

Name of Consultee/ Respondant	Summary of Comments	Draft Council Response	Recommendation
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)	<p><u>Core Document:</u> Suggests expand points on the sustainable community map to include the quality of streetscapes and show how higher densities can be created in the most accessible places to support urban structure.</p> <p>Supports reference to “By Design” – suggest mention its link as a companion guide to PPG1 and refer to Better Places to Live as a companion document to PPG3.</p> <p>Supports point that good design is also about how places work for people, but states that it is unclear how later statements about the historic conservation policies relate to design and fitting in with the established visual character.</p> <p>Suggests refer to list of design issues described in the Government’s Planning Bill statement when describing the content of design statements.</p> <p>Suggests use term “respect”, rather than “reflect” local character; this does not impose a requirement to copy existing surroundings. It also indicates that there is scope for local character to inform new designs where it might be important to change the established character in areas to gain improvements. The point is to acknowledge different design objectives for those areas with special valued character and those not so well appointed.</p>	<p>It is agreed that these points should be incorporated into the map.</p> <p>It is agreed that the document should refer to the linkage between PPG1 and “By Design”. Direct references to PPG3 and “Better Places to Live” will be included in the Residential Development subsidiary guide which will be produced in the future.</p> <p>The core document is based on District Plan policy C31a which covers all development situations. Part of the policy deals with development on prominent and sensitive sites. Conservation areas are referred to as examples of sensitive sites.</p> <p>The statement has been consulted and it is considered that the guidance is clear about the content of design statements.</p> <p>It is agreed that the term “respect” is more appropriate.</p> <p>The points about the need to change established character and applying different design objectives according to local circumstances should be included.</p>	<p>On map, add 2 points: (i) “quality streetscape” (ii) “higher residential densities in most accessible places support urban structure”</p> <p>Amend the policy background diagram to include “By Design” and exclude PPG3.</p> <p>In Architectural Quality section, Councils requirement box, delete last part of 4<sup>th</sup> point – “especially those in conservation areas” to emphasise that the purpose of the document is to cover all development situations.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>In Townscape and Landscape section, the Council’s requirements box, add word “respect” to second point.</p> <p>In Architectural Quality section delete 3 references to “reflect”, insert “respect.”</p> <p>In Understanding the Locality section, last para., delete last sentence. Insert “It is important to recognise that there will be different design objectives for those areas with a special valued character and for those not so well appointed. Where it is important to change established character to gain improvements, some elements of local</p>

			distinctiveness may be used to inform new designs. The challenge is to create a sense of place”.
English Nature	<p><u>Core Document:</u> Supports commitment to protection of landscape features. Suggests an additional sentence highlighting the fact that some species and habitats within the features may be protected by law and require specialist surveys.</p> <p>Supports the commitment to sustainability. Suggests the use of alternative energy sources, other than solar, could be included as well as other general efficiency measures.</p> <p>Supports references to water conservation measures, but suggest that reference to other water saving measures, such as low water cisterns, should be included.</p> <p><u>House extensions and alterations:</u> Suggests a section on ecology should be included to highlight possibility of detrimental impact on protected species.</p>	<p>Policies C4a – C7 in the District Plan afford protection to areas designated for their wildlife/scientific value and to protected species. However, an additional sentence can be added to cover the significance of protected species.</p> <p>It is agreed that references to alternative energy sources should be made.</p> <p>It is agreed that reference to other water saving measures should be included.</p> <p>It is agreed that it is appropriate to mention protected species in this context.</p>	<p>In Landscape Features sub-section, add to end of first para “Some landscape features may accommodate species and habitats which are protected by law and require specialist surveys”.</p> <p>In Townscape and Landscape section, the Council’s requirements box, add point “Development which retains, enhances and/or creates new landscape features”</p> <p>In Sustainability section, Council’s requirements box, add “and other alternative energy sources. Under Conservation of Resources add “where practical, other alternative energy sources such as wind power should be considered.”</p> <p>In Sustainability section, Council’s requirements box, add point “development which accommodates water saving measures”. Under Conservation of Resources add to 10th point “low water cisterns”</p> <p>In Roof alterations section, add ”In some buildings the alterations could affect protected species and their habitats. If you are in any doubt, contact English Nature.”</p>
