

Summary of main issues raised on the consultation draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Design Guide for Residential Development

Respondent	Summary of Main Issues	Action Taken and Justification
English Nature	No specific comments	Noted No action taken
Lancashire County Council	<p>No formal comments on the content of the draft SPD.</p> <p>The draft SPD is a thorough and well-presented document.</p> <p>Appendixes 1, A1 there are references to PPG7 and Circular 5/94. PPG7 has been replaced by PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas and Circular 5/94 has been cancelled.</p>	<p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Agree – have made amendments accordingly.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Section 2.4 (p.4) -The Agency is keen to be involved in any pre-application discussion where its interests may be affected, particularly with regard to Flood Risk and watercourses. The Council should therefore also refer prospective developers to the relevant statutory bodies or organisations where necessary.</p> <p>Section 2.5 (p.5) - For sites which may be at risk from flooding, PPG25 paragraph 60 requires developers to carry out a flood risk assessment to determine the effect of flooding on the site and submit it to the Planning Authority for approval before the application is determined. It is the Agency's experience that such assessments are usually submitted at a late stage following objection to a planning</p>	<p>Agree – The heading of Section 2.4 has been deleted. The text from this section has now included under the new heading Appendix A: Access to information and contact details.</p> <p>New text has been added to Appendix A. The text says, 'For more information on flood risk assessments, watercourses and flood maps please contact', the Environment Agency. The Agency's postal address, telephone number and facsimile details have been provided.</p> <p>Agree – The heading of Section 2.5 has now been deleted. The text from this section has been included under Appendix C – Planning application requirements.</p> <p>PPG25 has been added to list of relevant National planning policies under Appendix B – Planning policy context</p>

	<p>application, creating delays.</p> <p>We would therefore request that the examples of further investigations, which may be required, include a further bullet point for Flood Risk Assessments.</p>	<p>The suggested bullet point has been included in Appendix C</p>
Government Office for the North West	<p>Section 2.2 states that the SPD is primarily based upon and expands on policies in the replacement UDP. In view of this, the SPD should not yet been adopted before the UDP is adopted, as it cannot supplement policies, which have not yet been adopted.</p>	<p>Agree – In putting together the initial LDS, it had been expected that the Replacement UDP would be adopted by December 2005. However, the Inquiry closed later than initially anticipated on 25 February 2005, such that the Inspector's Report was not received until 9 September and Proposed Modifications could not be placed on deposit until January 2006. As result of these unanticipated delays we proposed that the Council adopt the SPD in the interim for development control purposes, pending adoption of the Replacement UDP. Relative to the weight that can be given to Policies R1D and EV3A in the draft replacement UDP.</p>
United Utilities	<p>Para 1.3, page 2 – United Utilities (UU) would agree wholeheartedly with the comment 'The most important factor in achieving good design is to employ a good qualified designer'.</p> <p>Many designers and householders believe that, in obtaining planning permission the Planning Officer has checked for underground utility services. They do not realise that it is the applicant's responsibility to check for these.</p> <p>We would welcome any help in making our customers aware of this issue. We have a publication on our web site and have printed leaflets available.</p>	<p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>The heading of 1.3 has been deleted, the text from this section has now been included under Part One: Introduction</p> <p>Agree – added new text to Appendix A, which says 'United Utilities have produced a Planning Application Guide and a number of other relevant publications to help with your planning application. If you would like to find out more information please contact,'</p>

	<p>Para 1.4, page 2 – Welcomes the paragraph about improving energy efficiency and minimising consumption of renewable natural resources.</p> <p>Suggest the SPD should expressly mention saving ‘potable water consumption’ within the wording.</p> <p>Para 2.3, page 4 – Within R1D, United Utilities would like another ‘bullet point’ adding to this list:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Underground utility services. <p>Para 2.3, page 4 – Please could the SPD consider householder applications requiring a statement that confirmed that they had checked for the presence of underground utility services, and none was affected?</p> <p>Para 2.5, page 5 – For very significant development which has major implications for United Utilities we have developed a ‘Utility Impact Assessment’ and would encourage this approach (similar to the concept of Transport Impact Assessments) where appropriate.</p> <p>Para 3.1.3 (2), page 10 – Thanking for the inclusion of the wording about energy and water efficient household appliances.</p> <p>The greatest use of potable water is in toilet flushing and you may wish to refer more specifically to</p>	<p>The organisation’s postal address, telephone and web site details have also been provided.</p> <p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Agree – The heading of 1.4 has been deleted, the text from this section has been revised and is now included under Principle 5 in Part Three.</p> <p>The heading of 2.3 has been deleted, the text from this section has been modified and now appears in Appendix B: Planning policy context.</p> <p>The suggested bullet point can not be added because paragraph 2.3 is quoting actual planning policy. Therefore I am unable to add new wording to an established policy.</p> <p>New text has been added to Appendix C, ‘Before submitting a planning application the presence of existing underground and overhead utility services must be investigated.’</p> <p>Agree – new bullet point has been added to the existing list of planning application requirements as set out in Appendix C.</p> <p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Agree – Under the new heading Energy and water conservation, the following point has been added</p>
--	--	---

