



Cheshire East Borough Council

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)

**The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England)
Regulations 2012**

**Draft Cheshire East Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning
Document**

Interim Statement of Consultation

March 2016

1: Introduction

- 1.1 This document summarises pre-consultation work undertaken in the preparation of the Draft Cheshire East Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), ahead of full public consultation. It also provides a summary of the extent of the current pre-public consultation.

2: Purpose of Supplementary Planning Documents

- 2.1 Local Planning Authorities may prepare Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) to provide greater detail on Local Plan policies. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports the production of SPDs where they can help applicants to make successful planning applications.
- 2.2 The SPD cannot set out new policy but will expand upon the Council's existing policies as set out within the adopted Macclesfield Borough Council Local Plan (2004), the adopted Congleton Borough Council Local Plan (2005) and the adopted Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan (2005), as well as the design policies of the emerging Cheshire East Borough Council Local Plan Strategy.
- 2.3 It is intended that the SPD will be used to provide detailed design guidance; ensuring development is responsive to the context and environments into which they are set.

3: Pre-SPD Consultation Stages

- 3.1: As part of the SPD preparation process, to ensure appropriate and proportionate Stakeholder involvement in advance of full formal public consultation, focused pre-production work was undertaken with a variety of internal and external stakeholders.
- 3.2: A full list of the stakeholders, actions and outcomes in relation to the development of the draft SPD are detailed in Appendix 1.

4: Availability of Documents

- 4.1: The Draft SPD together with all supporting documentation is available from the Council's website [\[INSERT LINK\]](#). Documents are also available for inspection at the following Council Offices; **Delamere House**, Delamere Street, Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 2JZ, **Macclesfield Town Hall**, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK10 1EA and **Westfields**, Middlewich Road, Sandbach, CW11 1HZ during their normal opening hours.
- 4.2: An information leaflet is also available at all the libraries throughout the Borough during their normal opening hours.
- 4.3: In accordance with the Regulations the Borough Council may make a reasonable charge if a hard copy of the draft SPD is requested. No charges are incurred to download these documents from the website or to inspect them in any of the locations mentioned above.

5: How to Comment on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document

5.1: Representations are invited between 5th April 2016 and 17th May 2016. All representations must be received by 18th May 2016.

5.2: Representations can be submitted in the following ways:

By completing the online questionnaire [\(insert link\)](#)

By e-mail: Designguide@cheshireeast.gov.uk

By post:

Environmental Planning
Po Box 606
Municipal Buildings
Earle Street
Crewe
Cheshire CW1 9HP

5.3: Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specific address of the adoption of the Cheshire East Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

6: Next Steps

6.1: Following the consultation on the draft SPD, all comments received will be taken into account in finalising the SPD, where appropriate. Adoption of the document as a final SPD will then be subject to approval in line with the Council's Constitution.

6.2: In line with Regulation 12(a), this Interim Statement of Consultation will be finalised upon adoption of the SPD. The final statement will include a list of the persons/bodies consulted during the preparation of the SPD, a summary of the main issues raised by those persons/bodies and how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.

6.3: Once adopted, the SPD will then be a Material Consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Appendix 1

Pre-SPD Consultation

7: Appendix 1: Statement of pre-consultation engagement

- 7.1: Before seeking to consult publically, there has been a strong desire on the part of the Council to ensure that the Design Guide had been through a robust process of development and refinement, principally through internal stakeholder engagement. This was seen to be critical to the Guide's success and it being fit for purpose, and ensure consistency of approach within Cheshire East Council.
- 7.2: To promote this approach, very early on in the process two stakeholder groups were established - Environment and Place with a broad range of participants across the Environmental Planning function and a technical services group with participants from highways, streetscape, waste and open space management. The participant list grew as the design guide evolved and new stakeholders were identified and engaged. Furthermore, because highway design and car parking are such crucial aspects of residential design there was a strong focus on adopting a collaborative approach with highways, with a view to providing guidance that fulfilled a joint planning and highway guidance function.
- 7.3: We were also keen to engage with the development industry as key users of the guide, both very early in the process and at the culmination of preparing and refining the draft guidance, whilst 'soft testing' has been undertaken between these 2 main stages by using the guidance in discussions with developers on live schemes and by securing comments upon the guidance from selected developers.
- 7.4: Once the guide was sufficiently far developed through the input of the stakeholder groups, it was firstly brought to the attention of members in informal training sessions and subsequently tested in workshops, participated in by Development Management, Environmental Planning, Highways and open space staff along with the Councillors. This proved a valuable capacity building and testing platform for the draft guide and led to further refinement.
- 7.5: All of these pre-consultation stages, which are summarised in the table below, have helped to strengthen the guidance and encouraged greater collaboration, particularly within Cheshire East Council but also with developers and others within the sector.

