

Appendix 2: Overview of responses to the consultations and proposed modifications

| Respondent and comments | NWLDC response |
|--|--|
| <p>Trent and Dove Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear and robust document, with well thought out principles. - Request flexibility for smaller and more difficult sites. - Minor observations relating to specific paragraphs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comments noted and will be reflected in minor modifications to SPD text where appropriate. |
| <p>Pegasus Planning Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Front cover image should reflect the residential emphasis of the document. - Little or no reference to 6CS. Conflict between 6Cs and Manual for Streets. - Make reference to younger residents. - Clarify status of BfL12. - Replace non-NWL images with NWL images. - Minor observations relating to specific paragraphs and graphics. - Comment raised relating to the method of delineation between driveways to different plots. - Could gardens be measured using a first class stamp? - Bin storage – solutions need to be offered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Front cover image to change to a residential scheme. - Reference to 6Cs to be made. Issues relating to Manual for Streets are discussed within the report. - The report will be adjusted accordingly. - Status of BfL12 will be clarified now that the government has confirmed its position in the February 2017 White Paper. - Where possible replacement images will be used from within NWL. The document has been many years in preparation and it is now possible to replace, for instance, the artist impressions of Hastings Park with a photograph of the completed scheme. - Comments noted and will be reflected in minor modifications to SPD text where appropriate. - Changes will be made to refer to the valid suggestion made. - We have considered this suggestion and consider that this could prove a difficult method to enforce in practice. - A new graphic will be inserted to illustrate potential solutions. |
| <p>Taylor Wimpey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Presumption against use of standard product – This is obviously tricky to achieve for a volume house builder of our size with a standard product range – as you know. If we do go with standard product I take it we will be going with a more landscape lead scheme and this would be acceptable?” - “Specification of features that have limited practical use but do have health and safety considerations (chimneys) – It is always a tricky one and effectively | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPD does not resist standard product but requires standard house types to be tailored to suit the locality with officers taking account of local market conditions. For instance, local tailoring has involved in lower market areas the use of locally appropriate bricks, tiles and boundary treatments (see Discovery Close, Coalville) through to remodelled elevations and higher specifications materials and details (e.g. timber frame windows as seen at Towles Pastures, Castle Donington). |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>the LPA are taking on the role of Lead Designer by insisting the position and use of chimneys. Are you happy with this?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Imposition of a local space standard in contravention of the national planning policy on space standards – It would be worth checking the requirements against those on a national level." - "Imposition of a local accessibility standard in contravention of national planning policy". - Additionally, for storage and garages I note that you are advocating increasing the garage length (to store bikes and alike) or constructing a building such as an outhouse. Would this need to be attached to the back of the property/garage? Also, will a shed be acceptable as an alternative? - "We tend to like integral garages in the region and I am slightly concerned that it is being proposed to limit to 20%. Where has this percentage come from and is it flexible on a site by site basis? Understand the point on primary streets and integrals being limited to secondary/tertiary routes." - "I agree that parking is a big issue and were seeing more and more emphasis on this in each authority. I am pleased that as an authority you are counting garages (our standard size is 3 x 6m) in the provision. Some authorities are not which is creating car dominated frontages and giving us real problems." - "As a suggestion, if the document does become an SPD would it be worth doing a few design surgery's with small groups of developers at a time to give good examples and break some of the context down (some of us understand the basics of urban design only)." - The Council cannot require timber | <p>This approach is considered to be supported in national and local policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most house builders replicate traditional architectural styles and as such it is appropriate for the LPA to require a traditional roofscape to be reflected where appropriate. - Noted. Until such time that national space standards are imposed, we will amend wording to 'seek' certain space standards. - As above. - Minor amendment to text to clarify. - We will introduce a degree of flexibility into the SPD text. The design driver here is to avoid car dominated frontages and avoid entire streets comprised of integral garages. - Noted. - Design surgeries are offered by OPUN. - Traditionally inspired schemes are expected to use traditional construction methods and materials, typically we would seek to ensure that gable end chimney stacks are constructed on site and corbelled out from the gable end; that porches are timber/tile or timber/lead. On contemporary schemes we have approved GRP. The SPD text will be modified to provide further clarify. - Continuous frontages have been created on developments through the use of structural landscaping. Visual impact of parked cars has been limited through application of the 50/50 principle. |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>porches and door surrounds in lieu of GRP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preference for on plot parking will compromise ability to create continuous frontages. - Design principles on parking courts are prescriptive and difficult. - Concern over perceived design requirement for balconies to apartments. - Walls adjacent to public and semi-public realm is costly. - 11.33 cost and impracticality. - 11.47 – cost and impracticality. - 11.51 – impact on visibility splays. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Courtyard design principles have been successfully secured and implemented by other volume house builders. These requirements are also set out within BfL12 (which in turn is supported by specific paragraphs within the NPPF). Failure to adhere to these principles creates places that are unattractive, poorly overlooked and neglected. - The balcony policy is ‘expected’ not ‘compulsory’ or otherwise required. - Boundary design principles have been successfully secured and implemented by other volume house builders. Failure to adhere to these principles creates places that are unattractive, poorly overlooked and neglected. If designers create strong perimeter blocks where buildings form the outward faces of a development block, there will be little or no need for walls to enclose rear gardens. An adjustment to the SPD will provide further clarity on the formation of strong perimeter blocks. - The paragraph will be adjusted to provide greater clarity and certainty as to what is encouraged and what is mandatory. - The paragraph will be adjusted to provide some flexibility where it may be appropriate for the authority to accept non-wall public realm facing boundaries. - The paragraph will be amended to refer to visibility splay requirements. |
| <p>Leicestershire County Council Highways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please refer to Appendix 1 and detailed comments from LCC Highways. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LCC comments are detailed in the main report. - MfS2 will be referenced in the final SPD. - A reference will be made to ensure applicants are made aware of commuted sum liabilities. - The SPD encourages resident car parking in a location well related to people’s front doors. An increased |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>emphasis will be made on issues relating to remote and displaced car parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The issue relating to private drives will be modified in the final SPD to address concerns relating to connectivity and future proofing links to adjacent land that may come forward for development. - The District Council is proposing to adopt its own parking standards through this SPD. - The District Council recognises that tandem parking can result in displaced parking, however an effective design solution to this (strategically placed trees along carriageways) is not supported by LCC Highways. - Door clearance will be made more explicit (ref: 11.17.2). - 11.26 – comment noted. - 11.27 – comment noted. - 11.28 – comment noted. - 11.34 – we will modify the text to provide further clarity to applicants. - SUDS, drainage and flooding will be given greater emphasis. |
| <p>NCHA/Pelham Architects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complemented an “exemplary SPD”. - Clear and concise. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted. |
| <p>Mr. G. Dalby</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List praiseworthy schemes in the SPD. - Print the SPD attractively and make it available to purchase. - Solar panels are disfiguring. - Comment on annotations to plans adjacent to paragraph 8.5. - Observation regarding cul de sacs versus accessibility. - Surveillance of parking might compromise front gardens and attractive streets. - Delighted the Council is recommending walls to be cut and bonded. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good idea. List to be inserted. - Noted. - The SPD encouraging homes to be orientated to benefit solar gain. - Minor text amendment to be made. - Minor text amendment to be made. - Minor text amendment to be made to reaffirm 50/50 ‘rule’. - Noted. |
| <p>East Midlands Housing Association</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fully supportive. - Manual for Streets difficult to achieve within the context of LCC Highways requirements. - Difficult in achieving 10 greens on some | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted. - Issues relating to the design of streets and LCC Highways are covered in the Cabinet report. - As per the guidance contained within |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 2 spaces hard to achieve on some sites.- Apartments with their own front doors is unfeasible in some instances. | <p>BfL12, we do not require 12 'greens', instead we expect schemes to avoid 'reds' and achieve as many 'greens' as possible; with any 'ambers' robustly justified. Further details of this methodology can be found in BfL12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- We will remain flexible on car parking spaces if this does not present a risk of displaced parking. We have done so on previously approved schemes for single occupancy units.- We will remain flexible if there is a robust justification, however the provision of individual front doors to ground floor apartments ensures that apartment buildings have a better relationship with the street. This approach can also be beneficial to RSLs by reducing the number of households served by communal areas. |
|--|--|