

APPENDIX E of the New South Oxfordshire Design Guide Consultation Summary Detailed responses

Code to colours:

	Resident
	Organisation
	Architect/Planning professionals
	Internal comments

	Comments	Name	Council's Response
1	<p>The graphics are good and the document is not too wordy.</p> <p>Could do with more guidance for small infill sites (1-5 units) where a small developer may need to be convinced to improve the environment and setting through good design.</p> <p>It is very difficult to qualify what is good design but generally it seems to be building and spaces that provide a positive response.</p> <p>The guide avoids giving any reference to physical design that has this quality, such as a house with beautifully proportioned gables or with interesting glazing. Would it be possible to add more examples of good buildings and spaces?</p>	<p>Amanda Walker Architect</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The principles outlined in the design guide are applicable to all scales of development. We have emphasised this message throughout the document as a result of the consultation. An example of how to apply these principles to small scale development has been added at the end of the guide.</p> <p>We have added a few more good examples of high quality buildings and spaces (through images).</p>

2	Health and Safety should be built into the design process in accordance with the Construction Design and Management Regulations 2015.		This would be covered as part of Building Regulations.
3	<p>The Benson Neighbourhood Plan Team is currently in the process of drawing up draft design and other policies on a local basis, and has reviewed the Draft Design Guide as a document that will establish core background principles. In this context we find much to agree with, but wish to register the following concerns/suggestions:</p> <p>1.The guide appears in essence to be a manual for urban design with a loosely-connected section on the character of South Oxfordshire. Whilst we have no quarrel with the urban design principles, we are concerned that the main emphasis appears to be on a generic urban context and gives little weight or space to the largely rural nature of the District or the character of its village communities.</p> <p>2. While the Guide does give weight to “understanding the planning context”, the flow diagram on page 12 seems to imply that this understanding should be used to gauge and refine the impact of a development that is already defined, rather than as a start-point for determining what sort</p>	Benson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Part 1 of the guide refers to the rural character of South Oxfordshire. We are aware of the predominant rural nature of the district and have reviewed all the principles in the guide to make sure that these are applicable to all scales and context of development. A section on how the principles of the guide can be applied to a small scale development has been added at the end of the guide.</p> <p>The diagram in page 12 only relates to the planning application process. Part 2 of the guide refers the morphological layers that need to be taken into account when drawing up a proposal (which needs to be used a starting point).</p> <p>A range of images have been used as examples showing different materials of each character area.</p>

<p>of development, and how much, might be appropriate.</p> <p>3. In defining distinctive character, it would be helpful if the list of building materials on page 17 could be more readily associated with the character areas identified on pages 15-16, and if more detail could be given about the distinctive use of the materials and e.g. the poor quality of the clunch.</p> <p>As currently presented, page 17 seems just to provide a random list of different walls and roofs. When the Guide returns to materials on page 44 it refers to traditional roof tiles as red/brown whereas most roofs in the Chilterns and Thames Valley have a distinctive underlying orange tint. 4.</p> <p>The section on Historic Features and Heritage on page 18 mentions only designated heritage assets and does not refer to the local value of non-designated assets. We are concerned that this does not tally with the NPPF, and could result in lack of regard for the historic but unlisted buildings that contribute to the character of Benson.</p> <p>The urban emphasis comes across particularly strongly in the illustrations used in the second part, and we fear that it will set expectations that do not fit the lesser formality and density of a settlement such as Benson, or its character as a village. 5. In Step 2</p>		<p>Page 17 is just a snapshot of what can be found in the district. Materials on page 44 are considered appropriate in the district.</p> <p>We have added text to say that 'undesigned heritage assets are identified in conservation area appraisals.</p> <p>Landscape character is dealt with as part of an accompanying technical document to the guide on landscape. We have tried to use examples that demonstrate best practice no matter the scale of development.</p>
---	--	---

<p>the green spaces illustrated or suggested are small and incidental, and the Guide seems to advocate limiting green space and simply making the most of what little there is. While this minimalist approach may be suitable in some instances, it ignores the fact that green space can be valuable in its own right as a means of making a place work well.</p> <p>Step 3 is quite rightly strong on connectivity, but underplays the importance of connecting the development with key community facilities such as shops and services, and with major routes. We suggest that a pre-requisite would be to identify traffic pinch points and determine a Traffic Flow Strategy from which to design the road layout and the provision of alternative routes.</p> <p>Step 4 specifies provision of shops and other facilities within a development. In Benson, however, there is considerable community support for avoiding this in the interests of maintaining or improving the viability of existing shops as parts of a more sustainable commercial centre at the heart of the village. We feel that in this and other respects the draft guidance should perhaps consider the well-being of the community as well as the well-being of the development that will hopefully be part of it.</p> <p>Step 5 is very urban. While it suggests that streets should be enclosed by buildings with a human scale,</p>		<p>The movement section (section 3 of the main guide) refers to key connections to existing facilities and the importance of connecting the development with adjacent facilities from existing communities. We appreciate that that all new developments will need to provide new facilities.</p> <p>See above. Noted.</p> <p>The checklists are best practice but should be applied in relation to the context and a justification to be given.</p> <p>This guide encourages a range of different parking solutions depending on the context.</p>
---	--	--

the examples shown, and the diagrams on set-backs from the road, suggest very dense tightly-packed development and formal contexts with lots of hard surfacing. This sort of treatment would not seem to be appropriate for rural sites.

Step 6 supports parking on the road. This does not seem sympathetic to smaller developments in a rural setting, and apparently ignores a problem faced by many larger villages. Benson has considerable on street parking issues, not just because of the historic layout but because housing developments in the mid-later 20th century failed to make adequate provision. Larger modern homes generate larger numbers of cars than present guidelines allow for, and parking problems are severe in places. There is also need to consider the effect of proximity to a strategic public transport route or, for example, a popular leisure attraction. We would not wish to see problems exacerbated by the approach put forward in the Guide, and suggest that a Parking Strategy should be a requirement. This could include a range of solutions. While we would agree that large parking courts should be avoided, alternatives such as angled parking and smaller visitor plots should be looked at much more closely, whilst off street parking should be a requirement for some sites.

The map diagrams in the Steps of Part 2 also tend to over-simplify the process, while the important

We have tried to show the main elements of each checklist visually via the map diagrams whilst making them easy to read. It is therefore not possible to show every detail. One of the aims of this guide was to make it as visual as possible so that applicants would find easy to follow.

	<p>details necessary for understanding the context are left to the small print and the test questions. Users will take their main lead from the diagrams and will tend to see the questions as a post-design checklist, useful as a means of justifying the anywhere buildings that the Guide mentions in Step 7. We suggest that it would be helpful to give more visual emphasis to the prime need to identify what is locally distinct before arriving at the design.</p>		
4	<p>I liked the format and found it to be a very accessible document.</p> <p>Should the guide contain some indication of a hierarchy of requirements? ie a developer attempting to meet the needs for different types of housing will find itself in a position of having to find the right compromise between housing density, communal space, parking space and personal space (gardens).</p> <p>Should there be clear guidance on how much weight will be given to each. For example, if a local housing need was predominately for family size homes, would the required housing density trump the need for communal and personal space or could the developer meet the needs of the community by providing less dense housing?</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. We appreciate that there may be compromises or conflicts in achieving all of the criteria which is why there is a mechanism whereby the applicant can justify where they cannot meet a criteria. The balancing act would ultimately be carried out by the planning officer.</p> <p>The balancing act is normally carried out by the case officer once they have received all consultation comments from consultees.</p>

	<p>The rural areas of South Oxfordshire are very attractive to developers to sell houses to commuters to Oxford, London and Reading, should the guidelines favour sites with good transport links such as nearby main roads or rail links? There is little point of having clear energy efficiency guidelines for new homes if their siting results in increased carbon emissions due to unnecessarily long commutes by car and increased road congestion.</p>		
5	<p>Supports the guide’s aspirations and much of the guidance contained in it. Subject to one major concern we regard it as a good basis for the next phase of the District’s development.</p> <p>We note, however, that there is a suite of concise technical documents which are likely to be of major significance to the process and we seek assurances that these will also be exposed for consultation.</p> <p>Our major concern is that the guide is written almost entirely from the standpoint of good urban design.</p> <p>We argue strongly that the Guide requires a further section directed specifically at the rural environment. One of the disappointments of the last fifty years has been the tendency for urban design principles to be translated into villages and so to introduce an urban feel which is frequently inappropriate.</p>	Brightwell Cum Sotwell Parish Council	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The suite of technical documents were subject to the same public consultation as the main guide.</p> <p>Urban design is a discipline that relates to the design of our cities, towns and villages. It is a collaborative and multi-disciplinary process of shaping the physical setting of where we live, work and socialise. It is the art of making places no matter the context. Therefore the word ‘urban’ is not be taken literally but rather as a way of describing a discipline.</p>

<p>P7 includes a list of additional resources. CPRE Design and Densities (2002) might be a useful addition here, highlighting as it does the importance of matching density to context. Alternatively some of its more interesting points might be introduced into a specific rural section.</p> <p>The heading Urban Design Principles rather makes our point for us.</p> <p>P8. We support the first and third bullet points but the second bullet point is concerning because ‘no net loss of habitat’ might appear to condone removal and replacement, whereas continuity of the existing and natural evolution are more important in a rural context. This point is picked up again at p12 and we would argue that in the rural context the habitat should only be tampered with at all to the extent that is essential for a development, and only where it is then tampered with should the no net loss principle be relevant.</p> <p>P8. The sixth bullet point will often be inappropriate in a rural context, where hedges and dense foliage may be the primary element of the context.</p> <p>P10. It is noted that all principles and criteria are relevant for all scales of development. We believe</p>	<p>Government does not provide any guidance on density since PPS3. The guide encourages density to be respectful of the existing context.</p> <p>The guide amplifies the guidance comprised in the NPPF.</p> <p>The criteria will be applied in relation to the site context.</p> <p>The principles and criteria can be applied to all scales of development but will need to respect the context.</p>
---	--

	<p>that this is over-prescriptive. We live in a village with no street lighting (a feature enjoying wide community support), a village characterised by lanes as well as streets (they are different), where there are often no pavements and where parking is preferably moved off the (often narrow) highway. Indeed we would hope that the concept of shared space in terms of highway design could be used imaginatively and effectively to create lanes. We also live in a village where there are and should be front hedges which prevent oversight of the external environment. All these attributes give our community its essential character and context. The Guide recognises the importance of context, but its more detailed guidance will often conflict with it in a rural environment.</p> <p>P11. New development should not be hidden away. Correct, but if the location is one where the landscape has a naturally hidden character these words might suggest the destruction of it, rather than its enhancement</p>		<p>Noted. See above</p>
6	<p>Really easy to read, very concise (always welcomed) and exciting document.</p> <p>Page 26 add link to Part B approved document B5 dimensions access vehicles.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Added.</p>