Consultation/engagement programme			
Event/activity	Participants	Key Issues raised	Response (in the consultation draft)
<p>Tuesday 17th March 2015 – developer event - launch of design guide process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seminar presentation and Q&A session • Overview of content of the guide, character assessment • Run through of guidance produced thus far 	<p>Over 40 representatives of the development industry including developers, agents and consultants</p>	<p>Striking a balance between historic character, vernacular and the requirements of modern, larger scale developments, including use of standard house types</p> <p>Ensuring a pragmatic approach to parking and an acceptance that parking is a fundamental requirement for new housing</p> <p>Ensuring that the design requirements are commercially realistic and based upon what homebuyers are seeking,</p> <p>Resources required within CEC to implement the guide once adopted</p> <p>How practical was the idea of developing a Design Review Panel and how would it be able to review all major projects in the Borough</p>	<p>Sections written into the guide discussing character, reinterpreting vernacular and sense of place (Vol 2 p 7, p 16, p 24/25), Volume 1 sets out the character of different parts of Cheshire East in extensive detail, focusing on the 'layers' that help to define places (Volume 2 (pp 14-65)</p> <p>Parking section within volume 2 (p 20-24) developed in conjunction with highways and identifies the need for pragmatic approach to resident and visitor parking. Design guide advocates mixed parking solutions.</p> <p>As above. Principles within the Design Guide reflect those in Building for Life 12, the nationally agreed standard for well designed homes</p> <p>Not a matter for the guide but identified as a fundamental requirement for successfully implementing the Design Guide</p> <p>The Design Review Panel would review a selection of projects, based on their sensitivity, location and/or scale (Volume 1, p69, para iii/44 to iii/49)</p>
<p>Friday 27th March 2015 – Technical Services and Highways workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior issue of draft document for comment • round table discussion 	<p>Attendees included representatives from Highways Development Management, technical and adoptions, open space</p>	<p>Reference to Council adopting 6Cs Highway Design Guidance</p> <p>The need to consider commuted payments for non-standard highway elements (areas of paving and trees in</p>	<p>Guidance developed co-jointly with Highways and specifically refers users to additional guidance in the 6Cs (p 32)</p> <p>Section included in Guide relating to adoption and a standard set of materials palettes details, agreed with highways are set out in the Guide (pp 44-50)</p>

around the topic areas of highways, parking, open space and public realm and adoption	management and streetscape	<p>adoptable areas)</p> <p>Importance of choosing the right species for landscape, particularly trees in adoptable areas and early blossoming species for use by bees etc.</p> <p>Practicalities of materials for highway over and above that already accepted – e.g. concerns about sourcing materials, cost, maintainability etc.</p> <p>Need for an appropriate street hierarchy within the guide that meets highways as well as urban design objectives</p> <p>CEC seeking solutions that avoid vertical deflection</p> <p>Parking standards need to reflect the local plan including enlarged garage sizes to make usable (3x5.5 metres)</p> <p>Sustainable urban drainage – advice needs to reflect national law/policy and should be a focus on above ground solutions wherever practicable</p> <p>SUD adoption needs to be set out in the guide</p>	<p>Information developed in Landscape section to set out materials principles trees within streets and open spaces (pp 75-78)</p> <p>As above. Materials palettes agreed with Highways based on character areas within the Borough and from mainstream suppliers.</p> <p>Street hierarchy refined in accordance with discussions with Highways and included (Volume 2 pp 33-38)</p> <p>Design guide does not include vertical deflection as point of principle</p> <p>Parking section reflects the Local Plan and advocates a mix of solutions to achieve the standards (Volume 2 pp 20-24)</p> <p>Initially a detailed section of the guide was developed but this has been reduced to balance the guide with focus on SUDs within place making, steering users to the Councils technical documents on Flood Risk and SUDs (pp 60-61)</p> <p>As above</p>
---	----------------------------	---	--

