

Appendix A

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

| Respondent | Summary of Main Issues | Action Taken and Justification |
|--|--|---|
| Government Office for the North West | Do not wish to offer any further comments at this stage | Noted No action taken |
| GM Police Architectural Liaison Unit (GMP ALU) | <p>Principle 3 (pg6) Asks for clarification on how the Council verifies planning application that has considered crime prevention measures when it is the responsibility of GMP ALU to do so.</p> <p>Pg 6 – Typo, need to change Group to Unit</p> <p>Parking (pg13) Does not consider that the SPD has afforded appropriate credence to the issue of overlooking car parking areas and that criminals may feel safe to commit a crime if the car parking area is not overlooked.</p> <p>Physical protection (pg 19) Secure By Design (SBD) should be embraced as a guide to designing out crime</p> <p>Maintaining privacy to ground floor residents (pg 21) The principle of SBD (see pg 19) discusses the need to create defensible spaces. Permitting</p> | <p>The verification process is to check that the applicant has liaised with GMP ALU and that the recommendations GMP ALU have made have been addressed accordingly.</p> <p>Agree – the change has been made</p> <p>Under the existing heading, ‘Surveillance’ – the first paragraph has been amended to include the words ‘car parking area’.</p> <p>‘The layout and design of the development must maximise opportunities to overlook streets, car parking areas and any public spaces throughout the day and evening,....’</p> <p>Secured By Design has been embraced within the SPD under the heading ‘Physical protection’ where the second paragraph says,</p> <p>“The Secured by Design initiative offers in-depth advice on physical protection as part of a broad approach to designing out crime. It also sets out technical standards for building security and is an essential part of the crime prevention toolkit.”</p> <p>Disagree – The photograph of the apartment block does show a line of bollards forming the site boundary and the apartment sitting slightly back from this boundary</p> |

| | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| | <p>apartments and houses to sit up to the back of pavement does not provide the necessary level of privacy. 'Goal posts' are painted on gable ends of houses, which sit in this position, the consequence of which often results in balls and children's feet banging on the house wall. This is not conducive to community interaction and harmony. The photo of the apartment block with amenity rooms on the public realm is not a good example of maintaining community harmony or minimising nuisance and disorder.</p> <p>Example 2 (pg 23) The preferred option is to permit access into a rear space with no development over. If the overpass is essential the opening should be gated to restrict the covered area becoming a 'comfort zone' for miscreants.</p> <p>Pg 27 Need to correct the GMP ALU's telephone number, add e-mail and web site address</p> <p>Pg32 No direct reference to designing out crime is referred to as a requirement of the Design and Access Statement</p> | <p>edge. I would consider this photograph worthy of retention as it shows how a high density development has successfully dealt with the constraints associated with a town centre site. In addition it is unlikely that this block would provide the opportunity as a football target because it directly fronts onto a busy, main road.</p> <p>The Council is not aware of any new build apartments/houses within the borough where this type of activity has occurred. This SPD, the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and working in partnership with GMP ALU demonstrate the Council's commitment to tackling potential conflicts before planning permission is granted.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agree – to amend and add new contact details to Appendix A</p> <p>Noted Amended second paragraph in Appendix D – Design and Access Statement to say, "It must relate directly to the individual site, the proposal being considered, the impact of the proposal on the wider area 'and how the overall scheme is designing out crime.'"</p> |
| Sports England | The SPD needs to highlight how the site layout, positioning of buildings and the close proximity of different uses in a mixed use scheme would need careful consideration | <p>Noted</p> <p>The SPD is intended to set out key design principles for new development. These principles supplement a wide range of</p> |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>policies within the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP), for example policy G1A – Impact of Development on Amenity, which relate to various amenity and land use considerations.</p> <p>It was never the intention of this document to give in-dept guidance to all eventualities or to act as a substitute for specialise guidance. But rather to give a broad overview of the key points needed to consider and deliver high-quality residential development which links successfully to its physical surroundings.</p> |
| Greater Manchester Ecological Unit | <p>Pleased to note that our suggestions have been taken into account in the revised draft, we would recommend that the ordering of the paragraphs in the ‘Biodiversity’ section be changed. Currently it could be taken that the second paragraph relating to the potential need to undertake ecological surveys only relates to areas of informal outdoor space. In addition, if the order of the paragraphs were switched, they would be more consistent with the order that applicant would need to proceed.</p> <p>The contact details for Ecology Unit needs updating</p> | <p>Agree – the first and second paragraphs have been changed around. (Please also see English Nature’s comments)</p> <p>Agree – updated contact details in Appendix A</p> |
| English Nature | <p>English Nature welcomes the production of the SPD</p> <p>Consider that reference should be made to the Town and Country Planning Association document, Biodiversity by Design Suggested the inclusion of the following text at the end of the first paragraph under Biodiversity, ‘A number of case studies demonstrating the possibilities can be seen within the publication, Biodiversity by Design, copies of which can be obtained free from the Town and Country Planning Association, details of which</p> | <p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Agree – added new text after the third paragraph (please see Greater Manchester Ecological Unit comments on reorganising the paragraphs)</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>can be found in Appendix A.'</p> <p>Requested the Town and Country Planning Association contact details be added and to include three publications that English Nature have produced to assist developers.</p> | <p>Agree – included contact details and highlighted publications that Town and Country Planning Association and English Nature has produced</p> |
| <p>Countryside Agency</p> | <p>Supports the preparation of the design guidance</p> <p>Request the organisation's address details are included and highlight a number of publications that the Agency has produced</p> <p>While we note the reference to consideration of landscape in the document, there seems to be only a brief reference to it in the under Design Considerations for Sustainable Development</p> | <p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Agree – the organisation's contact details have been amended and publications highlighted in Appendix A</p> <p>Under the chapter heading 'Design considerations for sustainable development', sub-heading 'Character and Identity', yes there has only been a brief reference of landscape assessment. This is because the content of this sub-heading is based upon the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP) policy EV3A – Design of Development. It is not the purpose of policy EV3A to cover landscape issues in depth but rather to work in conjunction with other relevant UDP policies for example, policies EV2 – Nature conservation and EV3D – Landscaping of development.</p> <p>To ensure that the opportunity is not missed, policies EV2 and EV3D have been included to the list of RUDP policies covered in Appendix B – Planning policy context</p> <p>However within the rest of the SPD, highlighting the need for the applicants to assess the existing</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>landscape have also been covered in more detail under the following headings,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visual impact ▪ Landscaping ▪ Public open space ▪ Other outdoor amenity spaces <p>Where further detail guidance is needed this SPD also provides the link to other Council publications for example, Wigan's Biodiversity Strategy, SPD – Landscape design submissions and the SPD – Provision of open space in new housing development, adoptions and financial contributions from developers and has highlighted other external organisations who can also offer detail guidance and advice on this particular matter.</p> |
| Environment Agency | <p>Pleased to note the Agency's previous comments have been taken into consideration</p> <p>Request the organisation's web site address be included in Appendix A</p> <p>Request the draft PPS25 be included in Appendix B</p> | <p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Agree – the organisation's contact details have been included in Appendix A</p> <p>Agree – Appendix B has been amended</p> |
| West Lancashire District Council | No comment | <p>Noted No action taken</p> |
| West Lancashire District Council Heritage and Environment | No direct comments but would like to note that the guidance does not directly relate or make reference to either listed buildings, conservation areas or other heritage buildings or sites. | <p>Noted This SPD is primarily based upon Replacement Unitary Development policies EV3A – Design of development and R1D – The Design of New Residential Development and House Extensions, which relate to new build development.</p> <p>Within the document reference has been given to the consideration of listed buildings, conservation areas and buildings of local interest under the headings of Character and Identity</p> <p>Appendix B also lists the other relevant RUDP policies which this</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| | | SPD supports for example, EV4 – Conservation, EV4A - Development and Design in Conservation Areas and EV4B – Listed Buildings |
| British Waterways | <p>Disappointed to note that their previous comments were not considered appropriate to include advice relating to the design of waterside development and would not agree that such advice would go beyond the remit of this SPD</p> <p>The organisation’s contact details need updated</p> | <p>It was never the intention of this document to give in-dept guidance to all eventualities or to act as a substitute for specialise guidance. But rather to give a broad overview of the key points needed to consider and deliver high-quality residential development which links successfully to its physical surroundings.</p> <p>It is anticipated that where additional/specialised information is required that the relevant organisation would be contacted directly. Therefore Appendix A provides the contact details of all the relevant organisations/bodies and also highlights a number of relevant documents that these organisations/bodies have produced.</p> <p>Agree – the organisation’s contact details have been amended in Appendix A</p> |
| Highways Agency | The Agency’s contact details need updating | Agree – the organisation’s contact details have been amended in Appendix A |
| GMPTE | <p>Welcome the inclusion of some of their previous comments</p> <p>Particularly like to support Principle 2 however it would be helpful if could clarify what the term ‘walkable neighbourhood’ means</p> <p>GMPTE have produced guidance on ‘Land Use and Public Transport’ and would be very useful if referenced</p> <p>The new heading ‘Convenient movement routes’ is welcomed</p> <p>Need to correct the organisation’s fax number and request the following e-mail address (landuse@gmpte.gov.uk) be</p> | <p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Agree – new sentence has been added at the end of Principle 2 which says, ‘Please see page 13 for further details on ‘walkable neighbourhoods’.</p> <p>Agree - the publication has been referenced in Appendix A under the organisation’s contact details</p> <p>Noted No action taken</p> <p>Agree – the organisation’s contact details have been amended and new e-mail address added in Appendix A</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | included in Appendix A. | |
| United Utilities | No further comment | Noted No action taken |
| Harry Gladson Interested Resident | Happy with the document and its amendments but has asked that his concerns relating to the problem of unsightly parking of cars are raised in future relevant meetings. His concerns are new housing estates should have wider roads, provide the capacity for overspill parking provisions and to ensure clear right of ways on the roads for double yellow lines to be allowed | Noted No action taken Agree to pass his concerns onto Engineering Services, Traffic Section to be discussed at future meetings All road layouts within the borough are designed in accordance with the approved standards as set out in national guidance, Design Bulletin 32 – Residential roads and footpaths. The Council has also produced its own version of this national guidance adding the local perspective, which is 'Layout of roads in residential development'. |
| Horwich Town Council | No comment | Noted No action taken |