<p>dual flush toilets, as their widespread use would play a major role in potable water demand management.</p> <p>Para 4.1, page 21 – The long-term survival of deep rooted shrubs and trees used for landscaping would be more assured if they were not planted in the vicinity of underground/overhead utility services. The roots can cause damage to our services and the tree/shrubs may prevent access, have to be removed and add to the delay/cost in carrying out our works.</p> <p>Please could we add a comment 'avoiding underground/overhead utility services'?</p> <p>Para 4.2, page 23 – In-fill developments take advantage of gaps in between existing buildings. On many occasions, these gaps have been left to accommodate major underground utility services passing through. It is more essential than ever to check for underground utility services before land is purchased or plans are developed for in-fill development.</p> <p>Please could we add a bullet point:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Check there are no underground utility services before purchasing the land or developing plans. <p>Appendix A: Para A1, page 27 Please add PPS 12 to the list.</p> <p>Appendix B: Para B2 (A1), page 27 – An important physical influence on the site is the presence of existing underground</p>	<p>'The basic fitting out of the development before the point of sale should include energy and water efficient appliances.'</p> <p>Agree – added new text under the new heading Landscaping, which says, 'Taking into consideration the depth of root and height of growths of some trees and shrubs, the location of any new trees and planting must avoid any underground and overhead utility services'.</p> <p>Agree – The following point was added to the existing list, 'Before purchasing the land or devising any development plans you are advised to investigate whether there are any underground utility services.'</p> <p>Agree – PPS 12 has been added to the list of National planning policies , which now appears under the new heading of Appendix B – Planning policy context</p> <p>The content of B2 was based upon the revised UDP EV3A. However after reviewing the document this section was deleted due to</p>
--	--

	<p>utility services. Please could you include another bullet point:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What existing utility services are under/over the site? <p>Appendix C: Page 32 - Please would you add another criteria: - 'Avoid underground/overhead utility services'</p>	<p>duplicating policy.</p> <p>This point has been included under the new heading, Appendix C.</p>
Councillor C Sweeney	<p>Fully support in contents. Anything that improves the quality of new housing developments in the borough is welcome. Clearly a lot of work has gone into producing this document, for which you and your colleagues should be congratulated.</p> <p>My only (nit-picking) comment would be that the quality of some of the pictures, including the ones on pages 7, 15 (water) are poor.</p>	<p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Agree –more suitable images have been used.</p>
G Wilcock Standish Community Forum	<p>No improvement – the guide is quite easily understood even by a lay-person like myself.</p> <p>The aims and ideals of the SPD are highly commendable providing they are rigorously adhered. To communication with residents and community groups is highly recommended.</p>	<p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Noted No action taken</p>
GM Police Architectural Liaison Unit (GMP ALU)	<p>Very concerned there is very little reference to Crime Prevention and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and request the document raises awareness of these issues.</p>	<p>Dealing with crime prevention measures and community safety issues through environmental design was covered under sections 3.1.1 (2), 3.2.4 (2) and 3.3.1 (1). In addition, on page 27 the reader has been directed to the latest national publication, Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention for further detailed guidance.</p>