	<p>Page 12 Describe who the design team will be; add Building Control to design team.</p> <p>Page 13 Add building control to specialists council officers.</p> <p>Page 13: Are we saying that for every applications one needs to consult all of the ones stated here:</p> <p>National Register of Access consultants – building control check against Part M at no cost (we need to make sure that people are aware of this service)</p> <p>Street design (link to Part M of Approved Doc which covers ramps)</p> <p>Part H5 Approved doc – refer to bin storage criteria 1.13</p> <p>Adaptable buildings – mentions build shaft</p> <p>Page 42 buildings regs M(4) cat 2 – too precise (move to accessibility within building/ dwelling) – just put Part M (access to and use of buildings) / add title to approved documents</p>		<p>Added.</p> <p>These are the ones that the applicant needs to be aware of.</p> <p>Removed.</p> <p>Added.</p> <p>Noted. This is a detailed matter for building control to deal with.</p> <p>Noted. We make reference to it under Plots and Buildings</p> <p>Removed.</p>
7	<p>First impression is promising, relatively jargon-free and user-friendly!</p>		<p>Noted.</p>

<p>Although the intro talks a lot about countryside and villages, most of the detail is about urban or suburban development.</p> <p>A lot of planned development in S Oxon is basically villages, 'new villages' tacked on the edge of towns, and (because they straddle the edge of town and country) these need to be careful to be villagey rather than suburban in ambience. That will make them much more livable, with more community feel. They need duck ponds, greens, pubs!</p> <p>There is a tendency with large developers to be too used to thinking urban and to pay lip service to local vernacular but then ignore it, distracting people with spin and gloss (while all they really care about is their bottom line). With so much building going on at one time, we need to pay extra care to ensure we don't impose uniformity.</p> <p>Maybe a few of your drawings or comments could be changed so that they portray villages rather than suburbia?</p> <p>Recently in the rush to build, much characterful detail has been lost and suburban houses are creeping into the villages. This must be curtailed in a big way if S Oxon is to keep its charm.</p> <p>You need to add Chilterns AONB to the list of relevant bodies near the beginning (not just North</p>	<p>The principles and criteria can be applied to all scales of development but will need to respect the context. Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>We have tried to provide a range of images that depict the different contexts.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Added.</p>
--	---

<p>Wessex). All relevant bodies should be consulted, eg CPRE. AONB must be sacrosanct. Listed buildings should be given great weight, not merely not over-ridden.</p> <p>Farmland should be given high priority. Any policies that encourage it to come back into use rather than lying fallow or being developed should be encouraged.</p> <p>Policies need to be careful to avoid built-up areas merging.</p> <p>Environmental issues, and particularly water/floods need to be given importance. There may be situations where porous surfaces are more suitable than tarmac; this should be encouraged.</p> <p>There needs to be joined-up thinking re transport. Often there is a lack of communication between SODC and OCC until too late. And simply expanding roads is not an answer: sometimes they should be restricted, and there has to be compromise between the needs of all types of users and residents.</p> <p>There needs to be care about urban pedestrianisation. Sometimes it is counter-productive, e.g. if it stops otherwise independent elderly people driving up to the shop they need. I</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>have had personal experience of this with elderly parents - it makes a huge difference to quality of life. In general I think it's important to avoid having rules or guidelines that are too inflexible, as one size does not and should not fit all.</p> <p>And finally a grammatical point: you often use "i.e." where you mean "e.g.!" "e.g." means "for example", whereas "i.e." means "that is to say", so "i.e." should be used only where that is the only possible example, where the two things are equivalent. Viz: "a stretch of the Thames, e.g. at Henley" compared with "the stretch of the Thames where the Henley Regatta is held, i.e. at Henley". !!</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p>
8	<p>The Board supports making the document more user friendly and interactive. However a lot of the detail from the existing guide has been lost and now appears in Technical Documents (it is not clear whether these are also out for consultation, what status these have and whether they will also be SPD).</p> <p>The new Design Guide itself appears to be a generic and basic introduction to Urban Design for major developments, rather than containing advice on architectural design appropriate to the South Oxfordshire area. Importantly, there is no reference to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide which has been adopted by SODC as SPG (see South</p>	Chilterns Conservation Board	<p>Noted. The technical suite of documents were subject to the same public consultation.</p> <p>Noted. We refer to it. The principles and criteria are relevant to all scales of development and all context.</p>

	<p>Oxfordshire Core Strategy para 15.27), or its supplementary technical notes on Chilterns Brick, Chilterns Flint and Roofing Materials. Please add reference to these documents within the new Design Guide to signpost where to find detailed advice on designing in the Chilterns AONB. The appropriate weblink would be http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/buildings-design-guidance.html</p> <p>This will help ensure that the natural beauty of the Chilterns is conserved and enhanced by encouraging the highest design standards, reinforcing local distinctiveness and respecting the landscape, settlement character and special qualities of the AONB.</p>		Noted.
9	<p>Welcomes South Oxfordshire District Council's Draft Design Guide Supplementary Document and appreciates the work and detail it represents and contains. Didcot Town Council anticipates that the key issue will relate to enforcement, particularly with the forthcoming Garden Town developments. The Town Council expects to make use of it as a planning tool in the future.</p>	Didcot Town Council	Noted.
10	<p>Grass-cutting regime on roadsides and urban greens should allow for 'long grass' areas i.e. only one late autumn cut and removal of cuttings to</p>		Noted for all of these comments.

	<p>encourage wild flowers and protect breeding invertebrates.</p> <p>Existing mature trees should be protected, on new estate sites, and further saplings planted. The latter should be adequately stated/ protected and watered. Residents can be requested to adopt your trees near their properties.</p> <p>New buildings (two storeys and above) should incorporate swift bricks to attract these declining urban birds to nest. Also, isolated loft areas should be built in to new homes to provide bat roosts.</p> <p>Finally, on a general point, continued human population growth (especially in as overcrowded a country as the UK) is unsustainable, and will lead to resource depletion, biodiversity loss and, ultimately, a complete breakdown in ecological and social systems. It, therefore, behoves local authorities to raise sustainability issues, with central government, and press for national policies which encourage human population stabilisation.</p> <p>Enclosed two leaflets on human population growth and sustainability for information</p>		
11	We welcome the focus in the Design Guide (Part 2) on working and designing in balance with environmental constraints, on environmental enhancement and on the provision of flexible	Earth Trust	Noted. There is a technical document that refers specifically on landscape appraisal, structure and assessment

<p>greenspace and recreational areas. However, we believe that the design of green-spaces within major residential developments should take into account the wider network of accessible greenspace in the area, and routes to and from these areas, rather than just the needs of the individual development. Therefore, greenspace provision should be designed to consolidate this wider network to enhance accessibility for all and we believe this should be reinforced in the Design Guide. Equally, this regional perspective on greenspace will help to relieve the visitor pressure on all recreational sites in the area that the projected housing, population and economic growth will inevitably bring.</p> <p>We note with interest, in the Landscape addendum, your specification that developers should ensure that the development <i>“Leaves a legacy that allows the resident community to have some control over managing their surroundings”</i> and <i>“includes opportunities to encourage local food growing such as community orchards, provision of allotments or other community garden projects.”</i> At Earth Trust, we firmly believe that small behavioural changes by many people can make large changes to the environment in which we all live. We fully support initiatives that encourage people to live in balance with the environment around them and encourage local and sustainable food practices such as reducing food miles or local food production, particularly on a community scale. We would like to</p>		<p>Added in street design checklist and open space design section</p>
--	--	---

<p>see this type of advice specified and encouraged in the main Design Guide (Part 2) to encourage early consideration of such initiatives in the creation of design concepts and designs.</p> <p>Growth in the local area will bring more visitors to our site, which we welcome, and we will continue to strive to provide the highest quality accessible greenspace to the residents of South Oxfordshire. However, we must ensure that the population, housing and economic growth that is forecast is not delivered at the expense of environmental quality and, as the biodiversity addendum to your Design Guide alludes to, we must collectively ensure that the minimum standard of no net loss in biodiversity resource is met for all new development. We would welcome positive reinforcement of the need to provide a minimum standard of no net loss of biodiversity for all developments within Part 2 of the Design Guide, and suggest that it should be added as a key criteria for “Test Your Design” in accordance with the Natural Environment (page 25). We think that additional guidance should be added to the Biodiversity annex to the Design Guide to provide developers with additional guidance on how to identify biodiversity offsetting need and opportunities and the types of local organisations, such as Earth Trust, who could help them to facilitate these requirements.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. This already forms part of the technical document on biodiversity.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	--	--

12	Thank you for asking for feedback on the above documents. I think it would be useful to include guidance regarding the placement of vents from kitchen extractor fans, i.e. that consideration is given to neighbours and that extractor fans do not blow directly into a neighbours garden (noise, smell and appearance).	Environmental Health Clare Blakeway -Phillips	Added
13	<p>It is great to see that accessibility has been weaved throughout the document. Please can you consider the following additions:</p> <p>Add “including the elderly, disabled, parents and carers” to page 9.</p> <p>Page 9 – Glossary – ‘Inclusive design’ would it be possible to add <i>‘including the elderly, disabled, parents and carers’</i></p> <p>Page 26 - In designing, when we refer to all users we mean everyone who could live, work or visit the development. This includes people with disabilities. Please can we add ‘parents/carers and older people’</p>	Equality Officer at SODC Cheryl Reeves	<p>Noted. Added.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>

<p>Page 27 (3.10) – typo should say ‘disabled’ could we also extend to say ‘parents/carers and older people’</p> <p>Page 29 (4.6) has a mix of uses, housing types and tenures that meet local and district needs and are justified in terms of planning policy and viability; if this is the only section relating to housing type – please could we add something along the lines of ‘that takes account the ageing population and the needs of disabled people’ maybe linking on the previous page to the new building regulations http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/br/BR_PD_F_AD_M1_2015.pdf</p> <p>I noticed that page 42 makes reference to this under the useful information – but I am not sure it really follows on from the information above it.</p> <p>Page 32 – useful info section. Could we include DFT shared spaces guidance https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/3873/ltn-1-11.pdf</p> <p>Not sure if there is anywhere suitable to add something along the following lines: Near shops and community buildings, six per cent of parking bays should be allocated as accessible parking bays.</p> <p>Page 48 – Goal: A place of high quality that is integrated with its context, works on consecutive</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Added</p> <p>We refer to OCC parking standards and therefore consider this to be to prescriptive.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

<p>scales and provides for a variety of users and takes into account future development could we add and need? Conclusion – could we consider adding: Provides an inclusive development for all users</p> <p>Shopfronts: Consideration should be given to people with visual and mobility impairments in the design. Doors should be easily distinguishable from their surrounds. Door opening furniture that is easily reached, and which provides a secure grip, is of critical importance to disabled people, including disabled children. It should be possible to operate all door opening furniture one-handed, without the need to grasp or twist.</p> <p>Wheelchair users can also find it difficult to open and close doors when door operation is not power-assisted.</p> <p>Landscape document – previously I had suggested we include ‘Ensure open space is accessible for all users including people with disabilities, parents/carers and older people’. It looks as though we have referred to the Councils open space standards instead making reference to accessibility – so it may be covered in here. I was not able to find these standards on our website so I don’t know if it’s possible for you to check perhaps a link could be added to the bottom if it does cover</p>		<p>Added.</p> <p>Noted to all of the following</p>
---	--	--

	accessibility. Or give consideration to adding my suggestion.		
14	<p>Appears to wholly address issues of design in an urban setting, despite South Oxfordshire being a predominantly rural area.</p> <p>It is completely silent on the reality of nearly all planning applications that are actually submitted.</p> <p>The guidance in the Design Guide could be applicable anywhere in the UK, it makes no reference to the character of the district and fails to mention Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>The new Design Guide is completely silent on extensions, alterations or new single buildings, which form the majority of planning applications.</p> <p>The new guide fails to provide any guidance at all for the vast majority of planning applications. This could have a devastating effect on the Chilterns AONB, as inappropriate development will come forward which will damage the nature and character of the landscape and character of the AONB.</p>	Goring Heath Parish Council	<p>Part 1 of the guide refers to the rural character of South Oxfordshire. We are aware of the predominant rural nature of the district and have reviewed all the principles in the guide to make sure that these are applicable to all scales of development. A section on how the principles of the guide can be applied to a small scale development has been added at the end of the guide.</p> <p>Chilterns AONB guide is mentioned under additional and useful resources</p> <p>A technical document focusing on householder extensions and outbuildings and building conversions give guidance on how to best design these.</p>

