Consultation Statement

May 2018

1. **Introduction**

1.1 **Background**

1.1.1 Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council has prepared a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in relation to design and sustainability considerations in order to guide development within the borough. The SPD provides more detailed advice and guidance concerning the relevant policies within the adopted Local Plan (2011 – 2029), and once adopted will be used as a material consideration for planning applications determined within the borough.

1.2 **Purpose of the Consultation Statement**

1.2.1 Part 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires that, when adopting a Supplementary Planning Document, Local Planning Authorities (LPA) should prepare a Consultation Statement. This should include the following information:

(i) The persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document;

(ii) A summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and

(iii) How those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document.

1.3 **How much consultation do the Regulations require? What is good practice?**

1.3.1 The Local Plan Regulations set out that LPAs should make the document ‘available’ for a minimum of four weeks. During such time, the document should be made available for inspection at the council offices and other appropriate locations, and should be published on the local planning authority website.

1.3.2 Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council has adopted a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), which sets a commitment to go over and above the legal minimum. This states that the council will undertake the following:
1.3.3 The purpose of this document is to demonstrate that LPA has met the regulatory requirements for a Supplementary Planning Document and complied with the best practice set out within the adopted SCI. It also provides
the necessary information required under Part 12 of the Regulations (as set out above).

2. **Evidence gathering and early engagement**

2.1.1 The draft consultation document was informed by discussions with stakeholders including Councillors and other departments within the council. This included a design workshop for Councillors held in October 2017.

2.1.2 The draft document was discussed at the council’s Economic, Planning and Housing Committee on 23 November 2017 and a number of further changes were made in response to comments made by Councillors at the committee meeting. These mainly related to strengthening the wording of various sections, along with including additional text in relation to heritage considerations. These changes were also discussed at a second design workshop for Councillors held in January 2018.

2.1.3 Prior to consulting on the SPD, the LPA carried out a screening exercise in order to establish whether there was a need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and/or a full Habitats Regulations Assessment to be produced. Following consultation with the three statutory consultees (the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England), it was concluded that an SEA was not required and the SPD would not need to be subject to a full Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations.

3. **Formal consultation on the draft SPD: Who was consulted and how?**

3.0.1 The LPA consulted on the draft SPD for six weeks from 5 February 2018 to 19 March 2018. In accordance with the adopted SCI, the council consulted a wide range of stakeholders. The engagement was tailored to ensure the consultees were engaged in the most effective and appropriate manner.

Where letters/emails were sent out they contained the following information (in accordance with the SCI):

- what was being consulted on
- where the documents could be viewed
- how and when comments could be made, and
- the next steps in the process.

3.1 **Statutory consultees**

3.1.1 Emails and letters were sent to the relevant statutory consultees. The statutory consultees are listed in Appendix A and an example email/letter is contained in Appendix B.
3.2 Members of the public

3.2.1 The LPA consulted members of the public who were registered on the council’s planning policy database who had expressed an interest in being notified about new planning guidance. Members of the public were also engaged through a statutory notice which was placed in the Basingstoke Gazette, Newbury News and Andover Advertiser (as shown in Appendix C). Paper copies of the consultation version of the SPD were also available to view at the borough council’s offices and all libraries across the borough.

3.2.2 Information about the consultation was also publicised through the council’s social media platforms (Appendix F).

3.3 Others consultees

3.3.1 The LPA also consulted members of the public. An email was sent to approximately 170 people on the council’s planning policy database (Appendix C).

3.3.2 The council also organised a consultation event, in the form of a breakfast briefing, in order to engage with local developers/landowners, architects and planning/urban design consultants. However, owing to a very limited level of interest the event was cancelled.

3.4 Where was the information available to view?

3.4.1 The consultation was publicised on the council’s planning policy consultations web page (http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations) where consultees could find out more about the consultation and a link was provided to where they could view the document.

3.4.2 The council’s consultation web page included a PDF copy of the document, the SEA and HRA screening opinions, along with a copy of the representation form, which could be filled in electronically or printed and returned to the LPA. The web page included an option to respond directly through the council’s consultation software if the consultee wished (web text in Appendix D and consultation portal page in Appendix E).

3.4.3 The web page explained where hard copies of the document could be viewed, explained how to make comments and set out the deadline for making representations.
4. **What issues were raised and how were they taken into account in the final document?**

4.1.0 **What responses were received?**

4.1.1 In response to the consultation, the LPA received 83 responses from 19 individuals, groups or organisations. This included representations from:

- Local residents
- Member of Parliament
- HCC - Countryside Planning Services
- Organisations – Festival Place and BDBD/HCC Manydown Team
- Parish Council – Tadley Town Council

4.1.2 A table showing who said what and how the LPA responded to those issues is set out in Appendix G (Part i). The full comments can be viewed on the consultation portal at: [http://basingstoke-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/fpt/spd/dsspd_1](http://basingstoke-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/fpt/spd/dsspd_1)

4.1.3 There are a number of other changes made to the draft Design and Sustainability SPD as a result of changes in national policy (including the publication of the consultation draft NPPF in March 2018). These are set out in Appendix G (part ii). There have also been a number of other minor changes, typos, presentational amendments and factual amendments/updates, however these minor changes are not detailed in the appendix.

4.1.4 An acknowledgement email/letter was sent to all the respondents that made representations.

4.2.0 **Issues raised**

4.2.1 A summary of the responses received and the LPA responses are set out in full in Appendix G. The key issues raised in the representations, in no order or priority, included the following:

- Minor amendments were requested by statutory and technical consultees, developers/landowners and members of the public
- The revisions requested related to amendments and additions concerning:
  - cycle infrastructure and footpaths
  - landscape and biodiversity
  - heritage considerations
  - sustainable design approaches
  - residential amenity standards
4.3.0 How was the document changed?

4.3.1 A number of changes were made to the draft document. The changes relate to specific comments made, are minor in nature, and strengthen the document rather than change the overall meaning. The following key changes were made:

- additional guidance provided in relation cycle infrastructure and footpath considerations
- greater detail concerning landscape and biodiversity issues
- additional references to heritage issues
- minor alterations to various sections in response to comments from landowners/developers

5. Other Consultation

5.0.1 A key issue for Councillors has been whether the SPD could require developments to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS).

5.0.2 Following discussions at EPH Committee in November 2017 the council wrote to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to seek clarity regarding the extent to which the SPD could incorporate the NDSS. A brief letter was subsequently received, dated 12 January, however, the council requested that a more detailed response be provided. The second letter, dated 25 January 2018, stated that the formal adoption of the NDSS would need to be via the Local Plan. However, the letter did suggest that it is possible to recommend in the SPD that new housing accord with the NDSS, even where the NDSS had not yet been formally adopted. The letter stated that the NDSS could be referred to in supplementary guidance. These letters are set out in Appendix H below.

5.0.3 In light of this letter the council is confident that the approach taken in the Design and Sustainability SPD is appropriate. As a result of the departmental response, and for ease of reference, the appendices have been extended in order to set out the relevant technical standards and size thresholds which form part of the NDSS.
Appendices

A  List of statutory consultees (specific and general bodies) consulted
B  Text of emails/letters sent to statutory consultees and those on the Local Plan database
C  Public Notice for the Andover Advertiser, Newbury News and Basingstoke Gazette
D  Planning Policy consultations on BDBC webpage text
E  Objective web text
F  Social media platforms – Twitter and Facebook
G  Full schedule of comments and proposed changes:
   Part i: LPA response to representations received
   Part ii: Other changes including those in response to changes in national policy.
Appendix A: List of statutory consultees (specific and general consultees) consulted

Specific consultees

Organisations who have been identified under the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 that may have an interest in the proposals within a Development Plan Document are set out below:

All parish councils within and adjoining the borough
East Hampshire District Council
English Heritage
Enterprise M3
Greater London Authority
Hampshire County Council
Hampshire Fire and Rescue
Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Hart District Council
Highways Agency
Historic England
Homes England (previously The Home and Communities Agency)
Mayor of London
Mono consultants (represents mobile operators)
National Grid
Natural England
Network Strategy and Planning Network Rail South East
NHS England
NHS West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group
North Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group
North Wessex Downs AONB
Office for Nuclear Regulation
Office of Rail Regulation
Police and Crime Commissioner
Scottish and Southern Energy
South East Water
Southern Gas Networks
Southern Water
Test Valley Borough Council
Thames Water
The Coal Authority
The Environment Agency
The Marine Management Organisation
Transport for London
West Berkshire Council
General consultation bodies

In addition to the specific consultation bodies listed above, the council will involve as many people and groups as possible in preparing supplementary planning documents. A number of whom are listed below:

Access for All Working Group
Association of Parish Councils
Basingstoke Voluntary Action
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England
Church Commissioners for England
Cycle Basingstoke
Defence Infrastructure Organisation
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Local Nature Partnership
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
Hampshire County Council Children's Services
Hampshire County Council Strategic Transport
Hampshire Police Authority
Health and Safety Executive
Integra
Maria Miller MP
Ministry of Defence
National Farmers Union
Natural Basingstoke
North Wessex Downs AONB
Office for Nuclear Regulation
Sport England
Thames Valley Police
The Whitchurch Association
Theatres Trust
Transition Basingstoke
Various land agents and planning consultants
Appendix B: Text of email sent to statutory consultees and consultees on the Local Plan Database

Dear Sir / Madam,

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council is consulting on three draft Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) relating to Design and Sustainability; Housing; and Parking Standards.