<p>Request advice should be sought from the Architectural Liaison Unit (ALU) at Greater Manchester Police (GMP) by developers or designers prior to planning application submission.</p> <p>Asks to consider the following considerations:</p> <p>Page 4, (within para 2.3) make reference to the design of developments should have regard to the risk and fear of crime in the creation of a safe secure environment.</p> <p>Page 9, para 3.1.1 (2) – any dwelling whether house or apartment should have the benefit of establishing a defensible space framework to allow persons to manage their environment.</p> <p>Page 14, para 3.2.2 (7) – parking areas must be visible from properties – residents fear crime and attacks upon their vehicles if cars are not parked in view – additionally, the criminal may feel safe in the knowledge that they can commit crime in car parking areas which are not overlooked.</p> <p>Page 16, para 3.2.4 (2) – Advice should be sought from GMP ALU.</p> <p>Page 27 – Circular 5/94 Planning Out Crime (is obsolete) has been replaced by PPS1.</p> <p>Page 29 – Appendix B -</p>	<p>Noted - This information was already included on page 16. However as part of the revisions to the document this information is now included under Appendix A.</p> <p>In addition the organisation's postal address, telephone number and facsimile details have been provided.</p> <p>Para 2.3 summaries actual UDP policies however the full text to R1D states 'development will be required to create attractive living environments and deliver sustainable development through supporting crime prevention and community safety'. During the revised UDP Public Inquiry the issue of risk and fear of crime was not raised therefore I am unable to add new wording to the policy.</p> <p>Noted - As part of the editing process a number of changes has been made to improve the readability and usability of the document.</p> <p>All issues relating to crime prevention and community safety issues have now been grouped together under the revised new headings, Part Three and Part Four. The points covered under these new sections have been taken from the ODPM and Home Office publication, Safer Place: The Planning System and Crime Prevention guide.</p> <p>On page 16 the text already states that advice should be sought from GM ALU.</p> <p>Noted - has been amended accordingly</p> <p>Noted – as part of the editing</p>
---	--

	<p>Pleased if the document could incorporate the following issues as a recognition of the requirements of PPS1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promote high quality and safe environment, ▪ Promote communities, which are inclusive, healthy, safe and crime free. ▪ Good design should – be an integral part of the process for ensuring safe and inclusive villages, towns and cities, ▪ Create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine quality of life, ▪ In planning high quality design planning authorities should have regard to good practice in Safer Places – the planning system. 	<p>process, modifications have been made to Appendix B. B1 – Design Statements has now become Design and Access Statements and is included under Part Two. B2 – Site Survey Details has been deleted due to duplication of the policy.</p> <p>In the revised text Appendix A now includes the relevant national planning policies where PPS1 is mentioned.</p>
The Countryside Agency North West Regional Office	<p>We support the preparation of design guidance and we are pleased to note the reference to the consideration of landscape character in the document. However, we do not otherwise wish to make specific comment on the draft document. I should explain that this is simply an expression of our remit and priorities at this time, and should not, of course, be taken as indicating lack of interest or implying either support for or objection to the proposals.</p>	<p>Noted No action taken</p>
The Theatres Trust	<p>The issues raised are not directly to the remit of The Theatres Trust.</p>	<p>Noted No action taken</p>
Harry Gladson Interested Resident	<p>The document is put together well but I have a couple of gripes words used such as 'advise' and 'guide' are woolly and should be replaced with 'shall', 'must', 'will'.</p> <p>The motor car is now an important part of our lives and ownership expected to double in</p>	<p>Noted Individual sites are different and may require different design solutions. The purpose of the guide is not to be overly prescriptive but rather aims to provide a level of guidance in order to help find the most appropriate solution.</p> <p>Noted No action taken</p>

	<p>the next twenty years. Now is the time to plan our lifestyle so that streets and housing estates are no longer cluttered with cars.</p>	
<p>Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive (GMPTE)</p>	<p>A number of improvements were suggested to ensure that public transport, cycling and walking are catered for in more detail.</p> <p>The suggested improvements range from providing clarification on how to determine what 'easy access to public transport, cycling and walking routes' means, to providing detailed guidance on bus lay-bys and appropriate locations for bus stops.</p> <p>Para 1.4 - Should include a reference to using design to promote sustainable transport and reduce car use.</p> <p>Para 2.4 - GMPTE offers pre-application advice, so 'public transport' should be added to the list of specialist who can offer</p>	<p>Some of the suggestions put forward did go beyond the remit of the SPD however where possible and appropriate the key points were summarised into the following,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New routes should be established through the area, connecting the new development to other neighbourhoods, town centres, established strategic bus routes and railway stations. ▪ Pedestrian access to local bus/rail services should be achieved by the shortest distance and by the most direct and secure route. ▪ For the purpose of this SPD, a general guide of up to 400m is taken as a reasonable walking distance to a bus stop and up to 800m to a railway station. However these distances may vary with the topography and the quality of the service being accessed. ▪ A good bus service is defined as one with a 20-minute frequency in peak traffic hours. <p>These new points have been included under the new heading 'Convenient movement routes' within Part Four</p> <p>Noted Not applicable to this section as this section is referring to construction and performance of buildings</p> <p>Noted GMPTE's contact details have been included under Appendix A</p>

