

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|-------------------------------------|------------|---|--|
| 1 | INT 01 | Liz Anderson, Ecologist | GI | - Reference to 'Designing for Biodiversity' (RIBA/BCT) should be made | - Insert reference |
| 2 | INT 02 | Lisa White, Leisure | GI/PP | - Suggested changes to text on play areas | - Change text |
| 3 | INT 03 | Historic Conservation | HE | - Add materials section from previous Design Guide (p.27-28) | - Insert content |
| 4 | INT 04 | Sue Frost, Local Planning & Housing | PP | - Add reference to Mobile Infrastructure Projects | - Add reference to document |
| 5 | INT 05 | Lauren Westley, DM | RES ALT | - Difference between 21m stipulated for back to back distance and 22m for infill development questioned at 5.02.0 | - Align to 21m in both instances |
| | | | | - Set distance needs to be stipulated as for two storey dwellings at 5.02.04? | - Stipulate set distance |
| | | | | - Questions whether examples of physical protection should be included at 5.03.02 '2' | - Include examples |
| | | | | - More clarity required as to when Secured by Design Standards would be applied at 5.04 | - Provide clarity |
| | | | | - States that extensions may be built up to the boundary at 7.03.06 | - Clarify distances to the boundary in all instances |
| | | | | - Retaining rear access, states a minimum 1m between two storey side extension and boundary. This should apply to single storey extensions at 7.03.09 | |
| | | | | - Wording too vague on the siting of two storey extensions at 7.04.02 | |
| 6 | INT 06 | Ian Finnegan, Flood Risk | GI | - Reference to CBC SUDs guidance should be made | - Insert reference |
| 7 | INT 07 | Keith Brown, Building Control | Multi | - Words missing in Figure 1.4 (step 4) and lack of consistency with punctuation | - Make change to Figure 1.4 - Add reference to Figure 1.7 |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|--------------------------|-------|--|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No mention of solar gain in figure 1.7 - Car number plate figure 1.27 should be pixilated - No reference to disabled parking bays at 1.14 - Figures 1.36/7 show examples of tandem parking - No key to feature 10 at figure 1.40 - U values of walls and windows supplied - Text should say that ground floor WCs are a requirement of B/Regs - Recessed door design at Figure 9.22 is not accessible unless an automatic opening device is fitted - Wording change to clarify at p.27 Heading 'Doors A' - Legislation should be The Equalities Act not DDA p.29 (9) - Photo example of sign which is mounted at a low level does not accord with the CBC signage policy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make change - Make change to Figure 1.27 - Add reference to disabled bays - Clarify that tandem parking of more than two vehicles not acceptable - Add key entry for Figure 1.40 - Add in U values as supplied - Change wording to make clear that ground floor WCs are a requirement - Add ref to automatic opening device - Make wording change at p.27 - Make change to legislation reference - Change photo |
| 8 | INT 08 | Simon Joynes, Env Health | PP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small scale text changes to pollution content | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make changes |
| 9 | INT 09 | Clare Harding Equalities | NA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pleased to see references to accessibility/ reference to legislation needs update | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update reference to legislation |
| 10 | INT 10 | Highways Combined | Multi | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detailed wording changes to correct inaccuracies and strengthen messages | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make minor wording changes through the main document and supplements |
| 11 | INT 11 | DM Highways | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Street layout, movement and hierarchy are one of the first stages in the design process and this should be reflected in the structure of the document. - Unnecessary repetition between | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emphasis to be improved in the Placemaking Principles document and reordering of supplements to ensure Movement and Streets come first. - Retain key messages in Placemaking Principles and |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|------------|------|--|--|
