

Appendix C

Comments and recommendations made by the Strategic Planning Board at its meeting on 19th April 2017

The following issues and recommended changes were identified by the Board:

SPB comment/recommendation	Officer response	Action
1) Recommendation be amended to take into account the comments made by the SPB	The PH report already includes this provision within its wording. <i>"2 Consider the comments made by Members on the Strategic Planning Board at its meeting on the 19 April 2017 set out in appendix C."</i>	No change is recommended
2) Issue ref. 43 – the proposed modification should be reworded to make clear that proposals that do not meet the required quality of design should be refused or deferred to allow amendment.	Noted. Amend modification ref. 43 to add the following to the final sentence - <i>"Proposals that do not meet the required design standards shall be refused unless amendments can be secured to enable this quality of design to be achieved"</i>	Amend as suggested
3) Issue49 – is car pooling relevant to Cheshire East and how would it work?	The suggested wording within modification 49, seeks to future proof for the provision of car clubs/pooling. Given the largely rural character of the Borough there will be parts of the Borough where car pools/clubs would be less likely to be successful, hence the comment that they are generally more successful in urban locations.	No change is recommended
4) Modification ref. 57 should not specifically identify that 20mph signage is unnecessary and it should be encouraged in new development (especially given the initiatives to provide 20mph signage in proximity to schools)	The wording of amendment ref. 57 does not prevent inclusion of signage to identify a 20mph driving speed in new residential development. However, it does discourage it in favour of speed control via other means, such as sensitive urban design. This should not have a bearing in relation to signage in proximity to schools and should not prevent it should new schools be developed as part of new residential development.	No change is recommended
5) Why is there no guidance on bin storage, when guidance on cycle storage is provided?	Guidance on bin storage and effective access for collection is provided at pages 27 and 28 of volume 2 of the SPD	No change is recommended
6) Why is there no guidance on rural types of development given that large parts of the Borough are rural? Production of further guidance in relation to rural development is strongly advocated.	The Design Guide was specifically written for larger scale residential developments as opposed to all types of development. In the way the guidance has been prepared, as 2 volumes, the ground has been prepared for further guidance to be produced as a suite of design Guidance for the Borough	No change is recommended
7) Report makes reference to Places Matter comments not being fully	As discussed in the report and explained at SPB, a balanced response	No change is recommended

<p>incorporated. Please explain what has been taken into account and what has been discounted</p>	<p>has been taken, having regard to the NPPF, Cheshire East as a place and the circumstances it faces in the immediate future, where the majority of developments are by volume housebuilders. It is imperative to get industry 'buy in', in order to secure progress in improving design quality and to reflect the NPPF in the round. Some of the suggestions were felt to be too radical at this point in time. In the future, there may be the potential for a more radical design approach to be adopted. Furthermore the Design Guide does not prevent such innovation and the changes to the guide also emphasise that the design Guide is not a 'rule book'</p> <p>Building for Life 12 refers to "making the ordinary better". It is considered that the final version of the Guide, incorporating the changes proposed, will set the framework to deliver such improvement.</p> <p><u>The main changes that have been incorporated:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encouraging future patterns of sustainable living and reducing car ownership use of pool cars/clubs to alter layout to become less car oriented – see response in relation to amendment ref. 49 of the consultation responses report • The guide must not become the rule book: true design greatness often breaks the rules – see response in relation to amendment ref. 43 of the consultation responses report <p><u>Comments that did not lead to amendment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good design is produced by good designers – already mentioned professional skills at vol 1iii/05 and 06 • Colour and material palettes too restrictive – local vernacular materials advocated but innovative materials are not discouraged as long as of high quality and justified Vol 2 chapter i - Using the Vernacular without creating Pastiche and chapter ii – House Types- Making them Unique are applicable as are other parts of the Guide 	
---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of vol 1 seems lost in the 21st century ‘anywhere’ layouts Illustrated in vol 2 – disagree with this comment. The guide needs to be read in the round and also have to mindful of our starting point, both with our own highways teams but also the development industry and the scale of housing being considered and that we need to deliver. This does not mean that more innovative layouts and street design are not being sought and the guide will reinforce this. • the future depending on resources <p><u>Other comments :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing design review Service provided by Places Matter! and the resource implications associated with design review. Also a case for regional and national design review for significant and strategic proposals – this is a matter for the establishment of the design review panel and to formalise arrangements. However, certain large scale proposals do already go to Places Matter! • Will the settlement guides be a manifesto for historicism? – the settlement guides are there as a starting point to guide and inform not for developers to create facsimiles of the historic. The guidance is very clear on this point at vol 1. Para ii/41-2. • Local character needs to evolve and vernacular needs to remain undiluted, therefore new developments need to be of their time yet respect and learn from the place – this is addressed in chapters I and ii of volume ii and expressly set out at vol 1. Para ii/41-2 • Will there be further guidance for other development scales and type? – this is something to be considered for • A statement of commitment and high level endorsement of the Guide is required within Cheshire East – noted it is envisaged that the Foreword will be either by the Leader of the Council, Planning Portfolio Holder or Planning Chair (or possibly a combination) • Unnecessary duplication from other publications such as BfL. - There is little duplication from BfL (but a strong 	
--	---	--