What do the documents cover?

The documents have been prepared by the Local Planning Authority to add further detail to the policies in the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 and guide future development across the borough.

The Design and Sustainability SPD sets out an approach to ensure a high standard of design and improve the sustainability credentials of the borough.

The Housing SPD provides guidance on: affordable housing; the mix of market homes; housing for older people and those in need of care; and self-build and custom housebuilding.

The Parking Standards SPD identifies the number of car and cycle parking spaces required for different types of development and guidance on how they should be designed and located.

The council is keen to engage with interested parties on the preparation of the SPDs and to offer the opportunity to raise relevant issues. Once adopted, the SPDs will be used as a material consideration for planning decisions within the borough.

The consultation runs for six weeks from **Monday 5 February to Monday 19 March**.

Viewing the documents

The draft SPDs and supporting documents can be viewed on the council’s website at [www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations](http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations).

Paper copies of all the documents are available for public viewing at the Borough Council’s offices, London Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG21 4AH between the hours of 8.30 – 17.00 Mon to Thurs and 8.30 to 16.30 on Fridays. The documents are also available to view in all libraries across the borough during their normal opening hours.

How to comment

If you would like to comment on any of the draft documents, please complete a representation form and return it to the council by **4pm on Monday 19 March**. Representation forms can be completed online or can be downloaded from our website ([www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations](http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations)). Paper copies are also available on request. Comments can be submitted in the following ways:
By completing the online form at: http://basingstoke-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal
By email to local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk
By post to Planning Policy, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG21 4AH

Next steps

Following this consultation, all comments for each respective SPD will be taken into consideration in compiling a final version of each document.

Consultation database

The council is contacting you because you have asked to receive updates on planning policy related issues.

If you would like to be removed from the planning policy consultation database or would like your details amended, please email local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk or contact the Planning Policy team on 01256 844844.

Further information

If you require further information about the draft SPDs, please email local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk or contact 01256 844844.

Yours sincerely

Planning Policy Team
Appendix C: Statutory Notices

Andover Advertiser:
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
PLANNING AND COMPULSORY
PURCHASE ACT 2004
THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING
(LOCAL PLANNING)
(ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012
Notice of Public Consultation on draft Housing, Design and Sustainability, and Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

Statement of the Representations Procedure
In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, notice is hereby given that the council is inviting representations on the draft:
- Housing SPD;
- Design and Sustainability SPD; and
- Parking Standards SPD
between 5 February and 19 March 2018.
The draft SPDs have been prepared by the Local Planning Authority to add further detail to the policies in the Local Plan and provide guidance in future development across the borough. In accordance with the regulations, the council has made a copy of each of the SPDs and this statement available:
- on the council’s website at www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations; and
- at the Civic Offices on London Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG21 4AH, Monday to Thursday 8.30am-5.00pm and Friday 8.30am-4.30pm; and
- in all libraries within Basingstoke and Deane Borough during their normal opening hours.

Consultation Responses
Representations can be made during the period to be made no later than 4pm on 19 March 2018 using the council’s online consultation portal, by email or by post.
Online at:
http://basingstoke-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal
Or by e-mail to: local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk
Or by post to: Planning Policy Team, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 4AH

Any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the adoption of the SPD.

All comments received will be publicly available and includes on the council’s website. Any person who has made representations about the above SPDs may withdraw those representations at any time by giving notice in writing to the council either by e-mail or by post at the addresses given above.
Basingstoke Gazette:

Public Notices

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012

Notice of Public Consultation on draft Housing, Design and Sustainability, and Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

Statement of the Representations Procedure

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, notice is hereby given that the council is inviting representations on the draft:

- Housing SPD;
- Design and Sustainability SPD; and
- Parking Standards SPD

between 5 February and 19 March 2018.

The draft SPDs have been prepared by the Local Planning Authority to add further detail to the policies in the Local Plan and provide guidance on future development across the borough. In accordance with the regulations, the council has made a copy of each of the SPDs and this statement available:

- on the council's website at www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations; and
- at the Civic Offices on London Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG21 4AH, Monday to Thursday 8.30am-5.00pm and Friday 8.30am-4.30pm; and
- in all libraries within Basingstoke and Deane Borough during their normal opening hours.

Consultation Responses

Representations can be made during the period to be made no later than 4pm on 19 March 2018 using the council’s online consultation portal, by email or by post.

Online at:  http://basingstoke-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal
Or by e-mail to:  local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk
Or by post to:  Planning Policy Team, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG21 4AH

Representations made will be considered for incorporation into the final version of each document.

Any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the adoption of the SPD.

All comments received will be publicly available and includes on the council’s website. Any person who has made representations about the above SPDs may withdraw those representations at any time by giving notice in writing to the council either by e-mail or by post at the addresses given above.
Plan Policy Consultations

We are keen to engage with our local residents and a range of stakeholders in the development of planning policy documents. If you would like to get involved and comment on an open consultation, register or amend your details for future consultations, please visit the Basingstoke and Deane Consultation Portal.

Current consultations

We are currently consulting on:

- **Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document** (consultation closes on 19 March 2018)
- **Housing Supplementary Planning Document** (consultation closes on 19 March 2018)
- **Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document** (consultation closes on 19 March 2018)
- **Submission Kingsclere Neighbourhood Plan** (consultation closes on 13 March 2018).

Further details about these documents can be found below.

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

Consultation on the three SPDs: Design and Sustainability, Housing and Parking will run for six weeks, from **Monday 5 February 2018** until 4pm on **Monday 19 March 2018**.

The easiest way to respond to one of the consultations is through the Consultation Portal. Alternatively, you can download a comments form from the consultation web pages and send your comments to us by email or post.

Design and Sustainability SPD

This draft SPD sets out an approach to ensure a high standard of design and improve the sustainability credentials of the borough.
View the draft SPD and please let us have your comments.

Housing Supplementary Planning Document

This draft SPD provides guidance on: affordable housing; the mix (size and type) of market homes; housing for older people and those in need of care; and self-build and custom house building.

View the draft SPD and please let us have your comments.

Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

This draft SPD identifies the number of car and cycle parking spaces required for different types of development, and guidance on how they should be designed and located.

View the draft SPD and please let us have your comments
Draft Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document

This draft Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in its role as Local Planning Authority to support the delivery of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029. The SPD sets out a positive and practical approach to ensuring a high standard of design and improving the sustainability credentials of the borough. When adopted by the council, the SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

How do you have your say?

The consultation is now open and responses must be received by 4pm on Monday 19 March 2018.

The Draft Design and Sustainability SPD can be downloaded by clicking the 'View and Comment' button. The Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening and Habitats Regulations Assessment for the SPD is also available to download from 'Supporting Documents' below.

In order to comment, we would encourage you to register (using the tab at the top of the page) and complete an online form. Alternatively you can download a representation form (below) and submit this by email to
local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk or via post to Planning Policy, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke RG21 4AH.

Please note the comments received during this consultation cannot be treated as confidential. Responses will be published on the council’s website and this will include the name and/or organisation of the respondent.

**Next Steps**

When the consultation has ended, the council will prepare a statement setting out who was consulted, a summary of the main issues raised and how the council has addressed those issues.

Should you have any questions, contact the Planning Policy Team on 01256 844844.
Appendix F: Social media notices

Twitter:

Residents and businesses are being encouraged to have their say on planning guidelines that will set standards for new developments. We’re consulting on three supplementary documents - Housing, Design and Sustainability, and Parking - until 19 March. Info: basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy...