| | | | | Placemaking Principles and Movement and Streets documents | detail in the supplement. |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Some parts are too detailed and repeat good practice guidance. The guide should only include locally specific requirements. – Not enough reference to good practice guidance i.e. Manual for Streets, Design Manual for Roads and bridges, and local guidance i.e. LTP3 and supporting strategies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Comments noted. The guidance includes important good practice information to ensure the full picture is presented to the reader. However, references to relevant guidance will be strengthened where necessary. |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – More emphasis is needed on CBC context and examples | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – CBC examples to be included and images will be replaced. |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Disproportionate focus on cars, particularly parking. Sustainable modes of transport are overlooked, particularly cycling. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Improve the emphasis on sustainable modes of transport by reordering the Movement and Streets supplement and strengthening the content. |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Number of functional street types too narrow. Should use 9 typologies identified by TFL as an example. – Higher order routes not acknowledged. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Comments noted. A smaller number of functional types were identified to avoid being too prescriptive and enable flexibility in terms of creating streets with differing characters. – Comments noted. Design of higher order routes to be guided by DMRB. |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Not enough emphasis on importance of future maintenance of street materials and features. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strengthen references to importance of future maintenance, and identify where funding mechanisms may be required. |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Relationship between functional street types and character types is unclear. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Restructure the document and include additional explanation to provide clarity. |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 20mph speed not necessarily appropriate in all locations and situations, such as link roads. Can be designed into new schemes but more difficult to retrofit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Include additional text to explain importance of context and situation. |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Lack of clarity on approach to shared spaces. Focus is only on level surface | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Include general section on shared spaces and key principles. |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|--|------|--|---|
| | | | | streets and there are other types. – Some parameters incorrect and need amending both within the PP document and in the MS Street Parameters table, including parking space dimensions and vertical front boundary heights for example. – Need to clarify that allocated parking cannot be included within the extent of the adoptable highway. – Materials section needs to reflect CBCs preferred approach, for example not supporting lighting attached to buildings and appropriateness of surface materials. | – Correct parameters. – Include additional text to ensure clarity. – Amend materials section in consultation with CBC Highways. |
| 12 | PC 01 | Tom Chevalier, Resident | MS | – Clarification sought on CBC's street lighting document that is referred to at paragraph 10.07.20 | – Remove reference as document is out of date and reword as appropriate |
| 13 | PC 02 | Pam Manfield, Resident | NA | – Validity of design guidance questioned in relation to the standard of recent development in Stotfold | – Full response dated 25/10/13 sent to Ms Manfield |
| 14 | PC 03 | Les Alexander, Resident | GI | – Figure 2.28 cannot be read at current low resolution | – Make sure image is reproduced at a higher resolution |
| 15 | PC 04 | Matrix Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey | PP | The standards in the current Parking Strategy constitute an over-provision and sustainable travel choices should be encouraged. A site by site approach should be taken | – The Design guide seeks to reduce the number of spaces required in line with these concerns |
| 16 | PC 05 | Nicolas Tye Architects | RES | Correction required to caption error | – Make correction |
| 17 | PC 06 | David Toland, Resident | NA | – Example of Marston Park cited as one of poor quality design due to pylons, incongruous three storey housing, lack of character and adequate bin storage | – Comments noted. Guide endeavours to help address these concerns |
| 18 | PC 07 | Health & Safety | NA | No comments | – No action |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|--------------------------|-------|---|---|
| | | Executive | | | |
| 19 | PC 08 | Hearne Homes | Multi | - Figure 1.5 not clear (Fairfield Masterplan) | - Change graphic |
| | | | | - A parking space per bedroom is too high for good design/viability | - This is a suggested level of provision – <i>minimum</i> level is lower |
| | | | | - Text sought to the planting of fruit trees | - This is covered in orchard section at 2.03.01.01.05. |
| | | | | - More flexibility required on sourcing of local materials | Additional guidance on local materials will be provided in the Placemaking Principles supplement – alternative materials should be discussed with CBC Conservation Officers |
| | | | | - More guidance on non-listed buildings of historic interest required | - Provide additional guidance |
| | | | | - General support for PA supplement | - No action |
| | | | | - Section on PD rights within Alterations and Extension supp requested | - Add section on PD rights |