15	<p>The new Part 1 and Part 2 are very clear and attractively presented.</p> <p>Page 15 Thame should be included as an example of a linear settlement, the map and text should clearly show the flood plane of the river THAME as well as the Thames.</p> <p>Page 16 there is a spelling mistake in the section on the Thames Corridor which should read '...and the lower part of the River Thame'.</p> <p>Welcome the recognition of the use of slate roofs in the area.</p> <p>I think that part 1 + 2 should have an explanation about application to smaller sites for the benefit of the public. Many sites are of up to 10 dwellings.</p> <p>Also there is nothing about commercial development.</p> <p>Page 17 it was not clear that this page was meant to be read as a table with page 16 Page 19 it would be helpful if a link to template or guide to writing.</p> <p>Page 15 - I welcome the recognition of the use of slate roofs in the areas including Thame and Henley in the late 18th century after Welsh slate could be efficiently brought in by river and canal.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Already have an example (Nuneham Courtenay)</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. A small scale development example has now been added at the end of the guide.</p> <p>Noted. A technical document on non-domestic buildings has been added to the suite of technical documents.</p> <p>Page 16 and 17 are to be read as a spread.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
----	---	--	---

	<p>The 2008 Sections 5 + 6 were constricting and prescriptive and I welcome an improvement in the technical guide to householder extensions technical note.</p> <p>The insistence on side extensions being subservient to the original dwelling in all cases is totally unnecessary on houses built after 1930. In the case of houses built after 1980 this is very difficult to achieve especially in small houses with low ceilings and small footprints.</p> <p>There should be more encouragement of contemporary design in house design and environmental energy efficient elements on existing and new buildings rather than designating them as unsightly add ons.</p> <p>The technical guide on Sustainable energy is encouraging but not encouraging enough of retrofit power generation and heat source pumps etc. There should be clear link between householder extensions and this technical note.</p> <p>The Building Conversion technical note is very restrictive and appears inflexible importance of sustainable energy should be included.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted – link provided.</p>
--	---	--	---

<p>Commercial buildings should all be required to include power generation of some sort. Particularly buildings with large low pitched roofs should be required to have photovoltaic panels.</p> <p>Page15 Thame should be included as an example of a linear settlement, the map and text should clearly show the flood plane of the river THAME as well as the Thames because it has a major impact on the towns and villages along it's course including Thame, Stadhampton, Chiselhampton, Newington, Drayton St Leonard etc.</p> <p>Page 16 there is a spelling mistake in the section on the Thames Corridor which should read ' ...and the lower part of the River Thame' not Thames.</p> <p>Page 19 it would be helpful if a link to template or guide to writing Biodiversity statements was included at this point.</p> <p>I am very disappointed that Sections 5 and 6 guidance on buildings and extensions seem to be the same as the last very constricting and proscriptive design guide. Were these 2 sections re written? I could not see anything new in them not even the illustrations which show the same mainly dull designs as before.</p>	<p>Too prescriptive – refer to sustainable energy section.</p> <p>We have already provided an example of a linear settlement (Nuneham Courtenay).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	---

	<p>The Shop front guide needs to be clear what is meant by natural materials. Stand alone stainless steel or powder coated letters on traditional shop fronts can be acceptable.</p> <p>The shop front technical note is much the same as the old policy and needs more revision.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>
16	<p>There is a consensus that this Design Guide will be a very useful planning aid, in particular with regard to the historic character of our own town and surrounding AONB Chiltern landscape, its natural and built environment.</p> <p>We are very glad that the Chilterns AONB Management Plan, Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and Shopfront Design Guide remain part of the foundation blocks of the new SODC Supplementary Guide. The emphasis on high quality, sustainable development, especially on inclusive design, which needs to work well for people now and into the future is essential and needs to be realized in practise, not just be a paper exercise – as so often seems to be the case at the moment.</p> <p>One matter of concern is the lack of emphasis on the problem of air quality in built-up areas. Should this not be dealt with in Technical Document No 4 under `Trees – Retaining and Planting'? All one can</p>	Henley Archaeological & Historical Group	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted – updated.</p>

	<p>see is a squiggly sketch in a drawing of a street scene, saying 'air quality' or so it seems unless there is more in another part of the document which we have overlooked.</p> <p>To help remedy this grave problem of air pollution no new planned street, lane or open public space should be acceptable without substantial tree planting being part of their lay-out. Unless spaces are allocated for trees at the outset there will be no room, nor funds for creating these essential green avenues at a later stage.</p>		Noted.
17	<p>On p.13, it is surprising that, in the list of organisations that should be consulted by developers, town and parish councils are at the bottom of the list - they should be much higher up. Also the list should local civic societies such as the Henley Society.</p> <p>In the supplement on Shopfronts and Signage, p.3 of on-line copy, 10th bullet point, we would suggest that the text should read " illumination of fascias and hanging signs is discouraged" rather than "...is not encouraged".</p>	Henley Society	Noted and changed. Noted.
18	Historic England welcomes the Council's initiative in the production of this generally excellent, comprehensive and attractively presented Design Guide.	Historic England	Noted.

<p>The intended wide applicability to audience and scale is ambitious and, we feel, not entirely successful. Whilst we accept that many design principles are applicable at any scale, we feel that for more complicated and large scale applications the guide provides a comprehensive approach but for single dwellings, extensions and other householder applications it may be an intimidating and lengthy document.</p> <p>Suggest providing individual documents including only those sections of the design guidance that are relevant to make use the document more helpful in guiding applicants through the assessment and design process and/or examples of how to apply the principles in the Guide at a smaller scale of development.</p> <p>The guide underplays the importance of the historic environment in successful, sustainable design which the NPPF includes.</p> <p>Refer to the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record for non-designated heritage assets and to the Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation, which will soon be completed.</p> <p>It would be helpful to identify which of the Conservation Areas have character appraisals and</p>	<p>The principles of the guide are transferrable to all scales of development and context, with the opportunity for justification where it is not possible to achieve all of the criteria. There is a separate technical document for householder extensions and alterations.</p> <p>Noted. A suite of technical documents has been prepared. An example of small scale development has been provided at the end of the main guide.</p> <p>There is a section in the guide on the historic environment and there are additional links to other relevant publications.</p> <p>Noted and the Historic Environment Record link has been added. Text has been added to refer to non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Noted and amended.</p> <p>Additional relevant references provided.</p>
---	---

	<p>management plans - these would be important to take into account in any proposed developments Reference could be made to Historic England, CABE and the Kent Architecture Centre's Building in Context and/or to Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Notes 2 Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment and 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets.</p> <p>We welcome the references in this box to Placecheck, Conservation Area Appraisals, Character Appraisal Toolkits (e.g. the Oxford Toolkit) and Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance.</p> <p>The flowchart on page 12 could recognise the input to design of external consultees such as Historic England to a successful design process.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Already included under 'who to consult'.</p>
19	<p>The document is very encouraging and I am impressed with many of the points it makes about raising the quality of development.</p> <p>There is no reference to the design of internal space standards.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p>
20	<p>No representation to make at this stage of your local planning process. This is because there is insufficient information in the consultation document on the location and use class of sites that could be</p>	John Moran	Noted.

	<p>developed. In the absence of this information, HSE is unable to give advice regarding the compatibility of future developments within the consultation zones of major hazard establishments and MAHPs located in the area of your local plan.</p>		
21	<p>Meaningless/valueless image on page 1.</p> <p>Jargon alert: “green and blue infrastructure” not defined and not readily understandable by all</p> <p>Little recent evidence of high quality development in South Oxfordshire in the document</p> <p>Two-stage consultation process not relevant to minor proposals</p> <p>Design review not appropriate for smaller schemes</p> <p>SODC bigger than 670M</p> <p>Page 15: describes infilling as harmful – but planning policy requires infilling – there is a direct conflict of direction being given here. Which is to take precedence?- efficient use of land is not made better by sweeping assertions like this. Infilling has happened for centuries and gives many settlements their character and cohesion.</p>	JPPC	<p>We have tried to include more relevant images.</p> <p>We have provided definitions.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>We still consider this to be best practice.</p> <p>It depends on the proposed development but it is still an example of best practice.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended.</p> <p>Filling in of the gaps between distinct settlements can be harmful in terms of landscape character but each site is considered on its own merits.</p>

<p>Excessive use of thatch and stone on page 17.</p> <p>The table on page 17 cannot be read as a PDF version.</p> <p>Page 15: Goring is not a dispersed settlement. Ipsden would be a better example you have highlighted two other totally difference villages Moulsoford and South Stoke and suggested that they are part of Goring. Henley and Lower Shiplake are two settlements and also not poly focal. Berrick Prior and Berrick Salome or Warborough and Shillingford would be better examples.</p> <p>Page 33: The image purports to show a successful open space. There is no one using the open space so it does look very successful to me, it is simply visual space but as the guide says, it should do more. This is a poor example.</p> <p>Page 37: OCC Highways will object to vertically stored bikes so why show this as a good example in a rural area?</p> <p>Why no mention of communal bin storage or recycling points?</p>	<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>The document is intended to be read as a full page spread. When viewed online, it is necessary to change the viewing settings to ensure that it can still be read this way. A note will be added to the website explain how to do this next to the link to the download to view the document.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. This is a good example of best practice.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>See above related to images.</p>
--	---

<p>Page 40: You refer to ‘anywhere’ design yet the good examples given are not local and are just the same anywhere design – just a newer version of it.</p> <p>Page 41 central image is like nothing in SODC.</p> <p>Page 43: The top image is not at all typical for fairly flat South Oxon, it is fairly pointless in my view.</p> <p>There is no reference to house sizes – quick reference to Technical Standards would suffice.</p> <p>Page 45: Phasing should be distinct from materials and makes a somewhat confused layout on this section.</p> <p>Page 47: 8.9 why is future maintenance of underground services not considered? Lots of new developments are scarred by workmen visiting a little later and not reinstating ground surfacing to the same quality or type. Some materials may not be available in years to come- advise careful choice of materials.</p> <p>8.12 size of tree pits should be ‘appropriate’ not necessarily agreed. A BS applies. It is not</p>		<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted. Image still considered to be relevant and shows a good approach to dealing with levels, as well as back to back distances.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p>
---	--	--