Facebook:

Residents and businesses are being encouraged to have their say on new planning guidance that will set standards for developments, covering a range of issues from the number of parking spaces they should have, to the types and sizes of homes that should be built. Consultations are now open on three supplementary planning documents: 1. Housing, 2. Design and Sustainability and 3. Parking. You can view them online here www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations and in libraries across the borough.
Appendix G: Full schedule of comments and proposed changes
Mr Abigail Natural light and outlook
Sheila Christopher Slack Peacock
BDBC response

ID 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company/ Organisation</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Respondent suggested modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Abigail Compton-Burnett</td>
<td>Local Centres, Green Spaces</td>
<td>Notes that community buildings and open spaces must be prioritised and should be attached where possible as these facilities work best together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paraphra 4.17 - 4.20: Include the requirement for dedicated cycle lanes (not mixed with pedestrians or motor traffic). Paragraphs 6.38 - 6.40: Encourage the planting of blooming and fruiting trees (new trees in paragraphs 6.38 - 6.40). Requests something is added to particularly encourage the planting of blooming and fruiting trees for the sustenance of bird and bee populations. Suggests the inclusion of a design consideration that it is not necessary to trim these trees down low enough every year that they fail to blossom and fruit. Regarding paragraphs 8.46 - 8.56: Add notes that more advanced (than composting toilets) and communal facilities for the processing of sewage in-situ are not mentioned. Requests the addition of an explicit reference to encouraging major innovation on this. Raised concerns current conditions will lead to groundwater pollution. Welcomes the consideration of HMOs in paragraph 8.86. Suggests the final version gives further guidance on minimum requirements for thermal and sound insulation and that cycle storage should be provided (unless constraints prevent it) for HMOs. Section 10: Include and encourage the use of open space, private gardens and public amenity space for cultivating food plants.

Notes that community buildings and open spaces must be prioritised and should be attached where possible as these facilities work best together. It is agreed that this paragraph would be helpful, as successful urban design is as follows: “Retain and enhance where possible habitat linkages and corridors through the built environment” in buildings bulleted add bullet to highlight the introduction of green roofs/walls and other technologies introducing biodiversity to urban areas.

### Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company/ Organisation</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Frank Wright</td>
<td>Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council</td>
<td>Natural features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggests inclusion of dedicated cycle lanes for faster commuter cyclists (not mixed with pedestrians or motor traffic) in 4.17 - 4.20. Welcomes commitment to maintaining/planting new trees in paragraphs 6.38 - 6.40. Requests something is added to particularly encourage the planting of blooming and fruiting trees for the sustenance of bird and bee populations. Suggests the inclusion of a design consideration that it is not necessary to trim these trees down low enough every year that they fail to blossom and fruit. Regarding paragraphs 8.46 - 8.56: Add notes that more advanced (than composting toilets) and communal facilities for the processing of sewage in-situ are not mentioned. Requests the addition of an explicit reference to encouraging major innovation on this. Raised concerns current conditions will lead to groundwater pollution. Welcomes the consideration of HMOs in paragraph 8.86. Suggests the final version gives further guidance on minimum requirements for thermal and sound insulation and that cycle storage should be provided (unless constraints prevent it) for HMOs. Section 10: Include and encourage the use of open space, private gardens and public amenity space for cultivating food plants.

Notes that community buildings and open spaces must be prioritised and should be attached where possible as these facilities work best together. It is agreed that this paragraph would be helpful, as successful urban design is as follows: “Retain and enhance where possible habitat linkages and corridors through the built environment” in buildings bulleted add bullet to highlight the introduction of green roofs/walls and other technologies introducing biodiversity to urban areas.

### Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company/ Organisation</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Frank Wright</td>
<td>Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council</td>
<td>Natural light and outlook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include the paragraph: “The canopies of trees can block out significant amounts of light to dwellings and their gardens. New housing should therefore avoid the prevention of daylight into habitable rooms, such as kitchens and lounges. Overhang from trees and shadowing of garden areas should also be kept to a minimum.” as similar text is included in the existing SPD and is often cited by NET in DC responses.

Notes that community buildings and open spaces must be prioritised and should be attached where possible as these facilities work best together. It is agreed that this paragraph would be helpful, as successful urban design should prevent conflicts between trees and development, and ensuring a suitable level of daylighting is important from a sustainability perspective. Consequently, this paragraph has been added as requested (new paragraph ...).

Notes that community buildings and open spaces must be prioritised and should be attached where possible as these facilities work best together. It is agreed that this paragraph would be helpful, as successful urban design should prevent conflicts between trees and development, and ensuring a suitable level of daylighting is important from a sustainability perspective. Consequently, this paragraph has been added as requested (new paragraph ...).

### Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company/ Organisation</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Black</td>
<td>Sustainable Urban Design Principles</td>
<td>Sustainable Urban Design Principles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In layout bullets, add: “Retain and enhance where possible habitat linkages and corridors through the built environment” in buildings bulleted add bullet to highlight the introduction of green roofs/walls and other technologies introducing biodiversity to urban areas.

Notes that community buildings and open spaces must be prioritised and should be attached where possible as these facilities work best together. It is agreed that this paragraph would be helpful, as successful urban design should prevent conflicts between trees and development, and ensuring a suitable level of daylighting is important from a sustainability perspective. Consequently, this paragraph has been added as requested (new paragraph ...).

Notes that community buildings and open spaces must be prioritised and should be attached where possible as these facilities work best together. It is agreed that this paragraph would be helpful, as successful urban design should prevent conflicts between trees and development, and ensuring a suitable level of daylighting is important from a sustainability perspective. Consequently, this paragraph has been added as requested (new paragraph ...).
Mr Christopher Slack  

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council  

Key urban design and sustainability principles for the borough  

Include “a need to retain habitat links throughout the built environment to retain habitat corridors and a linked framework” in the bullet points.  

Include “a need to retain habitat links throughout the built environment to retain habitat corridors and a linked framework” in the bullet points.  

Agree that biodiversity should be added to this section in order to reflect its importance from a sustainability perspective; however, it is considered that a slightly simplified reference should be added (to make it more consistent with the style of the other principles), which also addresses the request from Paul Johnston that Green Infrastructure be included, so a new criterion has been added: “Preserve and enhance green infrastructure and biodiversity”, which is considered to incorporate the need for biodiversity to be included within this section.

This section has been amended as per the recommendation in order to ensure that it is accurate from a technical perspective: “Consider the potential biodiversity implications of the proposed development. For example, is there the potential for the development to impact on protected species such as bats and great crested newts, and designated sites such as SSSIs or SINCs? In addition, the opportunities to incorporate biodiversity mitigation and enhancement should also be established, for example through the creation of new habitat such as hedgerows composed of native species, bird and bat boxes, wildlife friendly water features or by maintaining and extending habitat corridors.” Define particular novel species, considered beyond the scope of this document to address the definitions of different species, and this issue can be more appropriately addressed in the Landscape and Biodiversity SPD.

Reword paragraph as follows: “Consider the potential implications on biodiversity of the proposed development. For example, is there potential for the development to have impacts on protected species such as bats and great crested newts, and designated sites such as SSSIs or SINCs? In addition, the opportunities to incorporate biodiversity mitigation and enhancement should also be established, for example through the creation of new habitat such as hedgerows composed of native species, bird and bat boxes, wildlife friendly water features or by maintaining and extending habitat corridors.” Define particular novel species, considered beyond the scope of this document to address the definitions of different species, and this issue can be more appropriately addressed in the Landscape and Biodiversity SPD.

A new principle has been added in terms of requiring that the arrangement of new development prevents harm to biodiversity, in order to reflect the importance of biodiversity from a sustainability perspective and in order to ensure that biodiversity is properly factored into layout considerations.  

This section has been amended as per the recommendation in order to ensure that it is accurate from a technical perspective: “Consider the potential biodiversity implications of the proposed development. For example, is there the potential for the development to impact on protected species such as bats and great crested newts, and designated sites such as SSSIs or SINCs? In addition, the opportunities to incorporate biodiversity mitigation and enhancement should also be established, for example through the creation of new habitat such as hedgerows composed of native species, bird and bat boxes, wildlife friendly water features or by maintaining and extending habitat corridors.” Define particular novel species, considered beyond the scope of this document to address the definitions of different species, and this issue can be more appropriately addressed in the Landscape and Biodiversity SPD.