| | | | | - Principles on shop front design need to be more rigorously enforced | - Not within scope of the DG |
| 20 | PC 09 | Henlow Parish Council | | General support | - No action |
| 22 | PC 10 | Highways Agency | NA | No comments | - No action |
| 23 | PC 11 | Natural England | GI | - General comments other than need for inclusion of text in relation to light pollution | - Light pollution already dealt with in PP section |
| 24 | PC 12 | Aylesbury Vale DC | NA | No comments | - No action |
| 25 | PC 13 | Resident, Toddington | NA | General support other than for principle of Public Art | - No action - principle of delivering public art has been agreed |
| 26 | PC 14 | Anglian Water | GI | - Tree planting should not disrupt water or sewer infrastructure | - Insert text on tree planting as appropriate |
| | | | | - Support coverage of climate change adaptation measures | - No action required |
| 27 | PC 15 | English Heritage | Multi | - Six small scale detailed changes requested | - Action changes |
| 28 | PC 16 | Biggleswade Town Council | NA | - Letter to follow urging CBC to take stronger action to enforce Design Guide | - Design Guide will have the status of planning guidance once adopted |
| 29 | PC 17 | Bedfordshire Police | PP | - References Community Safety SPG 2005 | - CBC's approach is to deliver permeable schemes with |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|--------------------------|-------|--|--|
| | | ALO | | which concludes that permeable streets are undesirable and should be avoided wherever possible. | a common sense approach to community safety |
| 30 | PC 18 | Langford Parish Council | Multi | - Overall document uses 'should' or 'may' rather than 'must' and 'will' | - Design guidance offers ideas and possible approaches and seeking strict compliance is not appropriate in all cases |
| | | | | - Solar panels should be required on new developments | - There is no policy requirement for this and no evidence base to support such a policy |
| | | | | - Wording relating to habitats provision questioned 1.7 p.14 | - Change wording to clarify |
| | | | | - Evidence required to justify lower parking provision when good access to public transport available questioned | - Appropriate provision would be proximity to mainline rail station or busway |
| | | | | - Resident parking standards considered to be insufficient | - Parking standards far exceed car ownership |
| | | | | - Comments in relation to Environmental Health guidance requesting greater detail/clarity | - Overview only. All applications that have environmental risks will be assessed in detail by EH professionals |
| | | | | - Biodiversity checklist format unclear | - Biodiversity checklist will be reworded |
| 31 | PC 19 | Northhill Parish Council | Multi | - Private car should rank above public transport in road hierarchy | - Behaviour change to use public transport will only occur if it is convenient and designed in to development |
| | | | | - Grass verges can be problematic for maintenance by PC | - Grass verges can form an attractive part of a development and should remain an option |
| | | | | - Materials should be determined by master craftsmen | - Agree |
| | | | | - Rest areas could encourage anti-social behaviour | - Benches and seating are an important feature in the public realm provided that they are sited appropriately |
| | | | | - Consider provision of allotments for every development over 2 homes | - Allotment provision is considered in the Leisure Strategy |
| | | | | - Birds should be considered especially in close proximity to RSPB Headquarters, Sandy | - References to birds will be included using comments from the RSPB |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|---|-------|---|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consent and agreement of local PC should be mandatory for public art installations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Public art installations usually form part of a planning application |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Object to lack of double room provision in residential care homes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Single room provision is standard practice in residential care home – double are available on request |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Family size for G&T sites needs to be defined | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Family sizes can vary so it is not appropriate to include this in guidance |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There should be more emphasis on the protection of shrubs and trees on the boundary of properties | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Add wording about boundaries |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Raised footways near schools can be dangerous | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No evidence to suggest raised footways are dangerous – the contrary is in fact true |