Government Office for the South West	<p>Guidance would benefit from numbered paragraphs and pages.</p> <p>Suggests policy H24 should be referred to explicitly in the SPG.</p>	<p>The consultation document was a draft; the final edition will be page numbered. Better formatting should obviate the need for numbered paragraphs. It is intended that the documents should have an informal appearance.</p> <p>Though the core guide elaborates primarily on policy C31a, the introduction to the document does acknowledge that there are other design related policies in the District Plan. Policy H24 deals with the principles of residential development and will be of direct relevance to the Residential Development subsidiary guide which will be produced in the future.</p>	<p>Number the pages of both documents. Re-format documents where appropriate.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	<p><u>Core Document</u>: States that the opening sentence, which makes a reference to bringing rundown places back to life, may suggest that this is what good design is all about and discourage further reading of the document.</p> <p>The CABE report and the Government's "By Design" document are not fully referenced.</p> <p>The document should be consistent in its reference to the local plan or district plan.</p> <p>States that it is inaccurate to say that submitted applications will be determined against the design principles in the SPG. SPG should be taken into account only as a material consideration.</p> <p>States that there is inconsistency under the heading "large scale development" in that there are 4 issues listed, but only the first three have following sections.</p> <p>States that the guidance should be consistent with the C31a policy it supports hence guidance should refer to "respect and enhance" rather than "enhance".</p>	<p>It is agreed that this sentence could create the wrong impression.</p> <p>The final edition of the core document will be fully referenced.</p> <p>Agreed. Phrase "District Plan" should be used.</p> <p>It is agreed that SPG is a material consideration only in determining planning applications.</p> <p>Agreed. There should be 3 sections, with Use incorporated into the Sustainability section. The information on use is in line with government policy and with the policies in the District Plan and should be included.</p> <p>Agreed. The text should be changed to reflect Policy C31a.</p>	<p>Delete first sentence. Insert "In the last decade, the need for good design has become a key element of Government planning policy". At the end of the second para. Add "and it has come to be regarded as essential in helping to bring run down neglected places back to life".</p> <p>Include full references list at rear of document.</p> <p>Amend text as appropriate.</p> <p>In sub-section "How This Guidance Works" delete second half of first sentence of second para. Insert "it will be taken into account as a material consideration in determining those applications"</p> <p>Incorporate the details on Use into the Sustainability section: "It is evident that a mix of uses is the key to a successful urban area as it generates vitality and economic incentive and leads to a variety of activities and experiences. A variety of uses means a variety of users. Living, working, shopping and recreation benefit from being closely linked.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a proposal for a town centre site should enhance local variety and interest by incorporating or generating an appropriate mix of uses</li> <li>- the proposed use of the site should conform with the District Plan and any site development brief</li> <li>- parking provision should be convenient but not starkly obtrusive, particularly in sensitive areas; is should reflect the County Councils Parking adopted parking standards."</li> </ul> <p>In Townscape and Landscape section, the Council's requirements box, second point, add "respect and" enhance.</p> <p>In Architectural Quality section, the Council's requirements box, delete "reflects" and "reflect" , insert "respects" and "respect".</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>Suggests that the first paragraph under the Quality Outdoor Public spaces is disjointed and should be reworded. Suggests that the aim should be reworded.</p> <p>Suggests that for the sustainability section, the content of the draft Planning Policy Statement 1, para 1.27 and Annex C should be considered. The list under “What the Council will want” does not fully reflect the sub heading and text which follow.</p> <p><u>House alterations and extensions</u>: Generally a logically organised and well presented document, though the illustrations are not of consistent quality.</p> <p>States that the parking requirement considered under side extensions (the same number or at least two) is contrary to PPG3 which seeks an average of 1.5 off street parking spaces per dwelling.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the paragraph appears disjointed and that part of the section should be reworded.</p> <p>The contents of draft PPS1, para 27 and Annex C have been considered and it is agreed that some amendments should be made to the Sustainability section.</p> <p>The consultation document was a draft; the drawings will be reproduced to a high standard for the final edition.</p> <p>It is agreed that this statement is contrary to government advice and the text should be amended.</p>	<p>In Quality Outdoor Public Spaces section, delete second and third sentence of first para and first sentence of second para. Insert “Public spaces should be attractive to look at and be functional parts of new schemes – not spaces left over after development is complete. The space should attract a broad range of people” Plus other minor changes to improve English.</p> <p>In the Sustainability section, Council’s requirements box, the following points should be included, in order: “Development which incorporates recycling opportunities / Development which takes advantage of solar opportunities and other energy sources / Development which accommodates water saving measures / Development which makes the most efficient use of land / Adaptable durable buildings / Development which is easily accessible to all / Development which contributes to an appropriate mix of uses.” Include section on Use as previously recommended. In movements and accessibility sub-section, add point: “Development should be inclusive and have regard to building control regulations and the Disability Discrimination Act relating to access for the disabled. The Council has SPG entitled “Access for All”. Add 2 points on future proofing: “Reduce the risk of flooding by incorporating porous surfaces. Take account of potential impacts of climate change when considering flood protection and landscaping.”</p> <p>All drawings to be reproduced to a high standard.</p> <p>In Side extensions section, delete third sentence. Insert “In some cases a side extension may reduce the number of parking spaces available within the premises and put extra pressure on street parking. It is advisable to retain at least one, if not the same number of parking spaces as exist”</p>
--	--	---	--

	The PPG1 title reference is incorrect.	Agreed.	Correct reference at the back of the document.