<p>appropriate for every tree to be checked by a tree officer- it just cannot happen.</p> <p>The draft design guide states that all proposals should be tested against the Guide. However, it is clearly intended for larger developments and will be of very little use for smaller scale developments.</p> <p>Smaller scale developments are the vast majority of planning applications. If this is intended to replace the previous guide in total, then it will be little used which will undermine its purpose and it might as well say 'all proposals must respond to their surroundings and will be scrutinised by professionals'.</p> <p>As <u>both</u> previous SODG iterations were said by SODC to lead to better design it is not clear why they need replacing and are no longer fit for purpose! It is not made clear why they need replacing. Have they not worked? Has anyone reviewed decisions that have been made using the previous versions?</p> <p>In addition, it is disappointing to note that there do not appear to be any examples of good design from SODC within the new Guide that will have been undertaken in the life of the previous SODGs. (the only SODC images of buildings seem to predate the SODG). Promises were made in them about what</p>	<p>See above relating to different scales of development.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. We are seeking to include more relevant and recent images.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	--

	<p>good design meant so how come there are no examples from the past 15 years. Such inability points to the Design Guides being ignored. How will you make sure this won't be? I don't really see much in this guide that will stand the test of time and allow new development to be judged in retrospect against what the guide will have delivered rather than just what would have happened anyway when developers follow development fashions affecting the whole country.</p> <p>This is not a Design Guide for South Oxfordshire in my view as it is too general and does not point clearly to desirable local outcomes.</p> <p>Lastly the very high file size of the document (80mb!!) will have put many off using it and is not at all user friendly. Pdfs are great as they allow a search facility, but taking 5 minutes to download is far too high. As applicants all our documents have to be less than 5mb.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
22	<p>The Design Guide does not appear to mention or address the problem of light pollution.</p> <p>Include reference to the prevention of light pollution in the Chilterns AONB if nothing else.</p> <p>There are guides to the prevention of light pollution that could be referenced in the Design Guide.</p>		<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

23	<p>I think there are many excellent features in the new guide, what is missing is the detail for extensions and outbuildings, which was very helpful in the old guide.</p> <p>The guide is biased towards urban and suburbs rather than rural areas.</p>	Kidmore End Parish Council	<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Part 1 of the guide refers to the rural character of South Oxfordshire. We are aware of the predominant rural nature of the district and have reviewed all the principles in the guide to make sure that these are applicable to all scales and context of development.</p>
	50 pages and 80MB!!! Can I suggest you rethink the format of this document.	Louise Moreton	Noted.
24	<p>Under “who to consult”, should the list also include someone with expertise on needs of disabled and/or elderly?</p> <p>Should the list of statutory authorities and organisations also include "equality", "equal opportunity" and/or "diversity" officers of local authorities?</p>	Mobility Issues Group for Goring and Streatley	<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
25	<p>Good to see “including the elderly and disabled’ under safety and inclusion.</p> <p>Very good to see “Ensuring places are safe, secure and welcoming for all, including the elderly and disabled.”</p>		Noted for all. Inclusive design has been incorporated into the document throughout.

	<p>Add “for all, including the elderly and disabled” under Ease of Movement – “ensuring places that are easy to get to and move through”.</p> <p>Add “including disabled” to the fifth bullet point on page 8.</p>		
26	<p>This SPD could consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area. The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should plan <i>‘positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure’</i>. The Planning Practice Guidance on Green Infrastructure provides more detail on this.</p> <p>Urban green space provides multi-functional benefits. It contributes to coherent and resilient ecological networks, allowing species to move around within, and between, towns and the countryside with even small patches of habitat benefitting movement. Urban GI is also recognised as one of the most effective tools available to us in managing environmental risks such as flooding and heat waves. Greener neighbourhoods and improved access to nature can also improve public health and quality of life and reduce environmental inequalities</p> <p>There may be significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments. These</p>	Natural England	<p>The document refers to and defines green infrastructure.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

<p>can be realised through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• green roof systems and roof gardens;• green walls to provide insulation or shading and cooling;• new tree planting or altering the management of land (e.g. management of verges to enhance biodiversity). <p>You could also consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans.</p> <p>Further information on GI is include within The Town and Country Planning Association's "Design Guide for Sustainable Communities" and their more recent "Good Practice Guidance for Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity"</p> <p>- Biodiversity enhancement This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit.</p> <p>Landscape enhancement The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	-----------------------------

surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might make a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.

For example, it may be appropriate to seek that, where viable, trees should be of a species capable of growth to exceed building height and managed so to do, and where mature trees are retained on site, provision is made for succession planting so that new trees will be well established by the time mature trees die.

Other design considerations

The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity ([para 125](#)).

Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment

A SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment only in exceptional circumstances as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance [here](#). While SPDs are unlikely to give rise to likely significant effects on European Sites, they should be considered as a plan under the Habitats Regulations in

Noted.

	the same way as any other plan or project. If your SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment, you are required to consult us at certain stages as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance.		
27	Suggested paragraph to be added to pre-application responses to make applicants aware that they should contact network rail at the pre-application stage if the proposal would have an impact on the railway.	Network Rail Barbara Morgan	Noted.
28	<p>Some repetition of the principles of sound design rather than specific examples showing how the principles are followed or ignored.</p> <p>A list of useful references should be near the beginning of the document together with useful websites which are updated frequently and sources of advice. (Including the cost of such advice and consultation.)</p> <p>I found the document difficult to read on screen, perhaps a website presentation would be better. The green print used for headings did not stand out and was difficult to read.</p> <p>The illustrations are reminiscent of a book for children - I presume that this is a reference for professionals?</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Useful references added to each section.</p> <p>The document can be viewed at different scales online to make it easier to read.</p> <p>We have tried to make the document have a more relaxed appearance to make it visually engaging to a range of readers.</p>

	<p>Having said all that, the policy is sound but in my experience developers are mainly interested in the profit they can make and this objective often undermines good planning.</p> <p>Are the sanctions for broken undertakings sufficient?</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council has an enforcement team that deal with breaches of planning control.</p>
29	<p>I think it is great that you have mixed graphics so that the first impression is of a friendly and engaging document.</p> <p>The structure is very clear and the balance between text and graphics is also really good and provide a good way to understand the 'message' either by reading or by looking at the 'how to' process that the graphics show.</p> <p>The hand drawings give an impression of openness and friendliness which is great. The fact that it is condensed and mostly focused on design principles rather than on very detailed mandatory codes is a fantastic feature. The guide feels exciting.</p> <p>What you call 'principles' we call 'qualities' or 'values. qualities for us are 'what we want to achieve' and principles, the 'how we achieve it' ... what can we do as urban designers, architects, etc to achieve those qualities. The principles work with</p>	Oxford Brookes University	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p>

	<p>the raw materials of urban design (the morphological layers) to explore different arrangements that can be done to achieve those qualities.</p> <p>I love the 'craft' image of the book but I think it is also good to work in partnership with the GIS department (if you have one) and start mapping design quality as a feature which applies to development land. Of course it is good to have generic guidance but could be great for developers, architects, communities, etc... to be able to click on a plot and understand all the guidance, rules etc that apply to it.</p> <p>I also think that the 'value of good design' could have been more explained and explicit in page 9. What is the real value of good design? economically? for the developers? for the communities? etc? social, environmental? perhaps either a link to a document that discusses this or some stats would really help people engage with the guide. it might help them use the guidance because they understand the value rather than because the council is saying they have to follow.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p>
30	<p>Add improving health as a key point in the list of the benefits of good design.</p> <p>Add references to Public Health England briefing for local authorities - Working together to promote</p>	Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p>

	<p>active travel and Local Government Association - Building the foundations - tackling obesity through planning and development.</p> <p>Add “encourage physical activity” be added to the description on page 8</p> <p>In the design objectives point 7 could ‘consideration of co-located services’ be added?</p> <p>Can the consideration of additional ways to support cycling and walking be added to point 16 e.g. that where feasible provision could be made for cycle storage, benches, showering facilities, lockers for helmets etc in public areas dependant on the size of the development and how feasible in more rural locations etc.</p> <p>Page 13 typo: Oxfordshire County Council has been listed as Oxford County Council.</p> <p>Could Public Health be added to the list of example areas covered by OCC for consultation?</p>		<p>Updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Already refer to bike parking and external storage.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p>
31	<p>As Vice-Chairman of Oxfordshire Transport & Access Group (OXTRAG), I attended the Working Group Meeting on 26th November 2014. I am pleased that some of the comments I made then have been incorporated into the Draft for Consultation, however several of my comments</p>	OXTRAG	Noted.

<p>have not yet been incorporated, and it is important that they should be in order to avoid discriminating against disabled people.</p> <p>Part 1: Safety and Inclusion: the important words: “including the elderly and disabled” have been included. <i>Good.</i></p> <p>Urban Design Principles (page 8): Safety and Inclusion: “Ensuring places are safe, secure and welcoming for all, including the elderly and disabled”. <i>Very good.</i></p> <p>Ease of Movement: “Ensuring places that are easy to get to and move through”: ADD “for all, including the elderly and disabled”.</p> <p>Fifth bullet point: “...for all users” ADD “, including disabled people.”</p> <p>Section 3: Movement - Test Your Design: 3.5: After “for all users” INSERT: “, including people with disabilities,” 3.9: After “and public transport users” INSERT “, including people with disabilities,”</p> <p>Section 5: Streets as Civilised Spaces: Test Your Design: <i>Good; 5.11 and 5.12 are particularly pleasing.</i></p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Already refer to ‘all users’.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>As above. Noted but we think we have already made it clear that the definition of users includes people with disabilities.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Section 6: Parking: INSERT: Where there is to be a community meeting place or shops, at least one in six parking spaces should be marked (with appropriate extra width) for cars carrying disabled people. Additional such spaces may be needed where larger than average numbers of elderly and/or disabled people are expected.</p> <p>Conclusion: “If you followed the previous steps, the new development should:” ADD a bullet point: Provide safe and easy access for all people.</p>		<p>This is too prescriptive for the guide and the parking standards are taken from the existing Oxfordshire County Council standards.</p> <p>This has already been covered earlier in the guide.</p>
	<p>The purpose of the draft Design Guide, I note is to "improve the standard of design in developments" and "break the mould of the standard design guide", although the draft Design Guide maintains the minimum back-to-back to distance guide line of 25 metres (pages 42 and 43). You'll also note the diagram on the page 43 accepts 21m, which appear contradict the text.</p> <p>I would suggest that 21m back-to-back distance (common planning practice in relation to the consideration of mutual overlooking of dwellings) rather than the suggested minimum of 25m is progressed as I can't see a justification for a minimum distance of 25m in all circumstances.</p> <p>The only other 'standards' approach I've picked up on that is contrary to the stated intention of breaking</p>	<p>Paul Butt</p> <p>On behalf of Croudace Homes and University of Reading</p>	<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted and the checklist provides the opportunity for justifying a shorter distance where it is not possible to achieve 25 metres.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>the mould are also on page 42 in relation to: (i) the provision of adequate amenity space for each residential unit, including apartments (1 bed = 35sqm, 2 bed + 50sqm, 3 bed+ = 100sqm); and (ii) back to side minimum distances of 12m, front-to-front 10m, and back-to-boundary 10m.</p> <p>I note that, unlike the existing 2008 Design Guide, there are no caveats to either the 21/25m minimum back-to-back distance, or the amenity space, or the back-to-side and front-to-front and back-to-boundary distances. For example the existing 2008 Design Guide at paragraph 3.2.6 states: "<i>Where the distance between facing habitable rooms in new proposals is less than 25 metres, demonstrate how the design proposals ensure that privacy is maintained.</i>"</p>		<p>Noted. See above regarding the opportunity for justification.</p>
32	<p>Clarify that the new guide replaces the 2008 guide.</p> <p>Foreword separates the role of planner and designer and suggests all planners are not suitably equipped to deal with design matters</p> <p>Document does not include a numbering system</p> <p>Green Belt is a proper noun and should be capitalised</p>	<p>Persimm on Homes</p>	<p>Updated.</p> <p>This document will also be used as a training tool for a range of users including Planners.</p> <p>The criteria are numbered. The rest of the text is quite limited.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