	<p>synergy to its principles) or from other publications that are still active policy or guidance (publications such as By Design were discontinued as policy with the advent of the NPPF and NPPG). The government encouraged such guidance to be produced locally, embodying a local essence, which has been undertaken in preparing the Design Guide.</p>	
<p>8) Why were Poynton and Holmes Chapel specifically chosen as additional sample settlements? Recommend that ALL Key Service and Local Service Centres have sample settlement guidance</p> <p>Updated snapshot vision of Cheshire East towns important to determine their capacity</p>	<p>It was decided after much deliberation that additional sample settlement guidance be prepared for Poynton and Holmes Chapel given the fact that, in respect to Poynton, that it is a key service centre proposed to deliver in the order of 650 new homes in the emerging Local Plan Strategy. In relation to Holmes Chapel the settlement straddles 2 character areas and the community expressed concern that this could undermine achieving quality design in the settlement. Of the remaining Key service and Local Service centres, Handforth, Chelford, Goostrey, Shavington and Wrenbury.</p> <p>The Design Guide cannot introduce new policy such as defining housing limits for particular settlements. This issue has been considered in the emerging Local Plan Strategy as part of policy PG6 (Spatial Distribution)</p>	<p>No change is recommended</p> <p>Consider as part of the SADPD</p>
<p>9) Need to ensure that the raising of design standards does not deter brownfield development</p>	<p>This was raised by consultees and is considered by issues 4 and 5 of the consultation responses report ,whereby additional wording is proposed to be inserted into the design Guide relating to viability assessment and the potential for flexibility in relation to extraordinary development costs, subject to an open book approach. A systematic urban design approach and utilising appropriate professionals is not exempted however as this can help to make development more cost effective whilst maintaining quality.</p>	<p>No change is recommended</p>
<p>10) Wilmslow Parks SPDs currently 'saved' SPDs. How will continuity and joined up consideration of policy be secured?</p>	<p>It is not possible to make direct connection every saved SPD. However, the need to consider these alongside the Design Guide is recognised. This was also raised by consultees and is considered by issue 26 (p33) of the consultation responses report. A link is proposed to the SG/SPD guidance pages of the Planning website.</p>	<p>No change is recommended</p>
<p>11) No specific mention of the</p>	<p>Noted. Amend to insert new section in</p>	<p>Amend as</p>

<p>provision of bungalows within housing developments, when there is an acknowledged shortage</p>	<p>chapter ii urban design of volume 2 after ii/42 to read:</p> <p><i>“Housing mix</i></p> <p><i>The housing mix should be developed to respond to proven local need including provision of different sizes, types and tenures, including appropriate provision for the elderly and infirm (including consideration of bungalow provision). On larger scale developments, there should be consideration of plot provision for extra care housing development as part of the masterplanning. Further guidance on housing mix will be provided in the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document of the Local Plan.”</i></p> <p>Also add a further criterion to chapter ii checklist:</p> <p><i>“Does the proposal include an appropriate housing mix, including provision for the elderly and infirm and, on larger sites, does it consider extra care provision?”</i></p>	<p>suggested</p>
<p>12) parking – garages tend to be too small to be usable and insufficient parking is provided causing unplanned parking on street – suggestion that bollards should be used to prevent fly parking on pavements</p>	<p>Noted. Amend to include specific cross reference to parking standards in the LPS by inserting the following after ii/96 of volume 2.</p> <p><i>“Parking and cycling provision should be in accordance with the parking standards (including garage dimensions) as set out in table C.1 of Appendix C of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy”</i></p> <p>Amend criterion 12 of chapter ii checklist to read:</p> <p><i>“Has the layout incorporated a variety of parking solutions that meet the Council’s parking standards to ensure cars are accommodated as part of the street scene without overly dominating it”</i></p> <p>The design Guide provides extensive guidance on parking provision and the provision of balanced solutions to ensure the protection of street scenes. It makes reference to the minimum parking standards set out in the LPS, but will be further strengthened by the suggested additional wording above.</p>	<p>Amend as suggested</p>

	In relation to visitor parking this covered at para ii/71 of volume 2 of the Guide	
13) No specific mention of special needs/end of life housing within the Design Guide	Incorporated into response to comment/recommendation 11	As above at 11