Wiltshire County Council	Impressed with the Guidance	Welcome the support.	No change.
Bradford on Avon Town Council	<p><u>Core document:</u> Suggests that it is extended to cover Policy C19 and aspects of other policies that relate specifically to conservation areas, or that a companion document is prepared as soon as possible.</p> <p><u>House alterations and extensions:</u> Believes there should be guidance on rooflights, as these can be very damaging to roofscapes particularly those of Bradford on Avon Conservation Area. If rooflights have to be used, they should be of minimal size. Would like to see dormer windows as the preferred solution for attic extensions in the town's listed buildings and for buildings in the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>The core document elaborates on Policy C31a of the District Plan which deals with design. Policy C19 deals specifically with alterations to buildings in conservation areas. Such detailed issues are more appropriately dealt with in conservation area character appraisals, rather than the core document which covers general design principles across the whole District.</p> <p>In most cases rooflights on houses do not require planning permission, although listed buildings consent would be required for alterations to a listed building. To make the guidance more clear, a roofs section is proposed which will include all the existing information on roof forms and dormers but re-arranged to form sections on roof forms, roof alterations, rooflights and dormers. In terms of the impact of rooflights on the character of conservation areas, each application will be judged on its own merits, according to its scale, position and location.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Re-arrange guidance on roofs. Separate information on rooflights and dormers, create new section on rooflights with following text: "Roof lights can be used to gain light in the roof space. Generally, these will not require planning permission unless they project beyond the plane of the roof but it is advisable to first check with the Council's planning office. In all cases, it is important to ensure that when inserting rooflights, they are in proportion to the roof and do not undermine the roof structure."</p> <p>Rooflights on listed buildings will require listed building consent and will be assessed according to their prominence on the roof slope, their impact on the symmetry of the roof and the building and their degree of damage to the historic roof structure"</p>
Melksham Town Council	Suggest more detail on landscaping in new developments, especially the provision of formal play facilities for a wider age range of children and adequate financial support towards the upkeep of these	The core document is based on policy C31a and is intended to cover general design principles across the whole District. Landscaping requirements for new development are dealt with through District Plan policy C32. The landscaping solution will depend upon the characteristics of the development site and its surroundings. The provision of open space including childrens' play space in new development is the subject of separate SPG. The matter of adequate financial support is not an issue for the design guide but	No change.

	<p>Suggest include more detail on the “Safer by Design” principles for new developments</p> <p>Meter boxes on new houses should be more discreetly positioned preferably on side walls.</p>	<p>will be resolved through negotiation.</p> <p>The Government Publication “Safer Places: the planning system and crime prevention” was published after the guidance was sent out for publication. Detailed matters on security/safety will be incorporated into the subsidiary design modules where appropriate.</p> <p>This is a detailed issue which would be better dealt with in the Residential Development subsidiary guide to be produced later.</p>	<p>The document “Safer Places: the planning system and crime prevention” will be reviewed and security/safety guidance will be incorporated where appropriate.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Trowbridge Town Council	The Guidance is welcomed as an excellent piece of work.	Welcome the support	No change.