| 32 | PC 20 | Barton Willmore on behalf of Houghton Regis Development Corporation | Multi | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Vague wording of ‘good sized gardens’ challenged. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Wording provides an overview only and will be amended to show that some variation in size on is acceptable in certain circumstances |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – One size fits all approach unhelpful | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Disagree that this approach has been taken |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BREEAM Communities Assessment too onerous | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Change wording to make assessment optional |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – One space per bedroom standards will lead to poor design | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agreed – hence parking standards are being lowered slightly in this guide |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Unallocated on street parking should count as a parking space | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Review approach to unallocated on street parking |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Garage dimensions are too large | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Garage dimensions will not be altered as they allow the parking of larger family vehicles. Smaller garages can be delivered but they will not count as a parking space |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Examples of parking on p.34-35 are unsuitable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Graphics will be changed to remove set back parking and improve frontage design |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Play provision –commented that large developments often end up with small, underused play areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agree that this is unhelpful for the visual appearance of the development. Will include more flexibility to enable grouped play provision |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Noise barriers should not be excluded and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Text on p.50 point 5 does allow for the use of noise |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|------------|------|--|---|
| | | | | B/regs should not be exceeded | barriers as a final resort |
| | | | | – Text on p.50 should refer to ‘committed’ and not ‘known’ schemes | – Make change to wording |
| | | | | – Landscaping issues: CBC should stick to our advice on "not planting trees on top of bunds" - but planting on the side acceptable | – Para on ground modelling (2.02.02.02.01) will be revised - bunds should only be used as boundary features where excessive disturbance experienced in order to avoid awkward features and the loss of the soil as a resource. |
| | | | | – Comments that it is difficult to determine what are native species | – Don’t agree - it is commonly accepted what would and wouldn’t be reasonably considered as native. |
| | | | | – Elements in landscape checklist need to be clarified | – Amend table on p27 to improve clarity and amend text in relation to barriers to movement |
| | | | | – Content of Figure 2.32 is too aspirational | – Document should show how our policy aspirations for biodiversity net gain can be realised. This is entirely appropriate, and the scope of this guide, in setting out aspirations is completely in line with national and local policy. Not appropriate just to focus on mitigation |
| | | | | – Resource efficiency content at too detailed and out of place | – Agree, remove ‘Resource Efficiency and Climate Change Adaptation Issues’ |
| | | | | – The content of this section goes beyond the requirements of current UK Building Regulations | – It is important to stress that the Government has not yet published the consultation response to proposed changes to Housing Standards nor made changes to the current planning policy to not allow LAs to set their own standards through planning policy. In addition, the Parliamentary Environmental Audit Committee published their findings on the Government’s proposal to wind down the Code for Sustainable Homes standard, and recommended that the Local Authorities should be allowed to set local standards until such time the Building Regulations require dwellings to be ‘truly zero’ carbon as per Level 6 of the CfSH standard |
| | | | | – the proposed standards are too | – The Design Guide provides guidance on standards set |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|---------------------|------|---|---|
| | | | | prescriptive | by the emerging Development Strategy. The Guide outlines measures which should be consider, but acknowledges that due to sites' constrains not all might be possible to be implemented. |
| | | | | – Multiple standards are affecting the overall viability of development and in turn the achievement of housing targets | – The viability of housing standards had been tested as part of the Development Strategy viability test. |
| | | | | – Overall space standards and CEL standards need to be rationalised so that they match and standards are too generic | – Space standard tables will be rationalised into one table but standards themselves have been adopted as they are tried and tested |
| | | | | – Stated that a 10m garden depth is required for privacy when it may have rear parking behind for example | – Add wording to explain that this provision is to create decent sized gardens too |