<p>Expensive materials do not equate to a high quality finish and the thrust of the statement should be revised. High quality development is more than the materials used, but the cost is not a factor that should be considered.</p> <p>The emphasis of the document should be reviewed to consider new settlements and the potential to create a new character that is not related to an existing area.</p> <p>Para 2 sets out that well designed places are sustainable development. This statement is not correct and the Council should review this particularly given the weight the Council wishes to attach to this document. The document will be cited in appeal discussions with inspectors where the golden thread of the presumption in favour of sustainable development is key. This document will allow disconnected well designed development to be allowed at appeal.</p> <p>Key Design Objectives bullet 2 sets a requirement for no net loss of habitat. This statement needs to be clarified, particularly in light of larger sites. Some biodiversity metrics will give a low score to an agricultural field, but due to the size of the site will require a very high level of biodiversity offsetting. In situations such as this the creation of new habitats</p>		<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>This echoes the Government's guidance in the NPPF.</p>
---	--	---

<p>should be accepted as offsetting, although not creating an increase based on the metric.</p> <p>Bullet 5 sets out a requirement for permeable hierarchy of streets. The document later references the use of cul-de-sacs [sic] and these are a useful design tool which do not create permeability of vehicles. Clarity of the objective should be provided to allow a focus on movement of non-vehicular modes of transport.</p> <p>Bullet 8 requires development to reflect the surrounding area. This runs contrary to the principle of best use of land and SODCs desire to create new settlements. Such a strict objective should not be included. The objective would also rule out taller development in urban centres, such as Didcot, where higher density taller development around a transport hub would be considered highly appropriate.</p> <p>Design and Access Statements: The Council want the document to become the structure of DAS. This is not appropriate as national guidance sets out the requirements for DAS. Too often over-zealous validation officers will refuse to validate an application; and the Council is creating a situation where if a DAS does not follow the structure of this document it will be deemed inappropriate. Every site is different and the DAS should be proportionate and</p>	<p>The guide promotes connected networks of streets and the avoidance of culs-de-sac which can hinder direct and convenient links and integration.</p> <p>Noted and updated to ensure development respects rather than reflects in every situation.</p> <p>Noted and updated. Refer to validation checklist.</p> <p>Noted and updated. Refer to validation checklist.</p>
---	---

<p>respond to the issues at the site, not follow a pre-determined structure set by the Council.</p> <p>Heritage Statements: The Council are setting a requirement for non-designated heritage assets to have an accompanying heritage statement. Such a high bar for non-designated assets is not appropriate; and such information could be addressed through other documents. Such prescription is not appropriate.</p> <p>All Planning Applications: The Council are requiring illustrative masterplans to accompany outline applications. This is not a statutory requirement, and if the Council will not approve such drawings, there should be no requirement for them to be submitted.</p> <p>Set the Objective: The Council are setting a prescriptive process for design; which is not appropriate. Every site is different and the design process will be informed by different elements on the site.</p> <p>Check the Criteria: The principle that officers will check that a development scheme meets these criteria when determining an application is misleading. Officers will be required to carry out the appropriate planning balance, and the criteria within the document are one of a number of factors that will weigh within the planning balance.</p>		<p>We would recommend this as best practice.</p> <p>The guide respects this and promotes a logical design process which starts from the unique site context.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Design Review: The document sets out a statement in relation to Design Review process. It is unclear how the Council expects this to be utilised. The Council should also be aware that Design Review is a process that can take place at any stage and should ensure that site allocations in their own Local Plan are considered through a Design Review process.</p> <p>Character Areas: The assessment of Character Areas does not represent a familiar picture of South Oxfordshire. Areas around Didcot are part of the historic county of Berkshire, where the vernacular is well described in Pevsner, which includes the traditional Berkshire style with hung tile and larger roof structures.</p> <p>The Character Areas seem to be focused on landscape areas, which do not necessarily respond to architectural character. Character Areas need to be reviewed and should have regard to a recognised architectural source.</p> <p>Natural Environment: As set out above, the requirement to ensure no net loss of biodiversity is not possible under specific metrics on larger sites which have agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The guide echoes the Government's guidance in the NPPF.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p>
--	--

<p>The document sets out the requirements to look beyond a site's red line. Whilst this approach is understood and supported; the Council often allocates sites within a red line and this assessment beyond the red line should be completed by the Council in formulating a policy for the site.</p> <p>The Council identifies a badger sett on the plan within the example. As the Council will be aware Badgers are a protected species, and identification of their setts on a public facing document could lead to inappropriate actions. In some circumstances (such as the location of protected species) site features cannot be identified on public facing documents, but will need to be considered. The document should reflect the protection afforded to specific species and advise people appropriately.</p> <p>The plural of cul de sac is culs de sac (not cul de sacs), much in the same way the plural of grand prix is grands prix not grand prixes. This section sets out that the use of cul de sacs [sic] is not land efficient. This is incorrect. The use of culs de sac is an appropriate solution in specific circumstances, and when designed appropriately are not overly engineered.</p> <p>The movement strategy opposite shows a number of routes which are not connected, and therefore the</p>		<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>The main routes are connected.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

<p>guidance seems to run contrary to the statements of the document.</p> <p>The document sets out that dispersal of traffic is positive. This assumption is flawed, the dispersal of routes can lead to some routes not being used and becoming unwelcoming to users. As with all things, moderation is appropriate. Based on this items 3.1 and 3.5 of the checklist should be reworded.</p> <p>Criterion 3.3 has an incorrect focus, streets should give priority to pedestrians. They should not be highways focused, and buildings should play an important part in the design. The lack of reference to users make the criterion inappropriate. Criteria 3.7:</p> <p>The criteria reference short walking distances this term is undefined so makes the assessment non specific.</p> <p>Criterion 3.8: The criterion relates to walking distances and times. These distances are based on assessments from the 1970s for parents walking with children. No up to date research on walking distances has informed the criterion and needs to be reassessed. Walking distances based on time would be more acceptable, particularly as the time to walk and distance are directly related to how direct (or indirect) the route is to a given destination.</p>		<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p>
---	--	---

<p>Density and Use: The section makes no allowance for the Design Objective to use land efficiently. Simply copying low density development in an existing settlement is not appropriate. New development should have regard to the existing density, but not mirror this. This needs to be more clearly stated within the section. This makes criterion 4.2 incorrectly worded and needing to be reviewed.</p> <p>Criterion 4.7: This criterion has no regard to matters beyond the red line. Where existing rears of properties bound the site it would not be appropriate to provide a forward facing development at the edge of the site.</p> <p>Creating Definition and enclosure: Paragraph 2 the first sentence is incomplete.</p> <p>Criterion 5.4: Should be reworded to focus on natural surveillance not overlooking, otherwise it creates potential conflict with criterion 5.5.</p> <p>Criterion 5.12: This is overly specific making no allowance for a site's natural topography and requiring to design overly engineered streets and spaces.</p> <p>Criterion 5.19: This is overly specific, as there may be instances where open space on the periphery of</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. There is the opportunity to provide justification if this is not possible.</p>
--	--

<p>the site is appropriate as part of a development strategy. For example a site on the edge of the AONB where an open space buffer should be created. Criterion 5.34: This is not specific, long path/alley should be defined.</p> <p>Criterion 6.9: This is not specific, the provision of electric charging points is a significant cost and impacts the viability of developments.</p> <p>Criterion 7.4: This is not appropriate. As set out above the requirements of higher density development close to a transport hub may not reflect the scale already in the locality, but would represent appropriate forms of development.</p> <p>Criterion 7.6: This appears to be unsubstantiated as a requirement. Owners of properties tend to like to move between properties when they have changing requirements.</p> <p>Criterion 7.7: This is overly prescriptive. A variety of roof forms can be provided on flat roofs which provide ecological enhancement (including brown roofs). Notwithstanding the ability to provide such roof types on flat roofs could cause additional construction costs and impact viability. It could also result in the creation of a high level of non pitched roofs.</p>	<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted. Updated.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted and updated the typo.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p>
--	---

<p>Amenity Space: The minimum distances set out are overly prescriptive and are not based on any urban design best practice. This is further reinforced by the stated distance on page 43 of 21m back to back (compared to the 25m proposed on page 42). This is repeated in criterion 7.14, which should be amended.</p> <p>Criterion 7.9: This is not specific, long, narrow alleyways should be defined.</p> <p>Criterion 7.12: This is not specific, generous balconies should be defined.</p> <p>Criterion 7.15: This is overly prescriptive, footpaths should be provided through green spaces, but they should not necessarily be of such materials.</p> <p>The document references the avoidance of standardised house types. It is unclear how the base of a house (the inclusion of rooms in a familiar position) relates to materials and the document should be clarified to set out the requirements and issues with standardisation.</p> <p>The document references the use of high quality materials. This is not specific, and earlier in the document the use of expensive materials is linked to being high quality. This is not appropriate and the term high quality should be clearly defined. This</p>	<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	---

<p>term is continued in criterion 8.3, which needs to be reworded or more clearly defined. The document singles out tarmac as an inappropriate material, however, this is widely used for a wide range of roads across the country and therefore for a single authority to specifically ban its use is difficult to understand, particularly when it is unsubstantiated.</p> <p>The document sets out that applicants may be expected to make financial contributions towards maintenance. Further detail is required in relation to this requirement, as management can be carried out in a number of ways.</p> <p>Criterion 8.12: This is not appropriate as it provides no range for the negotiations with the Councils Tree Officer;</p> <p>Size: It is ridiculous that a 50 page document is over 80mb, surely a low resolution on line version can be made available. This makes the document inaccessible. Having opened the document in pdf editing software and saved in a reduced file size format it became 13.6 MB. The Council have made the document inaccessible through the very size; and should ensure the final version is available in a low resolution format.</p> <p>High Quality Development is a wide ranging term and means different things at different scales. High</p>		<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	--	---