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)	<p>Guidance welcomed.</p> <p><u>Core document:</u> As a point under Townscape and Landscape – What will the Council want? – suggest “Development which is primarily for people , not motor cars”</p> <p>Believes statement “development which provides convenient access to facilities” is rather vague. Would prefer to see “development that provides convenient access to public transport” – which would give access to work, shops, schools and health facilities and help reduce traffic. This comment is also made about the wording in the sustainability section.</p> <p>Commend Landscape section, but suggest addition of “planting occasional trees within a square or pedestrian area” to soften appearance of larger buildings and provide some shade for seating areas.</p> <p>Welcome guidance on building scale and</p>	<p>The phrase suggested for inclusion is already covered as the 4<sup>th</sup> point under the layout sub-heading viz: “Larger scale proposals should ...be designed in such way that people come first and motor vehicles second”</p> <p>The use of the term “facilities” is intended to cover public transport, work, shops, schools, and health facilities. The first guidance point in the movement and accessibility section states “new development should be within easy distance of public transport”.</p> <p>It is agreed that this point should be incorporated.</p> <p>There is Government guidance on Lighting in the</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>For clarity, in Townscape and Landscape section, the Council’s requirements box, 4<sup>th</sup> point, after the word “facilities” add “including public transport, work, shops, schools and health services.”</p> <p>Add to Creating landscape features section, after “For example” add “planting occasional trees within a square or along a pedestrian route can soften the appearance of large new buildings”</p> <p>In Quality Outdoor Public Spaces sub-section, include</p>

	<p>form. Suggests wording on lighting is not “good enough” in view of light pollution issue and recommends wording “adequate , well designed, attractive, down deflected lighting of a design and quality suitable to building types – especially in communal areas”. Also recommends illustrations of well designed lighting.</p> <p>Applauds the discouraging of standard designs and layouts. Queries term ”long shelf life” in relation to development. Suggest wording “the development will need to be long lasting” as an alternative.</p> <p>In Conservation of Resources section suggest addition of two points: “new development should use the latest proven energy saving materials, eg photo-voltaic tiles” and alternative energy sources such as geothermal energy and heat exchange equipment should be utilised where possible, and the possibility of using suitable sized wind turbines, as well as solar materials for larger scale development local energy supply should be researched by developers”.</p> <p>In the movement and accessibility section suggests deleting the words “It will be desirable for larger development proposals” and replacing them with firmer wording – “Larger development proposals should include measures.. etc”</p> <p>Likes the sustainable community illustration, but suggests deleting cars from the square pedestrian area and putting a tree there instead of a fountain.</p>	<p>Countryside and the District Plan contains policy C35 which deals with light pollution. As the core document is intended as general design guidance for the whole District, it would be inappropriate to include detailed comments and illustrations on lighting. However, it is agreed that the guidance should make some statement on this issue.</p> <p>It is agreed that the term may be misleading and should be changed.</p> <p>It is agreed that reference to other energy sources should be made.</p> <p>It is agreed that the wording should be more positive in this case.</p> <p>Agree that the parked vehicles may give the wrong message; a taxi rank would be more appropriate. Fountain included to illustrate scope for public art/landmarks</p>	<p>before public art “Lighting is an important feature of public space, not just for safety and security. The lighting solution for a site depends on its location and its function. In town centres, lighting can be used to create visual richness and accentuate the image of a place by highlighting its architectural or landscape features. It can also generate a feeling of vibrancy. However, in rural areas, the aim should be to minimise the intrusive effects of lighting to avoid skyglow and maintain the distinctive night character.”</p> <p>In the Sustainability section, third para, delete “have a long shelf life” insert “be long lasting”</p> <p>In Sustainability section, Councils requirements box, add “and other alternative energy sources. Under Conservation of Resources add “where practical, other alternative energy sources such as wind power should be considered.”</p> <p>In the Sustainability section under movement and accessibility, delete “it will be desirable for larger development proposals” and insert “Larger development proposals should include measures.. etc”</p> <p>Amend drawing to indicate taxi rank.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<u>House alterations and extensions</u> : Believes that this document ties in well with general guide.	Welcome the support.	No change.
Warminster Civic Trust (Chairman – Elisabeth Collins)	States that the Trust is fully in accord with the guidance.  Believes that Warminster has lost some of its unique character as a result of inappropriate development . Recognises the loss of distinctiveness through the construction of housebuilders' standard pattern houses and mentions the issue of too many cars on narrow estate roads.	Welcome the support.  It is acknowledged that in the past, there has been some characterless development in the District. However, it is hoped that the new design guidance will help to improve the quality of planning applications and act as a reference for good practice for decision makers.	No change.  No change.
Warminster Civic Trust (Planning Sub-Committee – Richard Haes)	Endorses the approach of the guidance.  Believes the document is idealistic and asks if developers/architects have been involved in the consultation.  Expresses concern about trying to balance need for developers to be design/material conscious against the need for affordable house pricing.  Asks if the Council might run a local design award scheme and suggests a points/star rating system to be used by planning officers for the style, technical and artistic merit in planning applications and their environmental impact. Suggests a league table of builder/developer performance – “name and fame.”  States that there is no mention of the WWDC	Welcome the support.  The document has been circulated to all agents/ architects listed in the development control database.  Good design and the use of good quality materials need not affect house pricing. The costs should stack up from the beginning with the purchase of the site.  The District Council runs a “Design Awards” scheme. In 2002, a property on the corner of Portway/High Street, Warminster won an award. Another awards scheme is being prepared and will be launched later this year. The Council wishes to encourage good design from all developers and would not want to be involved in separate assessments of developer performance. Design quality is already considered by planning officers; a scoring system would not be regarded as appropriate.  The Guidance is simply concerned with design	No change.  No change.  No change.  No change.  No change.