A small section on Biodiversity has been added to section 6, and incorporates this text: “The arrangement of block form needs to protect existing biodiversity features, and maintain green/habitat corridors. In addition, the arrangement of new development needs to have a successful relationship with existing habitats for example by ensuring that these are retained and that new development does not back onto important woodlands and hedgerows. Therefore existing disposal of garden waste into these habitats and maintaining a buffer (in line with Biodiversity SPD) to enable such habitats to still be accessed so they can be managed.”

Add mention that: “We would not like to see an arrangement whereby houses back onto woodlands and important hedgerows.”

A small section on Biodiversity has been added to section 6, and incorporates this text: “The arrangement of block form needs to protect existing biodiversity features, and maintain green/habitat corridors. In addition, the arrangement of new development needs to have a successful relationship with existing habitats for example by ensuring that these are retained and that new development does not back onto important woodlands and hedgerows. Therefore existing disposal of garden waste into these habitats and maintaining a buffer (in line with Biodiversity SPD) to enable such habitats to still be accessed so they can be managed.”

Add mention that: “We would not like to see an arrangement whereby houses back onto woodlands and important hedgerows.”

A small section on Biodiversity has been added to section 6, and incorporates this text: “The arrangement of block form needs to protect existing biodiversity features, and maintain green/habitat corridors. In addition, the arrangement of new development needs to have a successful relationship with existing habitats for example by ensuring that these are retained and that new development does not back onto important woodlands and hedgerows. Therefore existing disposal of garden waste into these habitats and maintaining a buffer (in line with Biodiversity SPD) to enable such habitats to still be accessed so they can be managed.”

Add mention that: “We would not like to see an arrangement whereby houses back onto woodlands and important hedgerows.”
Mrs Nethercott
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Roof lights page 83
Suggests inclusion of a comment regarding enhancements for bird species that make use of all buildings.
Add text to reflect that roof lights may not be appropriate where light spaces are occupied by bats.

Mrs Nethercott
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Design of individual buildings page 96
Suggests inclusion of a comment regarding enhancements for bird species that make use of all buildings.
Include comment that enhancements for bird species that make use of tall buildings such as peregrine falcons could be included here.

Mrs Nethercott
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Elevations - Bricks page 109
Suggests inclusion of use of bat friendly bricks.
Include use of bat friendly bricks.

Mrs Nethercott
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Tiling Page 111
Suggests mentioning that hanging tiles are particularly favoured by roosting bats on existing buildings for doing works to these.
Mention that hanging tiles are particularly favoured by roosting bats on existing buildings for doing works to these.

Mrs Nethercott
Nethercott
Paul Johnston
Nethercott
Julia
Nethercott
Julia
Nethercott
Remove ‘other’ before green infrastructure in bullet 2.
Add bullet outlining need to incorporate GI network within the constraints and opportunities/vision. Suggests being more explicit with GI to get it on the designed external environment.

Mrs Nethercott
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Roof detailing page 120
Notes that inclusion of bat friendly roof tiles and bat friendly roof felt (i.e. non-breathable) is a cheap/easy way to make a biodiversity enhancement.
Include text: “Extensions which go into the loft space, require works to the roof, soffits, barge boards etc are favoured roosting sites of bats which are all protected.” Link text to biodiversity checklist.

Mrs Nethercott
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Section 11 - Extensions
Suggests inclusion of text noting that extensions which go into the loft space, require works to the roof, soffits, barge boards etc are favoured roosting sites of bats which are all protected. Suggests linking this to the biodiversity checklist so applicants can see if their extension is likely to impact bats.
Include text: “Extensions which go into the loft space, require works to the roof, soffits, barge boards etc are favoured roosting sites of bats which are all protected.” Link text to biodiversity checklist.

Mrs Nethercott
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Roof detailing page 120
Notes that inclusion of bat friendly roof tiles and bat friendly roof felt (i.e. non-breathable) is a cheap/easy way to make a biodiversity enhancement.
Include another principle relating to GI. Add bullet highlighting the need to provide a high quality and well designed external environment. Reference to biodiversity has also been added to this section as per the comments from the biodiversity officers. Reference to Green Infrastructure has also been added to the list of strategic principles (please see response above concerning comment 6). In terms of providing more extensive definitions, as this is intended to be a list of general principles it is not considered appropriate to provide detailed definitions in this part of the document.

Nethercott
Paul Johnston
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Sustainable urban design principles (page 6)
Regarding layout bullet 3.4.5 consider a good extension of GI strategic principles.
Add specific reference to habitats (bullet 3.4.5 of layout) ‘existing’ needs to be added to ‘loss of planting/natural features’ Add firm definition in place of words like ‘minimise’ and ‘generous’.
Reference to biodiversity has been added to this section as per the comments from the biodiversity officers. Reference to Green Infrastructure has also been added to the list of strategic principles (please see response above concerning comment 6). In terms of providing more extensive definitions, as this is intended to be a list of general principles it is not considered appropriate to provide detailed definitions in this part of the document.

Paul Johnston
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Key urban design and sustainability principles for the borough
Suggests inclusion of another principle relating to GI needs including here. Suggests making additional of bullet outlining the need to provide a high quality and well designed external environment.
Include another principle relating to GI. Add bullet highlighting the need to provide a high quality and well designed external environment.
Reference to maintaining and enhancing green infrastructure has been added to the list, as has the suggested wording regarding a well-designed external environment, as these are both considered to be important aspects of urban design and sustainability and it should be factored into the design process from the outset. Reference to the GI Strategy has been added to paragraph 2.17: “having regard to the council’s Green Infrastructure Strategy”, and also to paragraph 2.29 “including how it relates to the council’s Green Infrastructure Strategy”. There has been advice added to the GI Strategy to maintain and enhance green infrastructure.

Paul Johnston
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
CSA2
Regarding bullet 2, suggests removing ‘other’ before green infrastructure.
Remove ‘other’ before green infrastructure in bullet 2.

This section of the document is focused on aesthetic considerations, and it would appear incongruous to consider specific issues in relation to other policy areas (i.e. biodiversity). However, it may be appropriate to add this issue in the revised Landscape and Biodiversity SPD.
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This section of the document is focused on aesthetic considerations, and it would appear incongruous to consider specific issues in relation to other policy areas (i.e. biodiversity). However, it may be appropriate to address this issue in the revised Landscape and Biodiversity SPD.
Mr. Owen Davine

Section 1 - Introduction

Suggest addition of a principle to provide extensive and well connected cycleways and pedestrian routes. Add principle to: "Provide extensive, well connected cycleways and pedestrian routes, which protect and enhance on-site public rights of way, and where appropriate, connect to the surrounding access networks." 

Reference to trees and hedges has been added to this paragraph as requested in order to provide clarification. "Therefore, it is important to try and incorporate soft landscaping (including trees and hedges) into new development." However, the reference to play spaces has not been included, as this paragraph is referring to research on the importance of natural features for well-being, largely on the basis of their visual and aesthetic qualities, and play spaces are unlikely to have the same benefits (as they will probably not appear to be natural spaces).

Mr. Owen Davine

Section 4 - Formation and expression of structure

Request that the document notes that existing and proposed PROW should be retained within a green corridor, separate from estate roads. Requests that provision of play areas is highlighted in this section. Additional text has been proposed in order to address the points raised: "The provision of open spaces has a significant impact on the character and identity of places (village greens for example). However, open spaces which have no clearly defined function often fail to properly utilise their potential to have a positive influence on new development, especially if they are used inappropriately and poorly maintained. It is also vital to avoid SLDDP (space left Over After Planning) and these spaces may be either in existing green infrastructure networks (including open space standards). This is considered important in terms of ensuring successful urban design as undeveloped spaces often become unattractive and have a detrimental impact on the character of new development.

Mr. Owen Davine

HCC Countrywide Planning

Relevant Planning Policy

Request that reference is made to para 75 NPPF requiring plans to protect and enhance public right of way, including adding links to existing network. Request any work to PROWs accords with the Countrywide Service Design Standards. Refer to para 75 of the NPPF. Include that work to PROWs needs to be carried out to Countrywide Service Design Standards. Refer to Hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/countryside/greeninfrastructure.html. However, it is not considered advisable to include the reference to the NPPF as this is likely to be amended in the near future and the revised version of the wording has not yet been finalised (as it is still subject to consultation).

