding of the various points</p> <p>i) The Council and developers should discuss the potential of waterside sites at an early stage</p> <p>j) General comments on the design of waterside developments</p> <p>k) The SPD includes little information on light pollution from developments (Berkshire CPRE)</p>	<p>g) No comment</p> <p>h) Agreed and action taken</p> <p>i) This is a Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into specific detail about waterside development</p> <p>j) This is a Residential Design SPD and therefore cannot go into specific detail about waterside development</p> <p>k) Light pollution from residential development is likely to be minimal. Light pollution is covered under Environmental Health legislation</p>
--	---	--