| | | | | – 14m garden depth will discourage developers from delivering wide frontage units | – Remove 14m garden depth and make 12m for three and four bedroom properties |
| | | | | – Disagree that all side and rear boundaries should be brick | – Change wording on boundaries to allow for other materials |
| | | | | – Text on p.23-24 suggests that three storeys is maximum appropriate | – Reword to clarify that suggested number of storeys is in relation to houses |
| | | | | – Criticism over the viability of applying all 16 Lifetime Home criteria | – Only a selection of the less onerous criteria are marked as essential |
| | | | | – The viability and operating requirement of larger footprint buildings need to be understood and as such BREEAM Excellent rating cannot be justified | – BREEAM rating has been set by Development Strategy draft policy |
| | | | | – More contemporary designs should be shown in the Town Centre Vitality Section | – Add a contemporary photo to Town Centre Vitality supplement |
| | | | | – Text in street parameters should say 'over 200' vehicles for main street | – Make change to text |
| | | | | – Bus length queried | – Bus length is as suggested by CBC Highways |
| | | | | – Slow ideal walking speeds queried | – Speed is as suggested by CBC Highways |
| 33 | PC 21 | Pegasus Planning on | NA | – Questions overall viability of proposals | – The DG will proceed as planned |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|---|--|--|-------|---|---|
| | | behalf of The North Luton Consortium | | and recommends that the Design Guide follows the adoption of the Development Strategy | |
| 34 | PC 22 | David Lock Associate on behalf of O & H Properties | Multi | - Summary of key principles for each supplement would be helpful | - Summaries will be added |
| | | | | - More reference to best practice guidance would be helpful | - Guidance is referenced where appropriate and among the changes are a number of additional references |
| | | | | - The guide is overly long and unwieldy | - The guide does seek to cover a lot of material hence the size but readers can dip in and out as required of what will be predominantly a digital resource. The document already shows the relationship between the supplements on at Figure 1.3 |
| | | | | - Guide should be consistent with other Council strategies and buy in from all service areas required | - All Council service areas have been rigorously consulted on the draft and their input has shaped the final content |
| | | | | - Consistent approach to presentation in general and paragraph numbering needs to be applied | - Once all changes have been approved, a full overhaul of all aspects of presentation including paragraph numbering, photo resolution will be undertaken |
| | | | | - Car parking standards should be moved to M&S Supplement | - Car parking standards will remain in Placemaking Principles as the provision affects initial layout |
| | | | | - Multiple requirements outlined based on different parameters e.g. design codes for over 400 dwellings | - It is considered that it is made clear where each requirement would apply but further work will be done to update the validation checklist |
| | | | | - Not clear how the density information at Para.1.20 should be applied | - More explanatory text will be added to the section on density |
| | | | | - Context around design codes should be made clear by adding to route map and order needs to be changed | - Add information on design codes to route map and move section to after route map |
| | | | | - Headings need to be added to 1.7 | - Add headings |
| - Reference to parking standards to state p.29 rather than p.28 | - Correct reference on p.25 (PP) | | | | |
| - Enforceability of suggested level of parking questioned | - As described, they are 'suggested' standards to allow developers the flexibility of delivering a premium | | | | |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|------------|------|--|--|
| | | | | | product |
| | | | | – Clarify what is meant by ‘demonstrative features’ for areas of play | – Add wording to areas of play |
| | | | | – Walking distances to NEAPs & LEAPS questioned | – Review walking distances as set out at 1.18 |
| | | | | – Figure 1.79 is not clear in terms of how trade offs can be applied to pollutants | – Remove figure 1.79 and list pollutants instead |
| | | | | – The inclusion of information on the Code for Sustainable Homes questioned given current status | – It is important to stress that the Government has not yet published the consultation response to proposed changes to Housing Standards |
| | | | | – 2.07.02.01 -not all sites lend themselves to a purist approach of solar orientation and therefore some interpretation will be required | – It has been acknowledged in Section 2.07.02. |
| | | | | – 2.07.02.02.04 Definition of Central Bedfordshire’s Community Energy Fund required | – The Community Energy Fund’s details will be defined in a separate guidance document after adoption of emerging Development Strategy. |
| | | | | – Too much descriptive text in relation to historic environment for design guidance | – Agree – cut paragraphs 3.02.05 – 3.02.10 as they repeat national guidance |