<p>quality development for a person building their own house means something very different to high quality development for an urban extension. It is not possible to answer this type of question without more specific parameters. High Quality Development is not expensive materials.</p> <p>Several of the technical documents go beyond the requirements of the planning system, straying into other regulatory systems. Whilst it is acknowledged these should be considered in the design process, setting targets and requirements at the planning stage is not appropriate.</p> <p>The document requires the use of larger tree species. This appears to be a false economy and should consider earlier planting of smaller trees to allow these to naturally grow. Matters such as management should be capable of being dealt with by condition and should not prevent commencement of development.</p> <p>The key elements of the document appears to be the 'Planning positively for biodiversity'. The document references that the Council applies a form of Biodiversity Accounting, but the details of this scheme are thin on the ground. As set out previously, where a large scale development comes forward on a green field site, the high quantity of low scoring habitats (such as arable fields) start to</p>		<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>The guide echoes the Government's guidance in the NPPF.</p>
---	--	--

<p>negatively impact upon developments. The Council needs to use a common sense approach to see mitigation and creation of habitats; but not to the level where strategic developments are required to deliver a net increase. The document sets out where planning conditions should be used. Obviously the PPG provides clear guidance on Planning Conditions and the document makes no reference to these requirements.</p> <p>The document does not appear to have regard to all other documents prepared. Persimmon Homes supports the creation of a homes which operate on a fabric first basis. There is no point in creating energy to be wasted within the home, and the energy in the home should be used efficiently. Building orientation should not focus solely on the potential for solar gain. Firstly solar gain is not necessarily a positive feature as this can lead to over heating of a property; secondly it disregards the contextual assessment of a site. The document appears to be trying to make energy requirements a planning consideration; however, the Government have clearly set out where a Local Authority can have control through the planning process in the PPG. These relate to accessibility; water efficiency and space standards. Energy efficiency is a requirement of the building regulations and should not be subject to planning requirements.</p>		<p>Noted. We have sought to provide cross linking references throughout the document.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

	The creation of art for arts sake is not something that is supported. Integration of artistic features within a development is welcomed, but if the art has an impact upon the best use of the land it should not become an over riding factor. The delivery of such initiatives should also be subject to viability assessments, the Council already seek significant contributions through CIL and affordable housing; the creation of additional costs relating to public art further dilute the ability to deliver viable schemes.		
33	It would help if the design guide was easier to download.	Peter Logan	Noted.
34	The image of a house in Wallingford on page 17 is in fact in Dorchester. Clarify that listed building status covers the interior of a listed building. Refer to the Local list of undesignated heritage assets.	Professor Malcolm Airs	Noted and updated. Noted and updated. Noted and updated.
35	Welcome the commitment to sustainability, enhancing biodiversity, planning for climate change and enhancing local facilities. While we recognise that south Oxfordshire is predominately a rural District. The design guide should emphasis more that we have four substantial country town, which are urban environments. Much	CPRE	Noted. Noted. We have sought to update our images to make them more relevant.

<p>of the planned developments will be in these towns (or in a new settlement which will be effectively a new urban settlement). We feel the emphasis here on vernacular architecture (witness the preponderance of photographs of old buildings or new/old pastiches) may not be appropriate to the development of these urban centres - both in the densities, heights and characters of the buildings.</p> <p>We would urge the provision of car charging points for electric cars to future proof these parking areas.</p> <p>Again we would urge where appropriate (and particularly in the more urban areas) higher densities and 3 or 4 storey building may be appropriate. We should guard against the monotonous, uniform low density suburban housing estates so often seen.</p> <p>This is a really odd and mixed section and difficult to comment on! We welcome the use of a variety of natural materials but do not forget modern.</p> <p>There is a section on phasing etc - if only the developers would do this realistically!</p> <p>I'm saddened to see no reference to energy efficiently, local generation and district heating systems - I know we've lost the energy efficiency building codes but in an affluent, science based area</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>There is a separate sustainable energy technical document.</p>
--	--	---

	like SO these should be given priority. Low energy and low impact designed with regard to local infrastructure. I think some review of these within the design guide would have been useful. Also better referencing.		
36	Add link to Public Art Online (oxonarts.info)	Public Art Officer	Noted and updated.
37	<p>The structure of the document works very well, however, when reading it on-line it is not as easy to grasp how the document is structured. I therefore think it would be useful to have a graphic at the start that more clearly explains the structure that I am able to refer back too. Could pages of the pdf be bookmarked to facilitate this? Pages 3, 10,11 do cover this, but I think what would help me would be some kind of graphic that I could hold in my head to help keep me on track with where I am in the document.</p> <p>I think the coloured tabs for Part 2 work really well in doing this but I think up front at page 3 might be the place to explain this. The use of headers(especially on the right hand pages) within the document would be useful to remind you of your place within the document e.g. Part 2:8 Ensuring Quality.</p> <p>Some consideration of how the new development will benefit the existing community. What is there to draw in neighbours and knit this new development into its surroundings? Maybe this could be included</p>	<p>Rachel Aldred</p> <p>Architect</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>in the Part2: 5, or Part 2: 2.6 and 2.7 which touches on this.</p> <p>Space standards- I feel some aspiration ought to be included in Part 2: 7, or at the least some reference to storage requirements.</p> <p>In addition to this document, the ‘test your design’ boxes could be replicated in another pdf document to form a checklist which could be submitted by developers. Providing expandable text boxes to enable them to give explanations of where criteria are not met and make reference to relevant supporting drawings and documents.</p> <p>A ‘next steps’ at the end of the document might be useful to conclude and reinforce the idea that the aim of this document is to make life easier for both LA and developers in reducing work load by streamlining the process and working collaboratively from the outset of the project.</p>		<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p>
38	<p>The design guide fails to incorporate the use of cellars/basements. These are widely used in house construction in places such as Canada. The advantages being: skylines can be reduced areas may be designed with simple partition walls as required by the purchaser, these may include such things as utility rooms, games rooms, spare bedrooms for visitors, study rooms, quiet rooms,</p>		<p>Noted.</p>

	TV/cinema rooms thus preventing cramped conditions within standard designs. Examples may be such things as a 2 bed terrace with a family of 2 adults and a young boy. They subsequently find that a new born girl arrives. They cannot afford to move but are able to utilise the cellar/basement to overcome this problem. Similar issues may occur whereby a couple with an elderly parent living elsewhere and no longer able to fend for themselves, together with granny annexes so few and far between. The option here is that this can be replaced by the cellar/basement thus also reducing social services funding for carers, meal delivery etc.		
39	There is no mention anywhere of minimum room sizes. UK has the smallest sqm spaces in the EU for dwelling of all types. We do not want to live in tiny boxes. There is plenty of land. Something like the Parker Morris standard SHOULD BE INCLUDED.		Noted and updated.
40	Should the district area be 670km2 and not as written.		Noted.
41	<p>The text is quite small. Check that the Validation team would be happy if the completion of the assessment tool is to form part of the validation process.</p> <p>Mention who the Design Guide is for, recognising that everyone from professional urban designers to the layperson will need to look at it.</p>	South Oxfordshire District Council Planning Policy	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Updated.</p>

<p>P7 – <i>Sustainable Development</i>: Differs from the definition provided within the NPPF. It is important that the whole document is NPPF compliant. No mention made of the environmental role of sustainable development.</p> <p>P7 – The NPPF places a lot of emphasis on good design and should be mentioned along with CABE and RIBA.</p> <p>Also is it worth mentioning the benefits of good design in reducing crime or the fear of crime? Do we need to mention “Secured by Design”. Also the issue of resilience and counter terrorism? http://www.securedbydesign.com/</p> <p>P10 – <i>Design & access statement</i> - Not all applications require these now.</p> <p>P10 – Heritage Statement: SODC’s validation checklist states that a Heritage Statement is only required for applications affecting a listed building or where the site falls within a conservation area. They are not required where an application affects a non-designated asset. Is this something that needs to be reviewed?</p> <p>Illustrative masterplans – We could encourage their approval as part of the outline permissions in order to facilitate good design.</p>		<p>Updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	--	---

<p>We could mention that we encourage pre-application discussions where we can raise the issue of good design from the start.</p> <p>We could also encourage the preparation and agreement of an illustrative masterplan for larger through pre-application discussions.</p> <p>P11 Inform your design: Do we need the first two sentences?</p> <p>P12 First para –The delivery of high quality development is not dependent on “good design professionals”. Everyone should be able to contribute with the aid of this guide.</p> <p>P13 – who to consult: This consultation will take place as part of the application process.</p> <p>P14 – figure needs a reference. The Green Belt and AONB extend beyond our district boundary.</p> <p>P15 - Whilst the settlement patterns are a statement of fact, how important are settlement patterns on new development?</p> <p>What is a “figure ground diagram”?</p> <p>How will understanding the settlement pattern lead to good design?</p>	<p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>It is also relevant to the pre-application stage.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--

<p>P17 The Clay Vale Roofs: Thatch – Bold carries on too far onto the T.</p> <p>P22 – We should explain that this applies from both strategic sites, to small infill developments and an extensions to dwellings.</p> <p>Refer to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment http://www.landscapeinstitute.org/knowledge/GLVIA.php</p> <p>P26 – Should consider a route/street hierarchy – it’s in the figure (needs a reference number) but not in the text.</p> <p>P27 Figure ? Primary street – cycle lanes are missing.</p> <p>P28 – shared use of spaces and facilities also useful.</p> <p>P29 – where are the examples shown in the photos? Better to reference them.</p> <p>P30 Para 2, second line – created by well defined??</p> <p>Human scale – Needs explaining. Need to be clear that larger than human scale does not mean it represents bad design.</p>	<p>Updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>We have not shown separate cycle lanes in this example because we do not normally request them at this scale.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--

<p>P31 – Figures need references and also details of where these places are.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>
<p>I'm not sure about the "windows to habitable rooms" photo. It's hard to believe that habitable rooms wouldn't have windows. We should also state that all habitable rooms should have natural light.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>
<p>P32 – Short sentence at the end of the last paragraph.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>
<p>After 5.15 should we have "design out crime"?</p>		<p>Noted.</p>
<p>P34 – Last sentence add that "Reference should be made to existing national guidance on inclusive play and any standards within the adopted development plan".</p>		<p>Noted.</p>
<p>P37 – First line clutter of bins</p>		<p>Updated.</p>
<p>P40 Third Para – Variety of building height along the street frontage...</p>		<p>Updated.</p>
<p>7.5 – comma missing after <i>attractive detailing</i></p>		<p>Updated.</p>
<p>P43 point i: refers to page 44. Should be 42?</p>		<p>Updated.</p>
<p>P44 – second para: Design codes ensure (not ensures)</p>		<p>Updated.</p>

<p>The document covers the value of good design but does not mention viability or viability testing.</p> <p>Overall – the design guide is good for large scale residential schemes however:</p> <p>It seems to be based largely on residential development rather than commercial or other uses.</p> <p>The guide doesn't provide much information on how it would be used by a layperson or; how a small scale scheme should consider good design.</p> <p>Technical documents:</p> <p>Technical Document 6: Building Conversions:</p> <p>Need an explanation of the purpose of the document. Many changes of use are now permitted development and no planning permission is required.</p> <p>It is too prescriptive and should not apply to "all types of conversion". Many conversions are permitted development where no control over the design is possible.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	---