	<p>strategic long term plan for an area/town into which any development must be dovetailed. States that there has been piecemeal development – eg on one side of town, housing, schools which generate traffic flow from the other side of town.</p> <p>States that industrial estates should be located away from residential areas.</p> <p>Observes that there is no WWDC guidance on telecomm masts or on other industrial/commercial; these can have a significant impact on the environment.</p> <p>Believes that the document should refer to the issue of light pollution.</p>	<p>issues. The District Plan is the policy document which serves to guide development in the District up to 2011. The sites that have been allocated for employment and housing development in the Plan are the most sustainable in terms of location - close to services and public transport facilities.</p> <p>B1 use (Use Classes Order) which include offices and light industry, by definition are compatible with residential uses. Other industrial or warehousing uses would not be permitted in close proximity to residential areas.</p> <p>The District Local Plan contains policy U6 on telecommunications and there is a wealth of government guidance on telecommunications development. The core document elaborates on policy C31a and is intended as general design guidance. Supplementary planning guidance on specific topics will be issued according to priorities to be agreed by the Council.</p> <p>See response to CPRE</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>See recommended text against response to CPRE</p>
Melksham Without Parish Council	<p>Wishes to draw attention to the poor quality of affordable housing on Bowerhill which was approved despite strong local objection. Suggest question to be posed should be “Would I like to live there?”</p> <p>States that the criteria of Policy C31a which apply to development on prominent or sensitive sites should apply to all development.</p> <p>States that Parish Councils are in a better position to comment about locality than the District Council, particularly as individual villages have different characteristics. In the past, the District has been seen as one entity</p>	<p>The Design Guidance will be used as a reference for good design in the future.</p> <p>The core document is intended to supplement policy C31a, not trying to change it.</p> <p>Parish Councils are able to influence the planning process through the production of their own village design statements. These statements should draw out the key characteristics and qualities of places.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	<p>which has meant a imposition of bland new housing throughout.</p> <p>Suggests that the comprehensive site analysis needs to include consultation with the local Parish Council/community about the characteristics and image of their area.</p> <p>States that for small scale development, proportion is especially important.</p> <p>Suggests phrase “development which offers a variety of building styles sizes and types” needs to be qualified with the word “blending” so that a level of congruity might be achieved.</p> <p>Suggests horse route provision should be emphasised as by ways are fast disappearing.</p> <p>State that the section on landscape should be written in a more forceful way to secure its protection and there should be an additional paragraph on the importance of retaining wildlife corridors. Wording “can be incorporated” should be changed to “should be incorporated, if possible.”</p> <p>Sensitive use of roof materials should be a requirement in rural areas as well as historic areas. Mentions metallic type roofs which have a shiny appearance – states that industrial building roofs can have a significant impact from a distance.</p> <p>Comments that the sub section on public and private space should be linked to a new</p>	<p>With major development sites, Parish Councils are usually consulted prior to the submission of planning applications.</p> <p>Agreed. It is considered that this is evident, particularly, from the wording in the house alterations and extensions document.</p> <p>Another point in the Councils requirement box in the Townscape and Landscape section is the need for an explanation on how the development will enhance its surroundings. It is proposed to amend the point to say “respect and enhance”. This will imply the need for “blending”.</p> <p>The core document elaborates on policy C31a and is intended as general design guidance. Further emphasis on horse route provision would not be appropriate.</p> <p>Policies C6a and C7 in the District Plan afford protection to landscape habitats and protected species. It is proposed to add a further sentence to the landscape features sub section, first para., to reflect the importance of protected species.</p> <p>Agreed. Add reference to rural areas in Materials sub-section. Each application will be judged on its own merits.</p> <p>The core document contains a sub-section entitled Quality Outdoor Public Spaces which deals with</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>In Landscape Features sub-section, add to end of first para “Some landscape features may accommodate species and habitats which are protected by law and require specialist surveys”.</p> <p>In Materials sub-section, add to second sentence after “sensitive areas” “and rural areas”.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>section on community development which would address the design of places where the community can gather.</p> <p>States that much of the new development at Bowerhill has ignored the need for privacy and that some properties have very small gardens.