Mr. Owen Davine

HCC Countrywide Planning

Section 4 - Formation and expression of structure

Request that the document notes that existing and proposed PROW should be retained within a green corridor, separate from estate roads. Add note that ‘existing and proposed PROW should be retained within a green corridor, separate from estate roads.’
Suggest raised tables and appropriate signage should be provided to maintain pedestrian priority. Support footpaths need to be located in parts of the site which are attractive and accessible.

Add in the need for provision of raised tables and appropriate signage. Add in the need for footpaths to be located in attractive green part of the site.

New text has been added to the list of bullets in paragraph 5.4 in order to reflect the comments concerning raised tables and signage. These footpaths need to be easy to navigate, including through the provision of raised tables and appropriate signage. This will have the benefit of supporting the delivery of a high quality pedestrian environment. Reference to footpaths being attractive is already included within the list of bullets in paragraph 5.4.

Comments noted, no change has been requested or considered to be required.

Will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the M4 and A34. No comments.

The text has been added as requested, as these are considered to be important urban design considerations.

Comment noted. No link to the characterisation material has been included as it may help to inform the contextual survey and analysis. Historic England have also published guidance on characterisation which may be consulted when assessing the historic context.

https://historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation-2f urban_characterisation/

Note that it is important to consider all heritage assets, not just listed buildings. Suggest that the BDBC may wish to consider a study similar to that commissioned by Southampton City Council.

The following text has been added to paragraph 8.61 as requested: "It is important that the design and location of tall buildings has regard to landmark historic buildings, and that they do not block such views or detract from them. The relationship between tall buildings and historic landmark buildings can have important urban design implications."

Note that part of festival place is excluded from the identified area for ‘tall buildings’. Question the rationale for this boundary (pg 94) and consider it is well-considered. Note that this area for ‘tall buildings’ has been added as requested: "The following text has been added to paragraph 8.61 as requested: "It is important that the design and location of tall buildings has regard to landmark historic buildings, and that they do not block such views or detract from them. The relationship between tall buildings and historic landmark buildings can have important urban design implications."

Reference to "other heritage assets" has been added as all could be relevant to design of new development. The reference to "courage" has been changed to "setting" as requested, in order to ensure the wording is correct from a technical perspective. "Identify important buildings, including historic listed buildings and other heritage assets, along with their setting/characterisation.

Some references to the historic environment have been included where appropriate, however, in general it is considered more effective to address these issues in detail in the forthcoming Historic Heritage SPD, so that will allow for more detailed consideration of the relevant issues.

Consider that the principles regarding renewable energy, water efficiency technologies and street (front of house) parking where allocated parking is provided to the rear of properties. Notes that design of parking provision needs to take account of convenience to prevent on-street parking. Support objectives to improve accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists. Notes that routes need to be as direct as possible and link new developments to stations for example.

Supports the principle that new housing should provide enough space to ensure a high quality living environment. Regarding conversion of office buildings to residential use, suggests going further and suggesting that developers should also be required to ensure that such buildings are accessible for disabled people.

The delivery of a high quality pedestrian environment. Reference to footpaths being attractive is already included within the list of bullets in paragraph 5.4.

While the suggestion concerning disabled access is noted and this is an important issue, it is considered that this matter is most appropriately addressed through building regulations.

The issue of footpath signage has been raised in the context of the proposed cycleways in the SPD. The SPD proposes that the location of cycleways should be selected so that they do not detract from the setting of historic buildings and that footpaths consolidate the historic street pattern and “emphasising the setting of historic buildings”. The comments noted that the context and location of cycleways should be considered in the context of other infrastructure proposals, such as the M4 and A34.

The following text has been added to paragraph 8.61 as requested: "It is important that the design and location of tall buildings has regard to landmark historic buildings, and that they do not block such views or detract from them. The relationship between tall buildings and historic landmark buildings can have important urban design implications."

Reference to "other heritage assets" has been added as all could be relevant to design of new development. The reference to "courage" has been changed to "setting" as requested, in order to ensure the wording is correct from a technical perspective. "Identify important buildings, including historic listed buildings and other heritage assets, along with their setting/characterisation.

Some references to the historic environment have been included where appropriate, however, in general it is considered more effective to address these issues in detail in the forthcoming Historic Heritage SPD, so that will allow for more detailed consideration of the relevant issues.

Consider that the principles regarding renewable energy, water efficiency technologies and street (front of house) parking where allocated parking is provided to the rear of properties. Notes that design of parking provision needs to take account of convenience to prevent on-street parking. Support objectives to improve accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists. Notes that routes need to be as direct as possible and link new developments to stations for example.

Supports the principle that new housing should provide enough space to ensure a high quality living environment. Regarding conversion of office buildings to residential use, suggests going further and suggesting that developers should also be required to ensure that such buildings are accessible for disabled people.

The delivery of a high quality pedestrian environment. Reference to footpaths being attractive is already included within the list of bullets in paragraph 5.4.

While the suggestion concerning disabled access is noted and this is an important issue, it is considered that this matter is most appropriately addressed through building regulations.

The issue of footpath signage has been raised in the context of the proposed cycleways in the SPD. The SPD proposes that the location of cycleways should be selected so that they do not detract from the setting of historic buildings and that footpaths consolidate the historic street pattern and “emphasising the setting of historic buildings”. The comments noted that the context and location of cycleways should be considered in the context of other infrastructure proposals, such as the M4 and A34.

The following text has been added to paragraph 8.61 as requested: "It is important that the design and location of tall buildings has regard to landmark historic buildings, and that they do not block such views or detract from them. The relationship between tall buildings and historic landmark buildings can have important urban design implications."

Reference to "other heritage assets" has been added as all could be relevant to design of new development. The reference to "courage" has been changed to "setting" as requested, in order to ensure the wording is correct from a technical perspective. "Identify important buildings, including historic listed buildings and other heritage assets, along with their setting/characterisation.

Some references to the historic environment have been included where appropriate, however, in general it is considered more effective to address these issues in detail in the forthcoming Historic Heritage SPD, so that will allow for more detailed consideration of the relevant issues.

Consider that the principles regarding renewable energy, water efficiency technologies and street (front of house) parking where allocated parking is provided to the rear of properties. Notes that design of parking provision needs to take account of convenience to prevent on-street parking. Support objectives to improve accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists. Notes that routes need to be as direct as possible and link new developments to stations for example.

Supports the principle that new housing should provide enough space to ensure a high quality living environment. Regarding conversion of office buildings to residential use, suggests going further and suggesting that developers should also be required to ensure that such buildings are accessible for disabled people.

The delivery of a high quality pedestrian environment. Reference to footpaths being attractive is already included within the list of bullets in paragraph 5.4.

While the suggestion concerning disabled access is noted and this is an important issue, it is considered that this matter is most appropriately addressed through building regulations.

The issue of footpath signage has been raised in the context of the proposed cycleways in the SPD. The SPD proposes that the location of cycleways should be selected so that they do not detract from the setting of historic buildings and that footpaths consolidate the historic street pattern and “emphasising the setting of historic buildings”. The comments noted that the context and location of cycleways should be considered in the context of other infrastructure proposals, such as the M4 and A34.
56 Sharon Lucas
Natural England
General
No specific comments. The response sets out general guidance advising that the following issues are considered: Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity enhancement, Landscape enhancement, Other design considerations, and Strategic Environmental Assessment / Habitats Regulations Assessment. (Detail in full representation).

57 Sophie Lucas
Savills (on behalf of Miller Homes Ltd)
Paragraph 1.1 - 1.11
Recommend that the reference to the NPPF is updated to reflect the proposed NPPF 2018 revisions to prevent the SPD quickly becoming out of date. Amend NPPF references to reflect the proposed NPPF 2018 revisions.

58 Sophie Lucas
Savills (on behalf of Miller Homes Ltd)
RA2
Question the requirement for 50sqm gardens to serve 1 bedroom houses. Consider the minimum requirement excessive. Note that depending on context, expectations of garden size vary i.e. urban / rural setting. Recommend that RA2 is amended to take into account variations in local context and set the minimum garden size for one bedroom properties reduced to 36sqm.

59 Sophie Lucas
Savills (on behalf of Miller Homes Ltd)
RA2
request further clarity on back to back distance for 2.5 storey properties as none has been suggested. Recommend a back to back distance of 25 meters is applied to 2.5 storey development (consider that greater would be excessive). Add a back to back distance of 25 meters for 2.5 storey properties.