<p>Thursday 2nd April 2015 – Environment and Place Stakeholder workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior issue of draft document for comment • round table discussion around environmental planning issues such as heritage, landscape, ecology, open space, play provision, development management, drainage health impact, community safety and public art. 	<p>Attendees included representatives of Environmental Planning, open space, community health, flood risk, Development Management</p>	<p>Tweaks to settlement character area boundaries suggested – specifically incorporation of Timbersbrook and The Cloud into Gritstone Edge Settlement Character Area.</p> <p>Need to include cross reference to conservation area appraisals within character assessment</p> <p>Rooting issues for trees in pavements and affecting drainage</p> <p>Role of management companies and responsibility in regards to open space and landscape features</p> <p>Ensure consistency in the guidance between landscape, open space and highway objectives and ensure a positive approach to landscape structure including health impacts</p> <p>Need to reflect art strategy in the Design Guide and connections between public realm, landscape and open space and role of public art in place shaping</p> <p>SUDs – need for high level approach to change thinking and encourage innovative approaches to SUDs – need to provide link to Flood Risk Management Strategy and concerns of combining SUDs approach with ecological mitigation/POS</p>	<p>See Cheshire East Settlement Character Areas plan Volume 1, Page 17, Fig ii:04</p> <p>Included in volume 1 (p 17) and in volume 2 (p 65)</p> <p>As above</p> <p>Guidance substantially redrafted to address this issue with commuted sums specified for trees within the highway (p 43) and open space (pp 80-81)</p> <p>Guidance within the GI/Landscape section has been substantially redrafted to address these issues. This has entailed working with representatives of the open space and landscape teams in terms of final content of this section of the guide (chapter iv Green Infrastructure and Landscape Design).</p> <p>Guidance re-worked following discussion with the public arts team, including section included (p 60) but with references running through volume 2 of the Guide</p> <p>As above for the Tech Services and Highways Workshop on 27/3/15</p>
--	---	--	--

		<p>provision</p> <p>Ensure health impact is incorporated into the guidance and reference to requirement for Health Impact Assessments</p>	<p>Quality of Life section provided in Volume 2 with specific reference to HIAs (p 93)</p>
<p>Tuesday 23rd April 2015</p> <p>Presentation to Development Management</p>	<p>Majority of the Development Management Team</p>	<p>Include description of what needs to be included with applications</p> <p>Needs to be in a format that is easily updated and there needs to be a format for ease of sharing</p> <p>Needs to be schedule of materials (positive and negative)</p> <p>What about smaller scale development and development in heritage sensitive locations.</p> <p>Need for training to implement the guide</p>	<p>Chapter iii of Volume 1 Best Practice Design Approach includes section on requirements for applications and Design and Access Statements (pp 69-71)</p> <p>Document has been designed to enable it to be an interactive document. Hyperlinks included to other sources of guidance</p> <p>Materials specified for streets and public realm (Volume 2 pp 44-50) and for landscape (pp 69-78). Case studies provided for each chapter in Volume 2.</p> <p>Guide geared toward larger scale development but character and process information in volume 1 and guidance in volume 2 also applicable to smaller scale of development</p> <p>Not a matter for the guide itself but identified as a fundamental requirement for successfully implementing the Design Guide</p>
<p>Wednesday 24th June 2015 – follow up Environment and Place workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow up to discuss 	<p>Previous attendees but also public art and HCA representatives</p>	<p>Usability – big document. Needs to be broken down</p> <p>Guidance should act as the minimum standard but also be aspirational. Shift from cost to quality.</p>	<p>Now broken into 2 volumes and intention to make it as interactive as possible electronically</p> <p>The whole thrust of the guide is to elevate quality, create aspiration but to also marry this against practicality. This reflects BfL12 – no specific change</p>