</p> <p>Suggests that new rural development should provide for community halls, playing fields and local services, schools, and amenities; developers should not be allowed to build where these are inadequate.</p> <p>Suggests that in the sub-section on the conservation of resources, the statement about the need to provide landscaping which provides only minimal maintenance should be qualified as it precludes important natural features such as new hedgerows and trees.</p>	<p>the design of the public realm where the community can gather. The section on Public/Private space deals with designing the delineation of these areas.</p> <p>The Design Guidance will be used as a reference for good design in the future.</p> <p>Where facilities are inadequate, developers will be required to make good any deficiencies in community facilities arising from their development through s106 agreements.</p> <p>The preservation and use of existing natural features in development is supported and covered in the Landscape sub-section. The point about minimal maintenance really relates to new landscaping.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
John Eaton, Southwick Parish Council	<p><u>Core Document</u>: Suggests that it is very lengthy and a bit wordy and would benefit from a contents page and/or index.</p> <p><u>House alterations and extensions</u>: States that it is clearly written, informative and easy to understand.</p>	<p>The consultation document was a draft; the final edition will be checked for plain English and page numbered.</p> <p>Welcome the support.</p>	<p>Arrange for plain English check of final draft. Number the pages of the document. Re-format document where appropriate.</p> <p>No change.</p>
J D Thomson	<p><u>Core document</u>: Suggests that guidance has too much of a black or white approach which will reduce innovation and imaginative architectural design. Suggests that planning officers will not be flexible in applying the principles in the guide.</p> <p>States that the standardisation of a design approach is inappropriate for the varying ages and styles of building across the District and</p>	<p>The approach in the design guide follows that recommended in Government guidance. Each application will be considered on its own merits and imaginative solutions which respect local character will be welcomed.</p> <p>A “standardised” approach should help applicants to supply the necessary information with their application. It does not affect the design <i>solution</i></p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	<p>may mean that applicants are unable to make the most efficient or economic alterations to dwellings. Such restrictions may be in conflict with householders rights under the Human Rights Act.</p> <p>States that the design rules are not related to any specific local characteristics and is therefore in conflict with Annex A of PPG1. Suggests that guidance should be specifically related to existing character and local building styles. Suggests the guide will be used in place of discussion and negotiation with architects.</p> <p><u>House alterations and extensions:</u> States that as there are a large number of properties in the District in the green belt, the level of advice on green belt development is wholly inadequate.</p> <p>Queries use of phrase “very limited additions” in guidance. Suggests that strict limitations on the scale of extensions in the green belt are not in line with Government guidance in PPG2 or with the District Plan.</p> <p>Believes definition of “original” taken from the GPDO is unworkable and unfair in the context of the green belt in West Wiltshire.</p> <p>Observes that there has been a distinct shift in the interpretation of green belt policy through the guide and recommends that references to the green belt should be deleted from it.</p>	<p>which should be unique to the site. Development control determines cases in accordance with Government policy and District Plan policy. It has been determined that development control is not an infringement of human rights; the House of Lords in the Alconbury case refers. Individual cases may be considered on their own merits and applicants have the right to appeal against development control decisions.</p> <p>It is up to applicants to research specific local characteristics and use them to inform the design of their scheme. The guidance is based on PPG1 and its companion document “By Design”.</p> <p>An informal discussion stage is regarded as part of the service to the public.</p> <p>The green belt does not cover a large proportion of the District and accommodates an even smaller proportion of households. Extensive comments about the interpretation of green belt policy would be inappropriate in the guide which seeks to build on policies C31a and C38.</p> <p>Accept that Government guidance in PPG2 and District Plan Policy GB2 uses phrase “limited extensions”</p> <p>In the absence of any other definition adopted by this Council for the green belt policy, the definition in the GPDO is used and is a nationally recognised definition.</p> <p>Green belt policy has not been reinterpreted in the design guidance; but it is considered that as there are particular requirements in the policy for residential extensions, they should be referred to</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change on this point but add reference to District Plan policy C38 to Introduction in subsidiary document.</p> <p>Delete word “very” in second sentence of second para in Green Belt section to reflect Government guidance and District Plan Policy.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	---

		in the guidance.	