<p>Whether the building being converted is within the Green Belt, the AONB, a Conservation Area, is Listed etc are key factors.</p> <p><i>The conversion must retain the character and appearance of the original building. Only required if the building is listed.</i></p> <p>In a conservation area the requirement is to preserve or enhance.</p> <p>The introduction of conspicuous domestic features should be avoided.</p> <p>Existing openings in elevations should be used for windows and doors: New openings could be made if it is good design.</p> <p>New windows or doors should be added sparingly and should not significantly alter the overall proportion of solid wall to openings. A simple window design is usually most appropriate.</p> <p>Where additional floors are introduced, they should not cut across tall windows. Too prescriptive.</p> <p>Much of the above depends if the building is listed. Floors cutting across tall windows can be successful.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

<p><i>Commercial buildings converted to flats should comply with the basic design principles set out in the Design Guide: All development that requires planning permission should comply with the adopted development plan and the NPPF. Policies will refer to the design guide.</i></p> <p><u>Retain the character of the setting:</u> This is contained within the design guide with greater detail.</p> <p>Would be better to “respect” the character of the setting rather than retain. For example an infill development cannot retain the gap between the buildings.</p> <p>I’m not sure what “compatible” means.</p> <p><u>Retain the character of the building:</u> <i>Adapt proposed living arrangements to suit the building and retain its characteristics.</i> Not possible in a change of use situation.</p> <p>Assumption that the conversion is to residential? Suit the building?</p> <p>Retain characteristics is covered above.</p> <p><i>Existing internal features of interest should be integrated into the conversion where possible. Why?</i></p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Technical Document 1: Landscape</p> <p>What makes the landscape unique?</p> <p>Refer to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment http://www.landscapeinstitute.org/knowledge/GLVIA.php</p> <p><u>Test your design:</u> Seems to repeat the design guide.</p> <p><u>Green Infrastructure:</u> Nothing contained in this section.</p> <p><u>Play space:</u> Mention passive surveillance?</p> <p>Insufficient weight has been given to the accepted methodology for Landscape Character Assessment. In Natural England 2014, An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>The description of items to be included in a landscape character assessment is confusing and limited in its scope.</p> <p>The document suggests that a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) has been carried out but it does not make it clear whether each planning application should be carrying out a full LCA or whether applicants should refer to existing LCAs that have</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	---

	<p>been carried out in the district. It would be sensible to refer to existing national guidance such as that by Natural England.</p> <p>While the 'further information' section includes the National Landscape Character Area Profiles there is no discussion about different levels of assessment. Methodologies elsewhere in the country commonly increase the level of detail to Landscape Character Types within Landscape Character Areas within National Character Areas.</p> <p>The further information section also refers to the emerging Oxfordshire County Council Historic Landscape Character but the technical document does not explain how this might fit in with contemporary landscape design.</p> <p>The UK is a signatory to the Council of Europe (2000), European Landscape Convention, Council of Europe, Florence, October 2000, known as the European Landscape Convention (ELC). This defines landscape as "... an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and / or human factors." Landscape Character Assessment is therefore commonly applied to urban landscapes and townscapes however the photographs used to illustrate landscape character give the misleading</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	---	--	---

<p>impression that only beautiful countryside has character.</p> <p>The Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (and its predecessor the Institute of Environmental Assessment) since 1995 have published joint guidelines on good practice in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Their industry recognised standards for such assessment are set out in the 2013, Guidance for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3 (GVLIA3).</p> <p>GVLIA3 clearly sets out two paths, one for formal landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) as a necessary part of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and a more informal landscape appraisal path where EIA is not required. The Design Guide technical document should ask applicants to state clearly the path that they are on and therefore whether they are providing LVIA or informal appraisal.</p> <p>Rather than selecting aspects such as topography and trees to appraise it would be better to direct applicants to the GVLIA3 guidance methodology, which has an in-depth approach to the landscape as a resource not just a collection of views.</p> <p>The use of the term 'landscape structure' to over existing and proposed features in the landscape is</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

<p>over simplistic. Existing landscape features should be covered adequately in LVIA or appraisal so this section should be called something like 'new landscapes' or 'design'.</p> <p>There also seems to be a lack of clarity in the artificial separation in the text between 'landscape structure', 'green infrastructure', 'topography and strategic views', 'health, well-being and recreation' and 'play space'. All of these factors overlap. The criteria selected therefore do not flow well and it is not at all clear whether the applicant should 'test the design' against all or some of the criteria. The use of 'ensure your design...' in some places gives confusing emphasis to only some criteria.</p> <p>The section completely omits.</p> <p>Lack of reference to the principles of water sensitive design or Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), which should be an essential part of any designed landscape for developments over a certain size. A lack of explanation of the relationship between landscape designs and Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>Reference to short or long-term landscape management plans and;</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	--	---

<p>No reference to designing in protection of existing structures, such as trees, during the construction period.</p> <p>Technical Document 7: Public art</p> <p><i>Public art is art for the public specifically designed by artists for the purpose of public display (i.e. it is beyond the artist's work merely shown in public spaces). Is this the definition of public art?</i></p> <p>The images are local but a few national and international examples could also be added.</p> <p><i>Further Information: South And Vale of White Horse District Council Public Art Policy (to link)</i></p> <p>More information on how public art will be provided in relation to S106 and CIL is required. If this is to be our public art strategy then more information is needed.</p> <p>http://www.associationforpublicart.org/what-is-public-art/ http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Noted and updated.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	---

<p>Technical Document 8: Shopfronts and signage</p> <p>SODC already has a “Traditional Shopfront Design Guide” 1995 SPG.</p> <p>Is this technical document only for traditional shopfronts as per the SPG or for all shopfronts? There are lots of examples of excellent modern shopfronts which have brought new life to town centres. Examples of very poor shopfronts that we fitted in the 60s being upgraded to modern, inspirational designs which enhance the public realm. This technical document could be an opportunity to guide the design of modern new shopfronts. We already have the SPG to protect the traditional shopfronts. Again, if it is important information, why is it not in the Design Guide itself?</p> <p><i>“A strikethrough version of the guide is appended..”</i> Why is a strikethrough version appended when the full version is still available on the SODC website?</p> <p><i>“The design details of traditional shopfronts have their roots in the display of goods in medieval market stalls, although the shopfront as we now recognise it emerged only with the expansion of commercial activity in the 18th century.”</i> I’m not sure that the above is entirely correct or adds any value to the document.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The strike through version is an updated existing SPD. This guide supports it.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	---

	<p><i>Traditional shopfronts in our district are increasingly threatened by the decline of the small individual retail outlet and the rise of larger stores with standard corporate images. Is this correct? It the threat now increasing? Why? Larger stores are not new and there is not a rise in them.</i></p> <p><i>However, it is possible to integrate the needs of retail units and pay regard to the character of the building or surrounding streetscape. Perhaps highlight the value that more traditional designs can add to the shops etc.</i></p> <p>Technical Document 2: Biodiversity</p> <p>Good information. Is this the correct place for it within the Design Guide?</p> <p>Technical Document 3: Sustainable Energy</p> <p>No comments to make other than the document is very short and doesn't contain a great deal of additional information. It should be within the Design Guide to avoid duplication and integrate sustainability into the design from the start.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
42	Pleased to see that affordable and market housing should not be differentiated		Noted.

43	<p>It would be helpful if there could be very brief references in the main guide (literally just a few words) to themes that are expanded on in the technical documents. A couple of places where this would be relevant are:</p> <p>i) p22/23 considering elements beyond the site boundary – please add a brief reference to linking energy solutions with large consumers (or generators) adjacent to the site</p> <p>ii) p28/29 making the most of sunlight – please add a reference to incorporating active solar energy systems</p> <p>Commentary on the issues of daylight/sunlight could helpfully be added to the main text on p28, rather than just being in the supplementary boxes</p> <p>p46/47 – there is a reference to adapting to climate conditions in the main text. Could you please add a further reference in ‘test your design’</p>	Sustainability Officer Heather Saunders	<p>Noted. There is a reference to the other technical documents that are relevant.</p> <p>We think this is too specific for the design guide.</p> <p>This is covered in the technical document.</p> <p>We don’t think it is necessary to repeat this.</p> <p>We don’t think it is necessary to repeat this. We refer to adaptability.</p>
44	<p>Compliments to the author(s) of this document. It is clear, concise, comprehensive and will be a most useful supplement to the NPPF and the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide.</p>	Swyncombe Parish Council	Noted.

<p>It is almost exclusively relevant for urban developments and does not take adequately into account the need for 'high quality rural developments'. This is particularly important for South Oxfordshire, which is predominantly rural and will, therefore, present specific infrastructure, building design, housing development and connectivity challenges.</p> <p>'Key design objectives' (page 8): this should include some reference to optimising the cost (price) / performance ratio, both for market and affordable housing.</p> <p>'Who to consult' (page 13): we note that no mention is made of the Chiltern Society, nor the CPRE.</p> <p>We wish to focus on our part of South Oxfordshire (Chiltern Hills) and would again commend the report for its detail and succinct description of the varied landscape characteristics and settlement patterns, within which our parish can be categorised as a fairly pronounced example of a dispersed settlement.</p> <p>We particularly approve of the goals and requirements set out in chapter 7 (pages 42 & 43), which are of special relevance to areas such as ours with its very distinctive and sensitive landscape characteristics.</p>	<p>Part 1 of the guide refers to the rural character of South Oxfordshire. We are aware of the predominant rural nature of the district and have reviewed all the principles in the guide to make sure that these are applicable to all scales and context of development.</p> <p>Updated the 'Value of good design' section.</p> <p>Noted. Chilterns Conservation Board added.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>A small scale example has now been provided to show how the guide relates to this scale.</p>
--	---

	<p>We similarly approve of the goals stated in chapter 8 (pages 44 & 45), both in the setting of design codes and choice of materials, but which should apply equally to single dwellings and minor developments (up to 4/5 dwellings).</p> <p>In conclusion, the draft design guide has our full approval. We feel strongly, however, that the guide must be specific and not open to interpretation, and its implementation must be commensurate with SODC's will and ability to insist on adherence, exercise control (supervision) and, where necessary, carry out enforcement. There must be no opportunity for a developer/builder/architect to 'drive a coach and horses' through the requirements of the guide, nor to circumvent the conditions under which planning approval was obtained.</p>		Noted.
45	The term “sustainable” was too vague and not clearly defined what it would require from developments to be considered to be sustainable.	Tetsworth Parish Council	Noted and changed.
46	Please can Planners be aware of equestrian's needs and retain their access on designated horse routes so that they can enjoy these Public Rights of Way.		Noted.