<p>further refinements to the Design Guide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Latest working draft of document circulated in advance • Round table discussion focusing on amendments/additions from earlier draft 		<p>In respect to SUDS there needs to be enough flex to enable new working practices and new legislation. The importance of SUDs should be elevated in conjunction with GI</p> <p>In DM terms difficult to sift through the guidance to determine wither should approve/refuse – use of a summary or checklist?</p> <p>More clarity in terms of the status of illustrative masterplans, parameters plans and the content and level of detail</p> <p>Need to summarise key issues from character assessments</p> <p>Strategic role of public art and role of public artists in design teams needs to be explicit</p> <p>Need to address competing demands on open space within the GI/landscape section, including specific impacts on ecology</p> <p>GI/Landscape section needs to provide advice on local food production</p> <p>Need to stress the links between GI, movement and healthy living and identify principles relating to pedestrian routes</p> <p>Management regimes for more natural areas including benefits for ecology as</p>	<p>As above for Tech. Services workshop 23/3/15</p> <p>Checklists and case studies added to each chapter of Volume 2</p> <p>Chapter iii of volume 1 refined to clarify the level of information to be included in parameters information and level of detail for illustrative masterplans (pp 70-71)</p> <p>Key character area and settlement design cues summarised in relation to each character area and sample settlement (Volume 1 pp 14-65)</p> <p>Guidance re-worked following discussion with the public arts team, including section included (p 60) but with references running through volume 2 of the Guide</p> <p>Guidance within the GI/Landscape section has been substantially redrafted to address these issues. This has entailed working with representatives of open space and landscape team in terms of final content of this section of the guide (chapter iv Green Infrastructure and Landscape Design).</p> <p>Section relating to footpaths in Street Hierarchy amended (Volume 2 p 35), Recreation and Health benefits associated with GI open space set out in GI section (Vol 2 p 58), also referenced in chapter vi (pp 92-93)</p> <p>As part of the re-working of the GI/Landscape section Landscape Management guidance strengthened</p>
---	--	--	--

		<p>part of integrated approach to landscape design and provision.</p> <p>Further refine content in relation to local food production</p> <p>Sustainable design – some concern that district heating may be unrealistic except the largest developments. Importance of future proofing for district heating</p> <p>Importance of interaction of settlement edges with countryside – what happens at interface</p> <p>Public art policy gap.</p>	<p>including, specific reference to promoting biodiversity at the start of the chapter (vol 2 pp 56-7 and Landscape management (Vol 2 pp 80-81)</p> <p>Enhanced section relation to local food production included (Volume 2 pp61-62)</p> <p>Checked guidance on district heating with Regeneration major projects team (sustainability) – references to Local Plan Policy with no thresholds – felt appropriate to retain as is.</p> <p>Incorporation of Rural Interface Studies (Positive/Negative examples) for each settlement character area (Volume 1, Chapter ii) and (Volume 2, Chapter ii, para ii/57, page 19) with additional general references throughout the rest of the document.</p> <p>SPD cannot introduce new policy but amendments incorporated as stated above and in relation to Environment and Place workshop 2/4/15</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>Wednesday 24th June 2015 – follow up Technical Services workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow up to discuss further refinements to the Design Guide Latest working draft of document circulated in advance Round table discussion focusing on amendments/additions from earlier draft 	<p>Attended by representatives of ANSA in relation to open space, streetscape and refuse and drainage and flood risk</p>	<p>Ensure appropriate street tree and open space species, including spring flowering and bee attracting species</p> <p>Further refinement in relation to adoption and commuted sum payments</p> <p>Suggestions of case study visits to Cambridge and Bristol</p>	<p>Specific section on soft landscape amended in conjunction with landscape and open space to address concerns about species and general principles in relation to tree planting (Vol 2 pp 75-78)</p> <p>Guidance further refined as part of re-writing of chapter iv. (p 80)</p> <p>Case studies included within design guide Volume 2 for each chapter but no scope for case study visits</p>
<p>Monday 13th July 2015 – Follow up Highway Workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow up to discuss further refinements to the Design Guide Latest working draft of document circulated in advance Round table discussion focusing on amendments/additions from earlier draft 	<p>Attended by various staff from Development Liaison, technical and adoptions in Highways</p>	<p>Technical amendments to street hierarchy text and drawings</p> <p>Refinement of materials palette for street types</p> <p>Refinements in relation to adoption information</p> <p>Refinements to information on technical requirements of street design</p>	<p>Street hierarchy section amended, including diagrams and cross sections (Vol 2 pp 32-40).</p> <p>Materials specifications for streets and associated public realm amended (Vol 2 pp 44-50)</p> <p>Amendments to information on adoption (vol 2 p 43)</p> <p>Amendments to section relating to technical requirements (vol 2 pp 41-42)</p>
<p>August 2015 – Developer testing of Design Guide by Barratt Homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Latest draft of the 	<p>Discussion with Technical Team (Layout Planners/Housing Designers)</p>	<p>Overall happy with approach and methodology to design - clear and concise guidance on best practice approach</p>	<p>Design Guide is intended to improve the quality of the public realm within housing developments. A hierarchical approach to movement and public realm will mean a balanced use of materials between bitmacs, concrete block paving and natural stone products as set</p>