60 Sophie Lucas
Savills (on behalf of Miller Homes Ltd)
HQB11
Note that building regs ensure delivery of low carbon housing, rendering HBQ11 unnecessary. Note that local requirements, following engagement with appropriate partners, will need to be based on robust, credible evidence with attention to viability. Request that HBQ11 is removed.

61 Sophie Lucas
Savills (on behalf of Miller Homes Ltd)
HQB12
These requirements form part of the Council's Adopted Local Plan (ALP) and so their inclusion within the SPD is not necessary. Remove QB12.

62 Charlotte Mayall
Southern Water
Paragraph 6.52 and 6.55
Support the inclusion of a requirement for water efficiency measures to be included in new buildings. The reference to the Local Plan policy has been removed, as this is not necessary in order to ensure compliance with policy EM10 of the ALP. However, it is considered that the principle of encouraging water efficiency should be retained as it is consistent with the goals of policy EM10 and will help improve the sustainability credentials of new development. It is also noted that the encouragement of water efficiency is supported by Southern Water.

63 Nicki Barry
Tadley Town Council
2.11 and 2.12 (Movement and Highways)
Consider points important, particularly no. of parking spaces.

64 Nicki Barry
Tadley Town Council
4.34 - 4.37 (Open Space)
Strongly support the incorporation of open space into design.

65 Nicki Barry
Tadley Town Council
Principles EM1 - EM5 (Movement and Waldbuilding)
Strongly support

66 Nicki Barry
Tadley Town Council
8.10 (Non-car parkers)
Welcome on-street parking restrictions.

In terms of green infrastructure, it is considered that the SPD is already very supportive, and the approach taken has also been expanded in light of the comments from the council’s Natural Environment Team. In addition, green roofs are already addressed in the document (section 8). However, text has been added in relation to roof gardens and green walls as this provides an opportunity to improve the sustainability credentials of new development. Similarly, there may be scope to incorporate roof gardens and green walls.

These can be effective mechanisms for incorporating green infrastructure into urban environments while also improving the sustainability credentials of buildings. In terms of the references to biodiversity, it is considered that these would be more appropriately addressed in the Landscape and Biodiversity SPD, though in any case additional material in relation to biodiversity has already been incorporated as per the comments above. Similarly, the issues in respect of Landscape Enhancement would probably be more appropriately addressed in the Landscape and Biodiversity SPD, though as with biodiversity, it is considered that the document is already very supportive in relation to landscape and green infrastructure considerations.

It is agreed that amendments should be made to paragraphs 1.11 - 1.17 and 10.09 in order to reflect the changes in the consultation version of the revised NPPF. Please see Appendix D part of the Consultation Statement for the full details of these amendments.

It is agreed that clarification regarding 2.5 storey development would be helpful, and the text has been amended in order to clarify that 2.5 storey buildings should be considered within category of 3 storey development. “para 10.11, which would also include accommodation within the roofspace”. No detailed justification has been provided for why a different figure should be used for rooms in the roof 2.5 storey development, and there seems no reason why a different standard should be applied to such development as the overlooking is likely to be from the same height, and from the same sized windows, as 3 storey height windows not located in the roofspace. However, as the second floor window may be set back from the rear eaves (e.g. in the case of a dormer window), a footnote has been added specifying that the distance of the set-back can be discounted from the overlooking distance. However, where the window at second floor level (e.g. dormer window) is set back from the rear elevation, then the distance of the set-back can be reduced by 3.5m and the text has been amended in order to clarify that 2.5 storey development (including dormer windows) is set back by a 1m then the reduced overlooking distance would be reduced to 27.5m.

However, “whenever possible” has been amended to “where possible” in order to reflect the lack of ability to require the inclusion of such features.

The reference to the Local Plan policy has been removed, as this is not necessary in order to ensure compliance with policy EM10 of the ALP. However, it is considered that the principle of encouraging water efficiency should be retained as it is consistent with the goals of policy EM10 and will help improve the sustainability credentials of new development. It is also noted that the encouragement of water efficiency is supported by Southern Water.

Comment noted. The specific reference to policy EM9 has been removed as this is not necessary, but the encouragement of water efficiency measures has been retained in order to support sustainable approaches to development.

Comment noted. No change has been requested.

Comment noted. No change has been requested.

Comment noted. No change has been requested.

Comment noted. No change has been requested.
Nicki Barry

Tadley Town Council

11.5 (Extensions)

Agree that extensions should not be built right up to the boundary.

Comment noted. No change has been requested.

Nicki Barry

Tadley Town Council

11.9 (Overshadowing and Overbearing Impacts)

Raise a concern that overshadowing could occur as a result of permitted development.

Comment noted. No specific change has been requested. The guidance in the document will help to reduce the likelihood of overshadowing; however, it can only be utilised where an application is required.

Nicki Barry

Tadley Town Council

11.44 (Residential Annexes)

Request the application of a planning approval condition that any annexe remains part of the main dwelling can cannot be converted to a separate dwelling in the future.

Apply a planning approval condition that any annexe remains part of the main dwelling cannot be converted to a separate dwelling in the future.

It is considered that the decision about whether to impose such a condition should rest with the decision maker based on the particular circumstances pertaining to relevant applications. Therefore, it is not considered advisable to make the change requested.

James Rowley

Thames Water Utilities (c/o Savills)

Section 8.52 (Water Usage)

Generally support section but suggest further detail is provided. Suggest that the SPD should make reference to the PPG guidance concerning 110 litres per head per day.

Note that the levels are not appropriate for use in all areas but they have the potential to help ensure the sewers network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the effects of climate change. Request that the following paragraph is included in the SPD: "It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding." Note that measures are required in order to comply with paragraph 103 of the NPPF. (See full representation for further context and detail on these points).

Include the paragraph: "It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding."

The requested wording has been added to paragraph 8.55 in order to ensure that these considerations are properly factored into the design process and in order to prevent future problems in relation to flooding.

Mr David Wilson

Water Utilities Thames

Section 8.53 - 8.55 (Sustainable Drainage)

Note that trees are not appropriate for use in all areas but they have the potential to help ensure the sewers network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the effects of climate change. Request that the following paragraph is included in the SPD: "It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding." Note that measures are required in order to comply with paragraph 103 of the NPPF. (See full representation for further context and detail on these points).

Include the paragraph: "It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.

General wording has been added to paragraph 6.43 in order to address this issue: "It will also be necessary to consider how the proposed tree planting will be compatible with constraints such as heavy infrastructure." This is considered important in order to ensure that conflicts between tree planting and infrastructure are avoided, as such situations could create pressure for tree removal, which would be detrimental from an urban design and sustainability perspective. However, more general wording has been used as tree planting choices could impact on wider infrastructure features than just those used for water.

Mr David Wilson

Landscaping

Recognise the benefits of trees and encourages planting. Note that tree / shrub planting near / close to underground infrastructure can cause serious damage. Suggest consideration is given to this in the selected species and planting location.

Consider species and location of tree / shrub planting so as not to cause damage to underground infrastructure.

The council already utilises Building for Life as part of the Authority Monitoring Report process. In addition, the council helps run a local design review panel (the North East Hampshire Design Review Panel), and this is referred to in the introduction of the document. Therefore, it is considered that the document is consistent with the points made in the representation. However, for completeness/clearification, reference to Building for Life has been added to the paragraph on design review in the introduction: "The council also makes use of Building for Life when reviewing the quality of new development as reported in Design by Authority Monitoring Report."
10. Designing Extensions

Section 6

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

James Rowley

Generally support the guidance in section 6. Question the guidance that development could not be built on elevated sites or in narrow slips. Note that views towards new development and their roofscapes need to be carefully considered, avoiding long monolithic buildings. Recommend a building height to street width ratio 1.15 to 1.13 is added to paragraph 6.21 but note that this will need to be used flexibly (particularly when applied to taller buildings within district centres). Recommend plots ratios at 35-45% (not exceeding 50%) for new commercial buildings in paragraph 6.6.2. Note that this should be applied flexibly in mixed use areas as it would lead to stand alone buildings.