T C Hounsome	<p><u>Core document:</u> States that there are some anomalies between policy C31a and the guide. This implies that the SPG is modifying the District Plan policy which is fundamentally wrong.</p> <p>States that the document does not make clear the level of detail required for different applications but later states that section III gives some clarification on this matter. Seeks wording to make it clear that a design statement need only cover matters relevant to the application and to a degree appropriate to the scale or impact of the application.</p> <p>Indicates that there should be a definition of “small scale” and “larger scale” and mention of outline applications and changes of use.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the guidance should accurately reflect the District Plan policy C31a.</p> <p>It is agreed that some amendments should be made to clarify the information required.</p> <p>Larger scale development can be interpreted as major development ie 10 dwellings or more. It is appropriate to include a note about outline applications and those for changes of use.</p>	<p>Amend text in guidance:</p> <p>In Townscape and Landscape section, the Council’s requirements box, second point, add “respect and” enhance.</p> <p>In Architectural Quality section, the Council’s requirements box, delete “reflects” and “reflect”, insert “respects” and “respect”.</p> <p>Incorporate the details on Use into the Sustainability section.</p> <p>In Section III, part which deals with larger scale development: delete first reference to “development on prominent or sensitive sites” and the 4<sup>th</sup> point about design statements. Create new part “larger scale development on prominent or sensitive sites”. Follow with “As per larger scale development plus:</p> <p>A design statement which explains:</p> <p>The design concept , showing how this relates to the existing built context and patterns of movement and the design principles covering layout, landscaping, building scale and form, relationship to public spaces, architecture and appearance, access and movement and mix of uses.</p> <p>Incorporate above amendments. In “Making the Place” section, 2<sup>nd</sup> para, “Small scale development” change first part of sentence to read “Clearly, house alterations and extensions and other small scale development”. 3<sup>rd</sup> para “Larger scale development” change to read “For larger scale development there are a range of issues to address related to townscape and landscape, architectural quality and sustainability”. Followed by “The level of detail required for small and larger scale development is set out in Section III”.</p> <p>In Section III insert after heading “larger scale development”: “As a guide larger scale development can be interpreted as major development ie 10 dwellings or more.</p> <p>After section on larger scale development insert para on outline applications: “Applications may be submitted in</p>

	<p><u>House alterations and extensions:</u> Believes that generally the document has an inconsistent approach in that there is guidance on some issues but specific requirements set out for others.</p> <p>Believes that some of the specific requirements set out in the document are more onerous than those allowed under permitted development. Suggests this may lead to anomalous situations where the specific requirements could be exceeded under permitted development rights.</p> <p>Front extensions: 1.5m limitation for a front extension is arbitrary and carries no reasoned justification.</p> <p>Side extensions: Questions whether an extension should always be a subservient element. Cannot see why a setback is always required and states that 1m is arbitrary.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the guidance may be interpreted in a prescriptive way.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some statements appear over prescriptive and amendments should be made to the text. The Council has no control over permitted development but considers that the guidance may be a useful reference for those considering such development. Where planning permission is required, by definition the guide does.</p> <p>It is accepted that quoting a measurement at this point in the text is unnecessary.</p> <p>The message in the guidance is that extensions should not be the dominant feature. However, some rewording for clarification is necessary.</p>	<p>outline to establish whether the principle of development is acceptable or not. Such applications apply only to proposals for the erection of buildings and should be accompanied by a site location plan, showing the site edged in red. In sensitive cases, such as applications in conservation areas, a full application will be required.”</p> <p>Make amendments to the text – see details below.</p> <p>In Section 4, Design Considerations, insert 2 paras as general guidance on extensions: “ The size shape and position of an extension can change the character and appearance of the original house. Therefore, it is important to design an extension which compliments the style and appearance of the main house and respect the amenities of neighbours. Taking a modestly sized house and adding large extensions will not only reduce the number of smaller family homes within the overall housing stock, but may also create unsympathetic designs which are out of keeping with the locality”.</p> <p>In front extensions and porches sub-section, delete 6<sup>th</sup> para and reference to 1.5m limitation. Insert: “For this reason large front extensions and porches which are out of scale with the main dwelling are generally not acceptable. In many cases, a front extension/porch which projects to the boundary of the property, which fronts onto a road or footpath, are unlikely to be permitted”.</p> <p>In side extensions sub-section, delete 4<sup>th</sup> para on corner plot extensions and reference to 3m. Insert: Any side extension on a corner plot should be considered carefully. Its impact on the corner could detract from or enhance the street scene. It needs to be designed so that it will not present a large blank gable end wall to the street or so that there is sufficient distance from the road to mitigate its</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>Rear extensions: 2m and 3m are arbitrary and easily exceeded under permitted development rights.</p> <p>Dormers: Cannot see the benefit of trying to restrict dormers to the rear. Often they are permitted development and can add variety and interest.</p> <p>Roof forms: States that a mix of roof slopes and angles can add interest and variety and that uniformity is only required where there is a distinct uniform architectural expression.</p> <p>Conservatories: Architecturally and visually, conservatories are entirely different from conventional solid buildings. The same design considerations should not uniformly apply.