<p>design guide issued to Barratt Homes (Manchester) for review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow up call to Barratt Manchester's Technical Team for Feedback 		<p>Concerns expressed over materials palettes and use of block paving/natural materials and the associated costs</p>	<p>out in the guide. Conservation Areas are more sensitive with a weighting towards natural products. (Vol 2, pp 44-50).</p> <p>Refinement of materials narrative, but no major changes (Vol 2 pp 44-45)</p>
<p>15th and 19th October 2015 - Member and Development Management technical workshops (3 workshops held)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentations and workshop/round table discussion using a testing scheme with different groups testing the effectiveness of specific sections of volume 2 of the Guide Q &A session at the end of each workshop 	<p>Attended by circa 40 Councillors and officers, including Development Management, Environmental Planning and Highways</p>	<p>Ordering of questions and wording of some of the checklists</p> <p>In the GI and Landscape checklist, Physical and ecological features should be separated</p> <p>Be careful about specifying manufacturers in the materials of streets public realm and for landscape details</p> <p>Ensure Latin names used for soft landscape specifications. Concern about limitations for variety imposed by the plants included in the guide.</p> <p>Include evidence box in checklists</p> <p>Concern about promoting connected street pattern as opposed to cul-de-sacs, which are safer and more readily policed. The guide should promote that form of development</p>	<p>Questionnaires reviewed and re-ordered where appropriate. BfL12 questions moved to bottom of the page</p> <p>It was felt that these could remain combined and so no change required</p> <p>References to manufacturers largely removed except where specific product advocated for its distinct qualities</p> <p>Plant specification substantially reduced in GI and Landscape chapter. Only tree species referenced but more about scale and character of planting rather than species. Latin names used where identified (Vol 2 pp 75-78).</p> <p>Evidence box to be incorporated into comprehensive checklist for DM use once the Guide has been through public consultation</p> <p>The diagrams on p 16 of Volume 2 of the Guide provide a simple illustration of positive urban design incorporating a connected street pattern that has significant urban design benefits set against an inappropriate cul-de-sac arrangement that results in a</p>

		Concern over use of urban design language and it's meanings – use of plain English	<p>far less successful urban design structure.</p> <p>The Guide is intended for use by professionals and lay-people, the language used is necessary to ensure it is a professional document and lay-users of the guide need capacity building sessions so that they can articulate their thoughts using the correct terminology. This workshop in itself assisted in that process. Additional resources will be required to ensure members are further informed on matters of design. In addition a CABE publication 'The Councillor's Guide to Urban Design' has been used as a 'Useful reference' document at the end of Volume 2 with hyperlinks to the complete document and the bibliography included, explaining the general urban design terminology.</p>
<p>18th November 2015 – Follow up developer presentation/workshops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 workshops/ Q &A sessions • Overview of the guide and its content with significant focus on Volume 2 	Over 30 representatives of the development industry including developers, agents and consultants	<p>Balance and proportionality weighing between vernacular and more recent development – guide too heavily focused on historic centres and not more modern post-war peripheral character where most new sites would be located</p> <p>Materials section in relation to highways and landscape is too prescriptive</p> <p>Concern that officers and members may apply the guide too literally and too inflexibly, with too much focus on the look of the scheme</p> <p>Concern that parking solutions illustrated need to be deliverable based on</p>	<p>Text added into guidance clarifying that vernacular should be used to understand and re-interpret the character and distil out the 'sense of place' but not slavishly copy or create pastiche. Text also clarifies that insensitive, anywhere neighbourhoods should not be used as positive precedents or as 'vernacular' to justify a design that has not been derived from a site sensitive design process. (Volume 2 p7)</p> <p>Materials palette largely unchanged, as it has already been agreed in discussion with highways and is informed by local character assessment. A hierarchical approach will mean a balanced use of materials between bitmacs, concrete block paving and natural stone products, with a stronger focus on natural materials in sensitive settings, such as conservation areas (Vol 2 pp 44-50)</p> <p>No change as this is about use of the guide. However,</p>