	advice.	
Fire and Rescue Service	<p>Satisfied with the overall document.</p> <p>The Fire Authority would suggest that reference be included on the provision and maintenance of access and facilities for fire appliance /fire fighting in accordance with the requirements of Section 63 of the Greater Manchester Act 1981 and Approved Document B5 of the Building Regulations 2000.</p>	<p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Agree - Under the new heading of 'Parking provision and servicing' the following new text has been added,</p> <p>'The design of the development should also allow for access and facilities for emergency and service vehicles.'</p>
GM Ecology Unit	<p>General – the Ecology welcomes the brief references to biodiversity within the document but has a number of comments.</p> <p>2.5 Planning Application Requirements - It might be worth including a reference to timing. Ecological studies can only be undertaken at certain times of the year and applicants need to ensure they have allowed sufficient time to undertake all necessary surveys prior to an application being submitted.</p> <p>3.2.3 Landscaping, private gardens and public open space - Welcomes the inclusion of the first bullet point under 1.</p> <p>3.3.3 Landscaping – Biodiversity Welcomes the inclusion of the section on biodiversity, it is rather brief for such a complex issue. We recognise that this document is not the place to include such detail, reference to other relevant guidance notes or SPD would be helpful.</p> <p>While we welcome the reference</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agree – Under the new heading of Biodiversity new text has been added, which says</p> <p>'Depending on the location of the site there may be a requirement to carry out ecological surveys, however some surveys can only be carried out at specific times of the year. The surveys will need to be submitted as part of the planning application and therefore consultation is needed at an early stage to avoid significant delays. Applications submitted without the required survey information are unlikely to be approved.'</p> <p>Noted This bullet point now appears under the new heading of Landscaping.</p> <p>Noted Under the new heading of Biodiversity, Wigan's Biodiversity Strategy has been included as a point of reference for further guidance.</p> <p>Noted</p>

	<p>to public open space and the need to provide links to the wider environment, there is a distinction between formal and informal public open space that is not clear in the SPD. Formal space will have limited value for biodiversity, while informal space has a much greater value. It would therefore not normally be acceptable to use formal public open space as mitigation for loss of any habitats or green corridors.</p> <p>Annex A - Recommend that PPS9 be included in the list of national policies as it has implications for the design of residential developments.</p> <p>Annex B - A.2 It might be more accurate to use “animal species” instead of “ecological species”. Alternatively, suggest that the wording is changed to the following:</p> <p>“What are the existing natural features on and adjacent to the site, including trees, hedgerows, other habitats and species including green corridors”.</p>	<p>The existing text has been revised in order to clarify the distinction. Under the new heading of Biodiversity the revised text says,</p> <p>‘In order to provide opportunities to enhance biodiversity, any informal outdoor spaces should make use of existing features and where appropriate provide new natural features that will contribute to Wigan’s biodiversity.’</p> <p>PPS9 has been added to list of relevant National planning policies under Appendix B – Planning policy context</p> <p>As part of the editing process, section B2 – Site survey details has now been deleted due this section duplicating policy EV3A</p>
British Waterways	<p>The SPD should make reference to the contribution of the Leeds and Liverpool Canal to the character of the locality.</p> <p>Developers should be advised that where a residential development site lies adjacent to or in the vicinity of the waterway, there are number of principles that should be applied.</p> <p>A number of principles were suggested, which ranged from the waterway should be viewed as an integral part of the wider network, not viewed in isolation to that the Government encourages the use of planning conditions, obligations or agreements as tools to secure waterways improvements.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>A number of the suggested principles put forward did go beyond the remit of the SPD however under Appendix A the following new text was added, ‘For advice relating to sites located adjacent to and/or in the vicinity of waterways, please contact, the organisation’s contact details has been provided.</p>