47	<p>We would like to see the following within all new developments:</p> <p>Shared Space: Cycle routes should be segregated from pedestrians. This could be achieved by using colour contrast on routes to identify the different types of shared space.</p> <p>A width of 1.2 metres should be included on the route to allow for a guide dog and or wheelchair/mobility scooters (non-road version) This should be at the very least 900 mm unobstructed pavement width.</p> <p>White banding on all dark posts (140-160 wide at a height of 1.5 to 1.7 metres above ground). Banding should also be used on coloured posts avoiding metallic and shiny material that may cause glare. Black would be an excellent choice.</p> <p>Parking on pavements: To avoid this issue we would suggest making the carriageways flush with pavements. In doing so we would recommend working with Guide Dog Organisation on the impact this might have on assistance dogs and their owners.</p>	Unlimited Oxfordshire	Noted all.
----	--	-----------------------	------------

<p>Street Furniture: We recommend that all so called street furniture is kept to that which is absolutely essential to avoid trip hazards for all.</p> <p>All glazed shelters bear a logo and markings from base to top. We would also like to see talking bus shelters giving passengers route information. Seating should also be provided within the shelter to assist those with physical disabilities.</p> <p>Items such as bins, bollards, cycle stands and flower beds are to be brightly coloured and offer both tonal and colour contrast using non glare materials.</p> <p>Temporary Highway Works: We would like to see that all essential highway works and or housing developments that involve closure of pavements are kept to those routes that are strictly necessary and that alternative accessible routes are made available for those people with disabilities. We would further request that section 169 of the Highways Act be adhered to with regard to padding, in bright colours, scaffolding poles. Poles should also be lit.</p> <p>Blue Badge parking is not removed unless essential. In this instance we would like to see appropriate nearby alternative parking</p>		
--	--	--

	<p>We would like to see a contact point for all long term works that will impact on people with disabilities together with bus route changes.</p> <p>Wheelie Bins: Within new housing developments we would like to see a dedicated bin storage area for each individual house, preferably located at the front of the property so that residents requiring disabled assistance with their bins do not have to leave gates or garages open to achieve collection. Arrangements should be made to ensure that communal wheelie bins are accessible for those with disabilities.</p> <p>Building Type: In regard to individual dwellings or flats, Both the Equalities Act 2010 and the Buildings Regulations Part M must be adhered to.</p> <p>We are delighted with the planned design of the bungalows being built at Thame Meadows, Thame. These properties will have walls that can easily be adjusted to suit a variety of family needs including disability.</p> <p>Allocated parking near to flats should be well laid out and adhere to the philosophy of point 1 shared space. The Width and length of these spaces should allow for easy of accessibility for wheelchair users.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Within Thame, in Park Terrace, opposite the BP Garage, a recent development for Green Square Housing Association has a very good frontage to each house. Each Property has wide parking for at least two vehicles and also a designated bin storage area. All contained within clear boundaries for each property.</p> <p>Attention also needs to be paid to the type of surface used within new communal spaces within town centres or village centres. Fancy patterns, can be confusing to people with sight issues and will lead to falls. Cobbled stones and shiny surfaces represent a trip hazard to everyone particularly those with sensory and physical disabilities.</p> <p>We are greatly concerned that housing developments are being built without any facilities for residents. This is true of all large scale developments in Thame within the last thirty years.</p> <p>In addition no thought has been given as to how these developments link together both with neighbouring developments often next door to each other but by separate developers, or with the existing area.</p>		
48	The vacuum system method of collection is not currently provided by this collection authority.	Waste, Abiola Ademiluyi	Noted.

	<p>Additional useful and interesting resources: - South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Council's wheeled bin Policy -South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Waste Planning Guidance (please include ref to this) in guide. - Guide for Streets 1 (2010) "6. Street user's needs - Waste management in buildings "code of practice, BS5906 2005 - Building for Life 12 (2015)" 12. External storage and amenity space.</p>		<p>Noted and added.</p>
<p>49</p>	<p>The appearance of the document is appealing and invites closer examination, but it is not clear who the intended audience is.</p> <p>It seems too elementary to be aimed at professional developers / designers, but they are the people who will be doing the real design work and so are the people that the Guide should be trying to influence.</p> <p>On the other hand it is pitched at about the right level for parish council planning committees or groups preparing Neighbourhood Plans. As far as Neighbourhood Plans go it provides ideas that could be incorporated as policies, but is not going to be that easy to reference because of its relaxed structure and style.</p> <p>The checklist approach in both the Guide and the Technical Documents is good, but there is not</p>	<p>Watlington Parish Council</p>	<p>Noted. We have clarified who the document is for under 'The Purpose of the Guide'.</p> <p>The guide seeks to be accessible to all readers and we purposefully chose a relaxed structure so that the majority of people could relate to it, not just designers.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

<p>always enough supporting text to make the checklist clear.</p> <p>For example Technical Document 5 twice refers to the 45 degree rule without ever explaining it. This is not a problem for design professionals who one hopes would know about it, but as the document is entitled “Householder Extensions” the rule should be explained for the benefit of lay users of the guide.</p> <p>Similarly the “Roof lights should be included on rear elevations where they are less likely to be visible in the street scene” could be an instruction to use roof lights where possible, or it could be an instruction only to use roof lights where they will not be visible from the street.</p> <p>The Technical Documents are clearly early drafts yet to be finalised which is a pity. It would have been far better to have consulted on the complete suite of documents. It is not clear whether further Technical Documents are planned, but this could be used to provide the useful details in the old guide that have not been transferred to the new guide.</p> <p>It would also be useful to have more explicit references to these Technical Documents in the Design Guide – some references are included, but others are not. Only four out of eight of them are</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	--	---

<p>referenced in the body of the Guide although a further one is referenced in the introductory text.</p> <p>The use of illustrations is not as clear as it might be with a tendency to borrow illustrations from the old Design Guide without making it clear what the relationship to the text on the page is. For example on page 9 the pairs of good and bad examples give no idea of why one is good and the other bad, and the glossary terms at the foot of the page provide no help at all (they are actually an overflow from the previous page).</p> <p>Again on page 29 there is a picture of a pavement cafe with the symbol “Zoom in - Further detailed explanations and examples” and a caption about providing facilities within walking distance. It is not clear at all how this relates to the adjoining check list which is mainly concerned with layout of blocks and streets.</p> <p>The new design guide is a useful ‘how to’ tool that could be further strengthened by inclusion of some further material from the old version. For example the section on ‘Development Setting’, omits some points from the original that are of importance. In our area (Vale fringes) the typical building materials are given as “locally produced brick, local soft ‘clunch’ used in association with brick dressings” while the original said “timber framed buildings and</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

<p>brick and flint are common in this area. Locally produced brick was used in some areas and there are examples of the local soft ‘clunch’ used in association with brick dressings”. It seems unlikely that new developments will use clunch but frequently they do include areas of flint used mainly as cladding to match with the older flint buildings around. The old guide included the advice to “Make sure that new buildings do not obscure important views within settlements or the outer surrounding areas” but this appears to have not to have been carried over to the new Guide.</p> <p>The document needs to be given a thorough and critical proof read. There are a number of places where the cut and paste transfer from the old guide is obvious, such as the 45 degree rule referenced above, or the heading in “Forward pl” in the Technical Document 4.</p> <p>Page 17: The local materials table gives a very variable level of detail. The lack of consistency risks losing some key local characteristics. In the Vale Fringe area there is no mention of the use of salt glazed bricks and patterned brickwork which is common, but this is included for other character areas. We appreciate that styles and materials spread across the artificial Character Area boundaries but selective use of some materials and styles for each area is not necessarily a helpful</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	--	-----------------------------

<p>guide to what will harmonise with the existing built environment.</p> <p>Page 18: The section on archaeology only mentions 'known' archaeological remnants or deposits. Surely it is necessary to discover if there are any previously unknown archaeological remains prior to development of a site in those cases where development is taking place in areas where there is potential for prior use of the land to left valuable archaeological remains. As an example when plans for construction of a new rectory on what is now green space land near the church were considered, the applicant had to undertake an archaeological survey as part of the planning requirements even though there are no "known" remains or deposits at that location.</p> <p>Page 30: The sentence "Enclosure in a street is mostly created by a strong building line but it can also be created by well defined." This doesn't seem to make sense and is probably a typing error.</p> <p>Page 43: "Awkward size gardens should be avoided" This does not seem to be a helpful bit of advice – what is an awkward size garden? This would perhaps be better as "Awkward Shaped Gardens"</p> <p>Page 43: The checklist includes an item "Green space incorporates bound gravel pathways". This</p>	<p>Archaeological investigations could be undertaken if it is considered that there is a need for them. This would be considered during the pre-application and planning application stages.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and changed.</p> <p>Noted and changed.</p>
--	--

	<p>seems too prescriptive – there is presumably no reason why paths should be bound gravel, any other durable material should be acceptable.</p> <p>Page 47: While we are in favour of ensuring that landscaping includes trees where appropriate the two pictures on page 47 show trees with very small soil area that we would not expect to thrive. We have problems with roundels (bigger than those shown and with smaller trees) where the trees died and we are left with stumps and root filled roundels that are almost impossible to plant in. Explicit reference to the Technical Document 4 would be helpful here.</p> <p>Page 49: A map to illustrate conclusion has one line with no comment associated with it – looks like central paved area.</p>		<p>We have a separate technical document for trees.</p> <p>Noted and changed.</p>
50	<p>The guide will help protect the beautiful character of the district.</p> <p>New development should relate to that character.</p> <p>New development should not harm neighbours.</p> <p>There should be a wide range of dwelling types to meet the needs of all in the community.</p>		Noted to all.

<p>Please provide any comments about this section below if you would like to Part 1 talks about a Rural and Urban area, but much of the information provided is biased to urban. E.G. Heading on Page 8 URBAN design. Page 13 lists only one tourist hot spot in Oxfordshire and none in the District itself.. Despite mention of the AONB I could not find any reference to the Chiltern Conservation Board Design Guide Document nor one for the North Wessex area.</p> <p>How far do you agree with Section 1? Agree</p> <p>How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 1 Disagree</p> <p>Please provide any comments about this section below As already posted</p> <p>How far do you agree with Section 3? Agree</p> <p>How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 3? Agree</p>	<p>Cllr Lynn Lloyd check</p>	<p>We have sought to emphasise that the guide relates to all contexts and scales of development.</p> <p>We have ensured that we refer to the Chilterns Conservation Board Design Guide.</p>
---	------------------------------	---

<p>Please provide any comments about this section below</p> <p>Section 3 refers to public transport and other facilities local to the development. This document makes no recognition that a majority of settlements in the District do not have any form of public transport available.</p> <p>Once again this part of the document deals with larger housing developments and doesn't provide sensible information for the rural developments in small settlements</p> <p>How far do you agree with Section 4 Agree</p> <p>How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 4? Agree</p> <p>How far do you agree with Section 5? Disagree</p> <p>How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 5? Disagree</p> <p>Please provide any comments about this section below</p>		<p>The checklists provide an opportunity for justifying where it is not possible or appropriate because of the context to achieve the criteria.</p>
---	--	---

<p>Once again this part of the document assumes that alternative forms of transport are available to people who will be living in these developments. see page 33 5.8. Please understand that the car is the only option in many SODC settlements</p> <p>How far do you agree with Section 7? Disagree</p> <p>How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 7? Agree</p> <p>Please provide any comments about this section below Once again written for developments in an urban area with no information or requirements for a small rural development.</p> <p>How far do you agree with Section 8? Agree</p> <p>How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 8? Disagree</p> <p>Once again no reference to the design guides from the AONB organisations</p>		<p>See above.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>See above.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Any other comments that you would like to make on the new design guide? Please deliver information for small rural developments</p> <p>What makes a high quality development? Density sensible for both rural and urban developments Movement facilities designed for the needs of those who do have public transport and those who don't. Design information for AONB developments, specific to the area not just urban spaces in the district Solar as a given for developments as with other sustainable heating and insulation</p> <p>How far do you agree with this Section? Disagree</p> <p>Comments box Couldn't find a trees section</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>This is a separate technical document.</p>
--	---	--	---