		<p>adoptable standards and demands of customers for enough, convenient parking</p> <p>Use of Design Codes – what scale of development will require their development</p> <p>Broadband – ensure developments or future proofed etc.</p>	<p>the purpose of the guide is to elevate quality including the attractiveness of developments in their context.</p> <p>Parking options set out in the guide have been re-assessed in terms of the Councils current parking requirements and as part of mixed solutions within a development as a whole.</p> <p>See Volume 1, Page 68, Chapter iii, Para's ii/30 to ii/32.</p> <p>See Volume 2, Page 88, Chapter v, Para's v/44 to v/48.</p>
<p>9th December 2015 – Town and Parish Conference</p> <p>1 of several presentations to Town and Parish Councillors setting design Guide in context with the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans</p>	32 Town and Parish Councils represented	No issues raised	No amendments required
<p>4th March 2016 Neighbourhood Planning Workshop day</p> <p>Series of presentations and workshops on neighbourhood planning</p>	55 representatives from existing or prospective Neighbourhood Planning Groups	<p>How will the guidance apply in an area that straddles 2 or more character areas</p> <p>Status of the guidance in planning terms</p> <p>How can the guidance be applied at the local level and what should Neighbourhood Plans be saying about design?</p>	<p>Added emphasis to assess and interpret local character – this is embedded in the guidance. Chapter iii of volume 1 (p 66) of the Guide sets out the importance of character assessment</p> <p>Design Guide refers to it being adopted as an SPD, initially against saved Policies in the Local Plan. (Vol 1 p 11)</p> <p>P17 vol 1 refers to the Design Guide being read in conjunction with Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements</p>

Other comments received in writing as a consequence of the engagement		
Organisation	Key issues raised	Response (in consultation draft)
Cheshire Police	Weak on designing out crime	Secured by design section added (vol 2 pp28-29)
Building Control, Civicance (formerly CEC)	Lifetimes Homes references a little out dated as now covered in the Building Regulations	Amended to omit specific references to Lifetime Homes but adaptability and liveable homes referred to in Chapter ii (p 27) and Chapter vi (p93)
Public rights of Way	Amendments to incorporate information relating to rights of way and inclusion of links to additional sources of information	Sections redrafted in accordance with comments, key amendments incorporated (Vol 2 p9, p 38, p57) but also other minor amendments in other parts of the Guide as required.
Advisory Team for Large Applications and Sites (part of the HCA)	Amendments to clarify function and status of design guide in the introduction;	The function and status of the guide as part of the Cheshire East design toolkit is set out (vol 1 p8)
	Emerging LP policies should refer to the Design SPD;	Emerging policies will directly cross refer to the Design Guide SPD
	introduction should set out how, via reference to national policy in relation to SPDS, the Design Guide fulfils this;	The function and status of the guide as part of the Cheshire East design toolkit is set out (vol 1 p8)
	More clarity in the use of design cues within character section;	Design cues refined within chapter ii including design cues for positive edges to new developments onto countryside (Vol 1 pp 17-65)
	setting out guidance in relation to comprehensive masterplans and what they should contain/involve;	Advice provided at vol 1 p71
	reference to use of BfL12 to structure pre-application discussion and design review;	Advice provided at vol 1 p67

Flood Risk, Cheshire East Council	<p>Greater reference to defined parameters and what is fixed and flexible;</p> <p>Development objectives to underpin the vision;</p> <p>Discussion on principles for strategic roads as part of larger developments Reference to phasing of GI alongside development</p> <p>Suggested amendments regarding SUDS drainage information in GI Landscape Chapter iv of Volume 2</p>	<p>Advice set out at vol 1 p70</p> <p>Set out in vol 2 p 10</p> <p>Street Design section written in conjunction with Highways and hierarchy identified in the guidance (Vol 2 p 33)</p> <p>Amendments incorporated then trimmed down in discussion with flood risk team to focus on place making issues relating to SUDs with links to forthcoming technical guidance on SUDs to be incorporated (Vol 2 pp60-61)</p>
Health Improvement Team, Cheshire East Council	<p>Need to include reference to policy that requires HIA on major schemes</p>	<p>Reference inserted (vol2 p93)</p>
Cultural Economy, Cheshire East Council	<p>Various comments and suggested amendments and insertions in relation to public art</p>	<p>1 to 1 discussion between consultant and public arts co-ordinator resulted in several amendments to the document (in particular in Chapter iv of Volume 2 p 60)</p>
Development Management, Cheshire East Council	<p>Making the document as usable as possible in format; more clarity on what is acceptable and what isn't, aided by graphics/drawing, indication of good and bad (use of ticks and crosses)</p>	<p>Guide split into 2 volumes; Additional information provided in relation to design cues within Volume 1 Chapter ii (pp 16-65); Checklists and case studies inserted and subsequently refined at end of each chapter (Vol 2, Chapters i-vi)</p>
Open Space Management , ANSA (formerly CEC)	<p>Concern about size of document; various technical comments about content of the guide</p>	<p>Split into 2 volumes, checklists provided to each chapter in Volume 2, including GI and Landscape section (Chapter iv); Chapter re-written in conjunction with Landscape officer working with consultant to address combined concerns requirements</p>