<p>Highways Agency</p>	<p>Para 2.4, page 4: Dealing with Pre-application Discussions – should be strengthened to ensure early discussions take place with the Highways where appropriate. This should then help to avoid potentially significant delays. To strengthen this.</p> <p>Paragraph 1 would suggest the following, or similar text be added. “Where a development is located near to or would have an impact on the trunk road or motorway network developers should contact the Highways Agency at time earliest possible time.”</p>	<p>Agree – added new text to Appendix A which says, ‘Early discussions are welcome in particular where a development is located near to or would have an impact on the trunk road or motorway network.’ The Agency’s contact details were added.</p>
<p>Karen Mitchinson Interested Resident</p>	<p>Page 14 – Car parking should be increased to 2 cars per household. Most households have at least 2 cars. Lack of parking means streets are overcrowded with vehicles.</p> <p>All new houses built should have a private driveway with parking for at least 2 cars.</p> <p>All estates should have speed ramps in roads.</p>	<p>Noted The Council’s car parking standards are based on regional and national standards.</p> <p>The parking provision is based upon the Council’s standards.</p> <p>In order to ensure road safety any new development must comply with Council’s Engineers standards</p>
<p>Peter Sargeant, Golborne Interested Resident</p>	<p>Page 18 - 3.3.3 (4) ‘the ownership, function and maintenance responsibility...’ Questions whether is it sensible to advocate a new forest of signs indicating who own and, who is responsible for, the maintenance of areas of land?</p> <p>Highlights a discrepancy between 1.3 that says the guide is not prescriptive and 3.2.2 (5) where min interface distances are required.</p> <p>Questions the interface distance measurements in particular why the distances are specified to the one decimal place. He argues</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agree – the document has been reformatted in order to make a clear distinction between meeting set requirements and considering a number of detailed design points. Therefore, Part Three and Part Four has been substantially revised.</p> <p>The dimensions provided reflect the standards set in the revised UDP, policy (R1D). The measurements have been set to</p>

	<p>that 0.2 is less than 2% of 12.2 and 0.5 is little more than 2% of 21.5. One decimal place is little more than the thickness of line on a drawing. Asks what the Council is trying to achieve and is 21.5 is actually adequate.</p> <p>An analysis was provided about the use of inappropriate language, spelling, punctuation, hyphens, textual errors and the use of capitals and jargon. Numerous suggestions were provided.</p> <p>Highlighted numerous references issues</p> <p>Suggests whether 1.5 is really necessary.</p>	<p>one decimal place because the dimensions have been converted into metric from earlier imperial measurements. The Inspector at the UDP Public Inquiry answered your question relating to 'what the Council is trying to achieve'. Please refer to section 8.104 of the Inspector's Report on the Draft Replacement Plan.</p> <p>Noted The SPD went through a rigorous Plain English review undertaken by trained staff. Numerous changes have now been made to the text and presentation of the SPD for the purposes of clarity and consistency.</p> <p>Noted – amendments have been made accordingly</p> <p>Noted - The document has been written for a wide audience and as a result needs to use clear and understandable terms. This approach also complies with the Council's approach to use Plain English.</p>
<p>W Fielding</p> <p>Interested Resident</p>	<p>2.3 Regard to visual amenity of street – Does not seem to apply to Wigan Lane</p> <p>2.4 Protected Trees – Are developers ever made to replace trees they have deliberately removed hoping nothing will be done.</p> <p>3.1.1 Overlooking Opportunities – What about apartment blocks springing up all over Wigan.</p> <p>3.1.2 Character and Identity – Too late for Orrell, Standish and Wigan Lane.</p> <p>Questions the car parking provision.</p>	<p>Once the SPD is formally adopted the guide will be applied boroughwide.</p> <p>Yes, the Council's Trees and Landscape Officer is consulted on planning applications where trees are involved. In some cases, replacement planting is required, where appropriate.</p> <p>The issue of overlooking and respecting privacy levels is assessed as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>To better define 'character' and 'identity' the wording in the revised draft SPD has been amended.</p> <p>The Council's car parking standards are based on regional and national standards.</p>

	<p>3.2.3 (3) Private gardens How often will recommendations occur?</p> <p>3.3.2 (3) Finding your way around the development - Has anyone from planning tried to deliver around the Holgate and Wentworth Gardens Development in Orrell.</p> <p>3.3.3(3) Bio-diversity I am sure the developers will find their way around this.</p> <p>4.1 Car parking provision (Apartments) - "Car parking provision must be investigated" – This does not imply something will HAVE to be done.</p> <p>Appendix A (A1- Housing) "Sensitive to the needs of people and the impact it has on the environment" - Cynical laughter is ringing round Orrell, Standish and Wigan Lane.</p> <p>Affordable Housing (request in Wigan Evening Post) Mr Layland says, "From next April we can insist a percentage of houses will be affordable". Unfortunately CAN is a long way from WILL.</p>	<p>As part of the editing process the required standards have been omitted to ensure a flexible design approach is possible.</p> <p>The guide stresses the importance of a legible and accessible environment.</p> <p>In order to deliver high-quality environments the guide encourages new and better design solutions.</p> <p>Underground and undercroft car parking provision is not always feasible but maybe more appropriate on other sites.</p> <p>"Sensitive to the needs..." is a direct quote from government planning policy, Planning Policy 3, Housing.</p> <p>The Council has prepared a SPD on 'Affordable Housing Provision in New Residential Developments'. This SPD will only become operational following the formal adoption of the UDP.</p>
--	--	--