| | | | | – Too much text on heritage assets, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas | – Disagree – the text is informative and all examples and figures supplied are specific to Central Bedfordshire |
| | | | | – Executive summary for Public Art section should be provided | – Executive summary will be provided for PA |
| | | | | – Text at 4.02.01 should be highlighted for clarity | – Highlight text at 4.02.01 |
| | | | | – More detail required about public art statements at 4.02.05 | – Add text relating to Public Art Statements |
| | | | | – 5.02.01-5.02.04 key figures should be highlighted for clarity | – Highlight key figures |
| | | | | – 5.02.01 back to back distances should not be advisory | – Change wording to clarify that back to back distances will be enforced |
| | | | | – Figures 2 & 3 bear no relation to text on | – Photos do relate to text but change numbering to 5.2 |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|------------|------|--|--|
| | | | | page at 5.02 | & 5.3 |
| | | | | – Support elements of Secured by Design illustrated but not non-permeable street design | – Noted |
| | | | | – Space standards will be difficult to enforce and are categorised as suggested and minimum standards | – Amalgamate tables for clarity and specify in each instance whether standards are minimum or maximum |
| | | | | – Bin storage guidance is welcomed but will need to be reviewed regularly | – Noted |
| | | | | – Highlight key areas and lengths in relation to garden depth | – Highlight for clarity at 5.06 |
| | | | | – Varying garden depths may be difficult to achieve where different sized homes are in a terrace | – Rationalise longest garden depth to 12m and then if two bedroom homes are next to larger homes then the larger of the two can be delivered |
| | | | | – Lifetime homes commentary needs to be highlighted for clarity at 5.13 | – Add highlight at 5.13 |
| | | | | – Needs to be made clearer that table relates to paragraph on location at 6.02 | – Add lower order paragraph numbers to ASHN (6) – Add caption to locations table at 6.02 |
| | | | | – A tabular format would be useful indicating the challenge and design response at 6.02 | – Highlight text to make more user friendly at 6.02 |
| | | | | – Extensions supplement would benefit from tables and more information on permitted development rights | – Add table on permitted development rights |
| | | | | – In Larger Footprint Buildings, summary of what has changed from previous version should be supplied | – Disagree - guide is designed to be read in its own right without reference to previous guidance |
| | | | | – Landscape heading in (8) should be highlighted | – Highlight heading |
| | | | | – Photos are at a low resolution in (8) | – Correct for final version |
| | | | | – Colour palette of buildings needs to be emphasised at 8.04.03 | – Highlight colour choice as key consideration |
| | | | | – Purpose of list of policy documents should | – Add additional text to clarify policy section at 9.3 |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|-----------------------|------|---|--|
| | | | | be clarified at 9.3 | |
| | | | | – Change figures in street parameters to be more realistic in terms of traffic flow | – Alter figures in parameters table |
| | | | | – The ten street typologies would benefit from grouping into three street parameters | – The ten typologies provide a useful guide to possible street types that would be appropriate in different contexts. They are non-prescriptive and are intended to allow a creative response to street design within the three main types |
| | | | | – Main street should not be limited to 20mph | – It is considered that main streets through new developments should be engineered to be 20mph. There may be instances where a higher order road is required to connect to the existing road network particularly if a step change is required from 40mph. In these very particular cases there is ample existing highways guidance that can be referenced |
| | | | | – Suggest adding approximately to a ‘maximum of five properties’ | – Agree add ‘approximately’ to provide a degree of flexibility to rear parking design |
| | | | | – Remove bullet suggesting that visitor parking should be focused on access roads | – Agree remove reference to visitor parking on access roads as it could lead to poor development gateways |
| | | | | – Contradiction between text at 10.03.09 which suggest reverse parking and photo examples of parking front on | – Change text at 10.03.09 to say that there are two options and front or reverse parking will be acceptable |
| | | | | – Make sure dimensions are consistent between 10.03.11 and the street parameters table | – Make changes to ensure consistency |
| | | | | – Design guide should include cycle parameters | – The Council’s Cycling Strategy provides detailed guidance but some key figures will be provided in a table |
| | | | | – Further clarification on the Council’s General Specification for Estate Roads Construction Option 1 | – Provide more clarification on the Council’s General Specification for estate roads |