<p>David Wilson Homes, North West</p>	<p>Advice needs to be applied consistently and early to ensure that costs can be taken account early in the process</p> <p>Flexibility in approach to detailing and use of standard house types crucial and should be assessed early for each scheme and proportional</p> <p>Greater focus on vernacular design responses but less prescription about where modern design solutions would be suitable. This should be an early part of the design discussion</p> <p>Need to establish the degree of compliance for each site, depending on local circumstances. The guide provides a good starting point for discussion.</p> <p>Guide says little about commitment of other CEC departments to implement the guide -highways design, parking provision, drainage, adoption of public spaces etc. are all potentially troublesome areas. How the other departments embrace the guide will be important.</p>	<p>This is about application of the guide post adoption. The guide is intended as the framework to achieve this consistency – no amendment was required.</p> <p>Whilst the Guide does seek to achieve unique developments with their own sense of place, and encourages bespoke housing designs where they are appropriate to the site, it also accepts the potential for standard house types, to be re-modelled as an alternative to meeting the quality aspirations of the Guide (Vol 2 pp 24-25)</p> <p>The Design Guide explains the process of analysis of the local vernacular and distilling the sense of place. It explains the use of vernacular in building design as part of the contextual appreciation of a place and highlights how local tradition and character can positively influence a more contemporary approach (Vol 2 p7), The section, ‘House types - Making them Unique’ (Vol 2 pp24-25) explains that contemporary as well as more traditional designs, as long as they are justified, will address the CEC design agenda – no amendment was required</p> <p>As commented by DWH above, there needs to be consistency in how the Guide is applied. The Council aspires to make all development better and therefore, whilst local circumstances may have some bearing, it is important that high quality is achieved in all instances. This is referenced throughout the Guidance but the Foreword and Introduction of Volume 1 especially explains why this is so important, Chapter iii, in respect</p>
---------------------------------------	--	--

<p>Jones Homes (North West)</p>	<p>Guidance may be overly detailed in places and potential conflict with guidance in the NPPF regarding not being overly prescriptive or preventing/stifling innovative design. Should include sufficient flexibility to act as a design aid, Concern that members will apply it too rigidly. Images in guide should include some more modern examples.</p> <p>Important to ensure the Guide complements other strategic objectives of the Local Plan, for example delivering 30dph on sites to ensure efficient use of land</p> <p>Design panel experience – participants</p>	<p>to use of Building for Life 12, states that the Council is seeking Built for Life accreditation on all future residential developments. This requires a minimum of 9 greens and no reds. – no amendment was required</p> <p>The Guide was developed with 2 stakeholder groups, one focusing on Environment and Place and the other on the technical services including highways, open space and streetscape. There was also direct collaboration with highway, drainage and landscape/open space to refine and re-work particular sections of the guidance, resulting in an agreed philosophy and requirements. In respect to street design, this resulted in the street hierarchy and materials specifications set out in the guide – no amendment was required</p> <p>As described above in relation to the DWH comments, the guidance seeks to encourage a vernacular driven approach but it explains the use of vernacular in building design as part of the contextual appreciation of a place not creating pastiche. It highlights how local tradition and character can positively influence a more contemporary approach (Vol 2 p7), The section, ‘Housetypes - Making them Unique’ (Vol 2 pp24-25) explains that contemporary as well as more traditional designs, as long as they are justified, will address the CEC design agenda – no amendment was required</p> <p>The guide advocates density reflecting characteristics of the site rather than applying a uniform figure for all sites and varied density within sites depending on their situation within the scheme (vol 2 p 17 and p 19) – no amendment was required</p>
---------------------------------	--	---