Note that overlooking can be prevented by a number of means and not just distance. There are many instances of B2 and B8, and homes are not likely to be visible to a number of residents. In Maryport, as it is assumed that only B1 uses would be provided on this site, as B2 and B8 are generally not likely to be easy to accommodate within residential development, this may not be the case. Consider garden length guidelines, particularly those in RA2 should be applied flexibly. Note there are different combination with qualitative measures would be a more suitable approach. Suggest back to back distances, particularly those in RA6 should be applied flexibly. Note that variation in character is essential to avoid monotony. Therefore, it is considered that the guidance is also sufficiently flexible in this section to allow for various approaches to parking provision, and so it is not considered that any changes are needed in relation to this comment. The comments concerning land-take are probably more relevant to the Parking SPD as it is considered that the guidance in this document should not necessarily result in any increase in land-take for parking.

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

James Rowley

Support the inclusion of integral garages. Suggest a wide range of parking solutions minimise impact and on-street parking has an important role to play. Generally agree with principles in paragraphs 7.15 - 7.19, however, with communal parking areas raise concern that these measures will increase land take (especially when combined with new parking standards) and a balance needs to be struck between car use and promoting more sustainable transport modes. Raised concern that a preference for garages to side allows for a limited range of typologies and direct design towards semi-detached houses. Note that this risks creating homogeneous development.

Consider the tall building guidelines in paragraph 8.5.8 could be applied to district centres at Maryport. Request any guidance on buildings >18m in paragraph 6.6.2. Note that this should be applied flexibly (particularly when applied to taller buildings within district centres). Recommend plots ratios at 35-45% (not exceeding 50%) for new commercial buildings in paragraph 6.6.2. Note that this should be applied flexibly in mixed use areas as it would lead to stand alone buildings.

Consider that garden length guidelines, particularly those in RA2 should be applied flexibly. Suggest a minimum amenity area through a variety of means (not just gardens) Apply back to back distance guidelines flexibly. Suggest a minimum area through a variety of means (not just gardens) in relation to residential buildings is generally achievable, the standards for non-residential buildings are much more challenging.

Consider that garden length guidelines, particularly those in RA2 should be applied flexibly. Suggest a minimum area through a variety of means (not just gardens) in relation to residential buildings is generally achievable, the standards for non-residential buildings are much more challenging.

In relation to the concern about building on elevated sites, it is considered that the proposed wording in the SPD could be somewhat sweeping, and so it is proposed to amend this as follows: “New development proposed on elevated sites needs to be carefully considered in order to ensure that it doesn’t have a detrimental impact on the character of the area and may be inappropriate in some circumstances.” In terms of enclosures, this section is intended to be interpreted in a flexible manner, but amended wording is proposed in order to emphasise this. “Turning to the plot ratios, it is considered that any changes are needed in relation to this comment. The comments concerning land-take are probably more relevant to the Parking SPD as it is considered that the guidance in this document should not necessarily result in any increase in land-take for parking. The document was not intended to be interpreted as it has been in this comment. Amendments have been made to paragraph 7.15 and 7.16 in order to reflect the concerns raised about perceived implications that garages could be used instead of driveways.” 7.16 Parking suitable parking within the curtilage is an important element of any development. Parking can be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling either via the front entrance to their car located within the public realm, creating more activity within the street scene. However, it is important that the car parking and any garaging does not create a negative interface with the public realm.” 7.16. Where parking is provided within the curtilage, this should wherever possible be located on enclosed (or garaged) side of the property, set back from the main building line.” In terms of the concern about an over emphasis on parking to the side of dwellings, it is considered that this section allows for various approaches to parking provision, and so it is not considered that any changes are needed in relation to this comment. The comments concerning land-take are probably more relevant to the Parking SPD as it is considered that the guidance in this document should not necessarily result in any increase in land-take for parking.

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

James Rowley

Welcome the guidance in Section 9. Particularly note that the oil of useful of render paint is well made.

Consider that garden length guidelines, particularly those in RA2 should be applied flexibly. Suggest a minimum area through a variety of means (not just gardens) in combination with qualitative measures would be a more suitable approach. Suggest back to back distances, particularly those in RA4 should be applied flexibly. Note that these measures will increase land take (especially when combined with new parking standards) and a balance needs to be struck between car use and promoting more sustainable transport modes.

Comment noted.

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

James Rowley

Consider that garden length guidelines, particularly those in RA2 should be applied flexibly. Suggest a minimum area through a variety of means (not just gardens) in combination with qualitative measures would be a more suitable approach. Suggest back to back distances, particularly those in RA4 should be applied flexibly. Note that these measures will increase land take (especially when combined with new parking standards) and a balance needs to be struck between car use and promoting more sustainable transport modes. Support 8.8.2, achieving high quality school buildings in principle. The comment also makes reference to the water efficiency standards in the ALP, and explains that while the requirement in relation to residential buildings is generally achievable, the standards for non-residential buildings are much more challenging.

There are already scope within the document for flexible approaches to types of amenity provision (such as roof gardens), where these can be justified. In addition, it is considered more appropriate for the specific issues in relation to Maryport to be addressed through the planning application process and site specific design codes. Comments in relation to water efficiency standards are noted, but these are set out in the Local Plan and so can only be reconsidered when the LP is reviewed.

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

James Rowley

Note that overlooking can be prevented by a number of means and not just distance. Consider the flexibility should be retained to allow people to stay in their properties and adapt them as lifestyles change. Suggest including guidance on designing for working from home.

The comments are noted. The only specific change suggested is in relation to providing guidance for home working. However, urban design is mainly focused on design considerations for the external environment, as opposed to the internal spaces within buildings. Therefore, design guidance pertaining to measures which would facilitate home-working is not considered appropriate.