| 35 | PC 23 | Ampthill Town Council | NA | – General support | – No action required |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|--|-------|--|---|
| 36 | PC 24 | CPRE Bedfordshire | Multi | - Overall welcomes document | - No action required |
| | | | | - Seeks reference to DG in Development Strategy Policy 43 | - Cannot change policy wording as part of this project |
| | | | | - Seeks reduction in light pollution and signage | - Both issues already covered in PP (p.53) & M&S (p.38) |
| | | | | - Cautions against over management of the countryside | - GI section does not encourage over-management |
| | | | | - Seeks gradual transitions between historic areas and modern development | - Not always appropriate to separate historic from modern |
| | | | | - Seeks a policy around consultation on public art | - Not necessary as PA would usually form part of a planning application. |
| 37 | PC 25 | Mervyn Dobson, Pegasus Planning | PP | - Concern raised about the requirement for two spaces for all two bedroomed properties | - Broad consensus is that standards as proposed are fair and have been derived as a result of appropriate consultation |
| 38 | PC 26 | Facebook Feed | NA | - Quality of new developments is poor and parking provision is inadequate | - Approach taken seeks to address these concerns |
| 39 | PC 27 | Chilterns Conservation Board | GI | - Board welcomes guide but requests minor text changes in relation to the setting of the AONB & space for trees | - Add additional text |
| 40 | PC 28 | Warmingtons Surveyors | RES | - Houses should be built with higher quality construction materials | - Construction materials will vary according to house type/location etc. so not appropriate to be too prescriptive other than giving a guide to local brick types |
| | | | | - Infilling should be supported to allow necessary growth | - Planning policy rather than design guidance will dictate where this is appropriate |
| | | | | - The concept of Lifetime Homes will not meet the test of time | - Guide will be reviewed as appropriate following outcome of Housing Standards Review |
| 41 | PC 29 | Resident, Sandy | PP | - More parking spaces are required as roads are currently too narrow to accommodate visitor parking or delivery vehicles | - New developments in Sandy were built under PPG13 parking standards which led to issue described - Approach taken addresses this issue |
| 42 | PC 30 | Shillington Village Design Association | Multi | - Considers guide should make ref to Village Design Statements and Parish | - Add ref to Village Design Statement and Parish Plans in flow chart on p.4 (PP) |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | Plans | |
| | | | | – Criteria for non-designated heritage assets questioned | – Further guidance from conservation officers should be sought in these instances |
| | | | | – Further guidance on the integration of social housing sought | – Further reference to tenure blindness in RES |
| 43 | PC 31 | Stotfold Town Council | Multi | – Threshold for briefs and appraisals questioned | – Thresholds are based on the most common sizes of developments that are submitted to CBC |
| | | | | – Comments that visitor parking is insufficient | – Third space on four bedroom properties will be unallocated and provision for 0.25 visitor spaces per dwelling has been made |
| | | | | – Requests deeper frontages | – Depth of frontage must be considered on a case by case basis as it is often desirable to build up to streets to give a sense of enclosure |
| 44 | PC 32 | RSPB | Multi | – Reference to species in proximity of site should be added at 1.7 | – Add reference at 1.7 |
| | | | | – Add reference to species at 1.8 (point 6) | – Add reference at 1.8 |
| | | | | – Reference to permeable surfaces should be made | – Add reference at 1.13 |
| | | | | – Detailed comments on GI picked up in Appendix X Table 2 | – Add reference at 3.07.04 and 3.09 to RIBA guidance and to GI section |
| | | | | – Questions lack of cross reference to RIBA guidance relating to historic conservation and biodiversity | – Add ref to RIBA guidance to Section 3 (HE) |
| | | | | – Should ref back to the GI Section (2) at 7.1 | – Add ref to GI Section (2) at 7.1 |
| | | | | – Add references to birds as supplied at 7.02.06 | – Add ref to birds as supplied at 7.02.06 |
| | | | | – Add references to bird as requested at 7.04.09 | – Add ref to birds as requested at 7.04.09 |
| | | | | – Add references to RIBA guidance as above and Living Roofs guidance in Section 8 | – Add ref to RIBA guidance as above and Living Roofs guidance to Section 8 |
| | | | – Refer to SUDs design guide to add detail | – Refer to SUDs design guide to add detail at Section 8 | |

Appendix A - SUMMARY OF DESIGN GUIDE PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| No. | Reference | Respondent | Supp | Summary of Comments | CBC Response |
|-----|-----------|-----------------|------------------|---|---|
| | | | | in Section 8 – 9.6.12 reference to roost bricks & SUDs required | – Add ref to 9.6.12 to roost bricks & SUDs required |
| 45 | INT 16 | Urban Design MK | PP RES M&S | Detailed changes suggested in their capacity as critical friend under the existing service level agreement with Development Management. Proposed changes noted and referenced in Appendix B | – Action |