	<p>sometimes have limited and blinkered views, panels will only be useful if they have the right information including constraints plans – detailed working of the panels needs careful consideration.</p> <p>The guide place importance on pre-application process, especially as part of BfL process. Council needs to properly resource to ensure the process is credible. Important that everyone is signed up to the process.</p> <p>Concern regarding the approach to SUDS and that there is sufficient expertise to implement the guidance.</p> <p>Within character areas information over emphasis on properties over 100 years old. Should be examples illustrating current good practice.</p> <p>Concerned about the logic of building in character with an area then encouraging character areas within larger schemes</p>	<p>This is a matter for setting up and running the design review panel - no amendment was required.</p> <p>Comments noted however this is a matter for the review of the pre-application service – no amendment was required</p> <p>Comments noted but this is a matter for the Flood Risk team to address with support from Planning rather than within the Guide – no amendment was required</p> <p>The Guide highlights how local tradition and character can positively influence a more contemporary approach (Vol 2 p7), The section, ‘Housetypes - Making them Unique’ (Vol 2 pp24-25) explains that contemporary as well as more traditional designs, as long as they are justified, will address the CEC design agenda – no amendment was required. In case studies both traditional looking and contemporary design are included throughout Volume 2, Page 25 includes a series of photographs of a contemporary housing scheme with supporting narrative – no amendment was required</p> <p>Vol 2 Para ii/103 explains the reasoning behind this suggestion that larger sites should consider character areas. It highlights that character areas should be defined by the local context and opportunities but there</p>
--	---	---

	<p>In terms of drive widths these should be reviewed, whilst question practicality of including garages as part of parking provision as they often get used for storage. Whilst sustainable transport is encouraged the guide needs to be realistic in terms of parking provision and its practicality</p> <p>Commuted sums for abnormal features and SUDS. Suggest updated specification on lighting that requires commuted payments. Some SUDs features could readily be maintained through resident management agreements. If commuted sums are required cannot see why permeable paving will not be adopted by CEC, particularly in areas where there is little scope for other surface water systems.</p> <p>POS suggest it would be preferable for open space to be adopted rather than via management company.</p> <p>Pleased that efforts had been made so that guide not too restrictive and limiting</p>	<p>may still be scope to utilise a more contemporary approach away from established townscape but employing base characteristics to tie the scheme together – no amendment was required</p> <p>The guide stresses that CEC intend to take a more pragmatic view to parking provision (Vol 2 p 20). The parking solutions included in (Vol 2 pp 21-24) have been considered with Highways input. External storage provision is discussed (Vol 2 pp 27/28) to ensure adequate storage space is provided either in sheds, bin storage areas or via enlarged garages as illustrated in fig ii:15 p 28 - No amendment was required.</p> <p>Noted. These are issues partly for the adopting authorities (namely highways and flood risk/drainage). Commuted payments included for trees within adoptable areas (Vol 2 Table iii:02 p 43) but for matters like detailed specification and costing for non-standard street furniture and lighting, for the time being, this will be by discussion with the Highway Authority until such a schedule is in place. The same applies to SUDS – No amendment was required.</p> <p>Within the GI/Landscape chapter, the guide does discuss options for management of open space, including the option to transfer to the Council via adoption. It stresses early discussion with CEC as to the most appropriate form of management. It also stresses the importance of management plans for POS. (Vol 2 p 81) – no amendment is required</p>
--	--	--

<p>Wardell Armstrong, Environmental Consultant</p>	<p>for landscape designers but concern that it could still be restrictive in terms of creating schemes that lack 21st Century innovation and uniqueness because they become bland and the same. The guidance may need tweaking to avoid this</p>	<p>Landscaping section comprehensively amended. Amended to remove soft landscape species matrix with more generic references in relation to hedging and examples in relation to tree species, with greater focus in the guidance on form, scale, function and context (Vol 2 pp 75-78)</p> <p>Para iv/138 suggests innovation in materiality for hard landscaping within the palettes set out or different character areas.</p> <p>This gives licence to designers to create varied and distinctive landscapes that still reflect the characteristics and vernacular of different parts of the Borough</p>
--	--	--