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

James Rowley

10. Designing Extensions

Note that overlooking can be prevented by a number of means and not just distance. Consider the flexibility should be retained to allow people to stay in their properties and adapt them as lifestyles change. Suggest including guidance on designing for working from home.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/paragraph</th>
<th>Amendment made</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreward</td>
<td>Updated in order to reflect current status of the document.</td>
<td>In order to reflect the progression from the consultation version to the adoption version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>One of the core planning principles of the NPPF is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings (para 17).</td>
<td>In order to reflect proposed changes to the NPPF, as set out in the consultation version of that document dated March 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>The NPPF states that the government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is also identified as a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.</td>
<td>In order to reflect proposed changes to the NPPF, as set out in the consultation version of that document dated March 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Well-designed places good design and establishes a strong framework for supporting the creation of high quality buildings and places ensuring good design in the borough.</td>
<td>In order to reflect proposed changes to the NPPF, as set out in the consultation version of that document dated March 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Respond positively to local distinctiveness (para 60 of the NPPF).</td>
<td>In order to reflect proposed changes to the NPPF, as set out in the consultation version of that document dated March 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>While the NPPF stresses that the visual appearance and architecture of individual buildings are very important factors. However, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, this guidance also ensures connections between people and places and the successful integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment, in particular through the emphasis on contextual design solutions (para 61 of the NPPF).</td>
<td>In order to reflect proposed changes to the NPPF, as set out in the consultation version of that document dated March 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>(para 63 of the NPPF).</td>
<td>In order to reflect proposed changes to the NPPF, as set out in the consultation version of that document dated March 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>Changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>The council’s approach to the consideration of new development also accords with the NPPF encouragement requirement for having local design review arrangements in place in order to facilitate high standards of design. Accordingly, this guide will help to inform the considerations of the Design Review Panel in providing design advice to BDBC (para 62 of the NPPF). The council also makes use of Building for Life when reviewing the quality of new development as part of its Authority Monitoring Report process. In order to reflect proposed changes to the NPPF, as set out in the consultation version of that document dated March 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Delete ‘emerging’ before St Mary Bourne and Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Plans. In order to reflect that these have now been made by the council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>Text enlarged in diagram In order to make the text easier to read, as per request from Cllr Parker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>Hedges added to the design framework diagram In order to respond to request from Paul Johnston.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>Delete ‘also’ before words ‘be very important’. In order to improve the wording of this sentence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21 (new paragraph)</td>
<td>They also Parking Courts need to be convenient to use and feel safe and secure. This will require direct access to/from the surrounding dwellings and the provision of adequate lighting (dusk to dawn energy efficient lighting to appropriate levels). Boundary treatment may need to be designed to allow observation from dwellings over the parking spaces. Parking courts should not be located in inaccessible areas at the extremity of the development. In response to comments from Cabinet members, who recommended that further guidance be provided concerning the means of improving the effectiveness of parking courts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>In diagram showing key long views of tall buildings, addition of viewpoint just to the south of Basingstoke on the A339. This was left off in error in the version published for consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>In diagram showing locations for tall buildings, the key has been amended so that it is better related to the drawing. In order to improve the presentation of the image.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Additional text: Bricks are generally the traditional external finishing material used in the borough and their use in new development is encouraged. In response to comments from Cabinet members concerning the importance of using bricks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Consequently, the use of clay tiles as an external finishing material is encouraged. This approach generally utilises clay tiles, but slate can also be employed.</td>
<td>In response to comments from Cabinet members concerning the importance of using tiles, and a consequential amendment to ensure the paragraph as a whole remains coherent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>Accordingly, the use of render is discouraged and it must only be used where it can be demonstrated that it will be adequately maintained and will not become severely discoloured. When using render it is necessary to have regard to the impact the use of this material will have on the locality, and how well it will weather in light of the specific site context.</td>
<td>In response to comments from Cabinet members regarding their concerns about the use of render in new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.17 (new paragraph number)</td>
<td>Applications involving the use of render must demonstrate how it can be ensured that its appearance will not deteriorate/discolour. Ensuring that the appearance of render is suitably maintained will be dependent on various factors. Examples include for example through the use of self-cleaning finishes/types of render such as silicone and using through-coloured render. The applicant must also demonstrate that suitable procedures are in place to ensure the ongoing maintenance and cleaning of the render, and this will need to be secured through the planning process.</td>
<td>In response to comments from Cabinet members regarding their concerns about the use of render in new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>As an external cladding system timber cladding can be left to weather naturally, or stained/coated via various methods.</td>
<td>Clarification of wording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD5</td>
<td>MD5 – While render can produce attractive buildings, the use of this material is discouraged and needs to be used with caution.</td>
<td>In response to comments from Cabinet members regarding their concerns about the use of render in new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>Staining/coating timber removes the potential for the material to weather gracefully over time.</td>
<td>Clarification of wording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>Therefore, where timber cladding is proposed it will be important to demonstrate that it will be maintained in a suitable manner, will be durable and will weather in an attractive manner.</td>
<td>In response to comments from Cabinet members regarding their concerns about the use of timber cladding in new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD7</td>
<td>MD7 – It is vital to ensure that the timber cladding is used in a manner which allows it to weather/age attractively and can be suitably maintained.</td>
<td>In response to comments from Cabinet members regarding their concerns about the use of timber cladding in new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>One of the core principles of the NPPF and Policy EM10 in the ALP is to always seek a good requires the provision of a high standard of amenity for occupants of developments, all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</td>
<td>In order to reflect proposed changes to the NPPF, as set out in the consultation version of that document dated March 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>(please see appendix 3 for details).</td>
<td>For ease of reference the relevant information contained within the technical standards has been added to Appendix 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Heritage impacts It will also be important to establish whether there are any heritage implications associated with the proposed extension. Any extensions to listed buildings will require very detailed consideration, and there will be an array of specific design considerations which will apply in such scenarios. In addition, if extensions are proposed in conservation areas or in a location where they could impact upon the setting of a listed building(s) then it will be vital to consider in detail the impact this will have on the heritage assets. Further guidance regarding these issues will be set out in the council’s Heritage SPD.</td>
<td>In response to comments from Cabinet members regarding the need to identify and respond to any heritage related implications associated with extensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>, while some are also specifically referenced in relevant neighbourhood plans. Consequently, these need to be and are</td>
<td>Text updated in order to reflect how Village Design Statements have integrated into neighbourhood plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1, para 1.2</td>
<td>time and potentially updated in association with the neighbourhood planning process. Where these documents have been prepared applicants and developers must take them into account. A list of all the VDS documents in the borough is set out in Appendix 2 of this SPD and a</td>
<td>Text amended in order to reflect the potential impact of neighbourhood planning and in order to respond to avoid repeating the other text added to this paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1, para 1.3</td>
<td>settlements documents</td>
<td>Correction in order to clarify the meaning of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>Include new Appendix 3, comprising the relevant details from the Nationally Described Space Standards, this includes the technical requirements and the table setting out the minimum size thresholds.</td>
<td>For ease of reference in relation to the text set out in paragraph 10.20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Updated paragraph numbering and table of contents.</td>
<td>In order to reflect the other changes made to the document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Letters received from Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government

Councillor Ruffell
Email: Joanne.Bromley@basingstoke.gov.uk

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government
Fry Building,
3rd Floor,
2 Marsham Street,
London
SW1P 4DF

Fax: 020 7035 0018
www.gov.uk/mhclg
Our Ref: 354815
Your Ref:
Date: 12 January 2018

Dear Councillor Ruffell,

Thank you for your letter of 11 December 2017 to the Rt Hon Alok Sharma MP regarding the adoption of the Nationally Described Space Standard in your area. I have been asked to reply.

As you may be aware, Paragraphs 174 and 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are specifically referenced in the WMS.

Paragraph 174 of the NPPF is clear that Local planning authorities should set out their policy on local standards in the Local Plan and that the likely cumulative impacts on development in their area of all existing and proposed local standards, supplementary planning documents and policies that support the development plan, when added to nationally required standards should be assessed.

Paragraph 177 states that “infrastructure and development policies should be planned at the same time in the Local Plan. Any affordable housing or local standards requirements that may be applied to development should be assessed at the plan-making stage, where possible, and kept under review.”

This is re-iterated in the current National Planning Practice Guidance which states that “Where a local planning authority (or qualifying body) wishes to require an internal space standard, they should only do so by reference in their Local Plan”.

I appreciate your authority’s desire to deliver good quality homes and the adoption of the standards will help this. You may therefore wish to consider bringing forward a review (or partial review) of the adopted Local Plan. The Government recently consulted on measures which would streamline the plan making process and make it easier for Local Authorities to get plans in place, and the Government are currently analysing the responses to this. You may also wish to respond to the consultation on the draft NPPF when it is published this year.

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Borrows

---

1 Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 56-018-20150327
www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-optional-technical-standards
Dear Mr Ruffell

Thank you for taking the time to contact The Department for Communities and Local Government. I have been asked to reply and I am sorry for the delay in replying.

The nationally described space standard (NDSS) was introduced in 2015 in the Housing Standards Review to rationalise existing space standards set by local authorities. It can be applied by a local authority subject to assessment of need and viability. The expectation is that the NDSS will feature in the Local Plan, and when it does it can be attached as a condition to planning permissions. If it does not feature in the Local Plan, although a helpful standard, it will not have the same formal power through planning. So to adopt it in any other way means it will remain a recommendation, not a condition of planning.

Sir Eric Pickles’ Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) of 25th March 2015 set out how the space standard should be applied. It can be applied where a local authority has an appropriate local plan policy in place, subject to an assessment of local housing need and viability. A link to the WMS can be found at:


Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council having recently updated their Local Plan and might now only be able to include the standard in the next 5 yearly cycle. In the meantime, they might establish evidence and refer to it in their supplementary guidance, but they need to be aware that it will then not be attachable to planning permissions as a planning condition, but retain the status of guidance. Their proposed supplementary planning documents (SPD) will go to public consultation, but will not lead to the same level of Planning Inspectorate scrutiny as would a Local Plan. The risk with the SPD approach is that it will not deliver the powers behind the policy design, which works when the NDSS is referred to in the Local Plan.

The planning practice guidance (PPG) describes the method needed to embed space standards. There are no plans to add an alternate method to the actual
method described in the PPG, as this adds greater scope for complication, which the Housing Standards Review sought to reduce.

The application of a policy is a matter for the decision maker (the local planning authority), having regard to the local plan and any other material considerations.

The WMS of 25th March 29015 is one such material consideration. I note that Basingstoke and Deane adopted their local plan in May 2016 and that it contains a policy which sets out requirements for new development to provide a high quality of amenity for occupants, having regard for issues such as amenity space. You will appreciate that I cannot comment how that policy would apply to particular developments: that would be a matter for the decision maker. However, the intention of the March 2015 Statement was clearly that any references to space standards in either existing or new policies should be interpreted by reference to the nationally described space standard.

The development of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on design and sustainability which will refer to NDSS is possible. In considering that, the Council should take account of paragraph 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework which explains how SPDs should be used:


Paragraph 153 says: Supplementary planning documents should be used where they can help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery, and should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development.

Thank you for writing on this matter. I trust this information helps.

Yours sincerely

Luke Turner

Luke Turner
Principal Architect - Approved Documents K and M
Building Regulations and Energy Performance Division