</p>	<p>The message in the guidance is that rear extensions should not have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties. However, some clarification and rewording is necessary.</p> <p>It is agreed that this section requires amendment.</p> <p>It is considered that roof shapes and sizes are important features which contribute to the character of an area or building. The SPG gives guidance and it should be clarified, but as each application will be considered on its merits, there is scope to address the particular needs of the site.</p> <p>It is accepted that conservatories are not identical to conventional solid extensions, but their impact on neighbouring properties and the host building should be assessed in the same way.</p>	<p>impact.”</p> <p>In rear extensions sub section, delete 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> paras and references to 2m and 3m. Insert: “The same design principles will apply to rear extensions as to other extensions , especially if viewed from a public place. Careful attention should be given to the size and style of the extension and to the roof form. Rear extensions on terraced and semi detached houses can have a greater impact on neighbouring properties and their amenity. Further advice is given in the section “Will it affect the neighbours?””</p> <p>See amendments proposed to Bradford on Avon TC comments. In 5<sup>th</sup> para, delete 3<sup>rd</sup> point . Insert “ The face of the dormer window should be well back from the front of the main front wall and from the side/party wall.” Change principle in box to read “where appropriate” instead of “whenever possible.”</p> <p>No change on this point but reorder and reword section as per amendments proposed to Bradford on Avon TC comments.</p> <p>No change on this point but elaborate on subject in the Conservatories section with new 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> paras: Conservatories can be a practical way of providing an additional ground floor room. However, the modern types do not often echo the traditional form of building or materials in the historic areas of the District. Generally, simple lean to styles are more likely to appear sympathetic to small dwellings and modern houses. Large conservatories on modern terraced and semi detached houses can create amenity problems with adjoining houses. Not only can they have an impact on neighbours’ privacy, but it can also cause problems with light pollution. In these cases, a solid wall closest to the boundary will avoid overlooking and light problems.”</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>Neighbours: An extension should be acceptable if it meets either of the 25 degree or 45 degree criteria.</p> <p>A comment should be made about orientation.</p> <p>General: Suggests correct title of section should be Will it adversely affect the reasonable amenities of the neighbouring property? Believes it should be made clear that it is the reasonable amenities of the neighbouring property that needs to be secured not necessarily to the existing level.</p>	<p>It is accepted that the text could lead to confusion and therefore requires amendments.</p> <p>It is agreed that the guidance should comment about the effect of orientation.</p> <p>It is felt that the document should be phrased in plain English for the benefit of the general public, rather than in statutory planning terms. It is agreed that the point about neighbour amenity should be clarified.</p>	<p>In the section “Will it affect the neighbours” overshadowing sub section, split the text on the 45and 25 degree criteria for clarity.</p> <p>In the section “Will it affect the neighbours”, overshadowing sub-section, add 3 additional paras as guidance: “However, for adjoining houses which are closely related to each other, a single storey extension which exceeds 3m in length, at or near the boundary, is more likely to have an adverse effect on the neighbour. Other factors will also be taken into account such as the design, shape, and orientation of the extension and its relationship with the adjacent property. This will apply mainly to terraced and semi detached houses or to detached houses if they are close to each other. Two storey rear extensions close to the boundary can have a significant impact on the adjoining semi detached or terraced house. An extension which faces west/south west or east/south east may affect the amount of sunlight and daylight reaching the neighbours house on the garden to the north. An extension that is very long and constructed close to the boundary may have an overbearing and dominant effect on the outlook and garden of the house next door. A 2 storey extension more than 2m in length on or close to the boundary with another house is likely to have an adverse impact on the neighbour although the shape, design and orientation of the properties will also be taken into account”.</p> <p>No change to title.</p> <p>In the section “Will it affect the neighbours”, add to wording of first sentence to read “These guidelines seek to ensure the amenities for the occupiers of existing are not significantly affected”.</p>
Neil Heard	Guidance seems to go completely against the	The guidance states that good design respects the	No change.



	<p>idea of blending in with the existing by making extensions look like additions.</p> <p>Believes that dimensions quoted for extensions are totally inappropriate.</p> <p>Queries whether loss of light should be determined by planning officers.</p> <p>Suggests that different planning officers will interpret the guidance in different ways.</p> <p>States that writing in with proposals is time consuming and causes delays, whereas telephone conversations and site meetings can resolve problems quickly.</p> <p>Suggests that the guidance is effectively dictating how people can alter their property and is therefore an infringement of human rights.</p>	<p>character of the surrounding area and that well designed extensions are those in sympathy with the existing property.</p> <p>The subsidiary document is intended to give guidance on dimensions so as to minimise the likely impact on neighbouring properties. The text has been amended so that the document reads more as guidance. Individual cases will be considered on their own merits.</p> <p>The protection of neighbouring developments from unreasonable loss of light is a long standing material planning consideration which has been established in case law.</p> <p>The aim of the guidance is to improve consistency in decision making.</p> <p>An informal discussion stage is regarded as part of the service to the public. However, written communication provides for a record of the advice sought and the response given and makes for greater consistency.</p> <p>Development control determines cases in accordance with Government policy and District Plan policy. It has been determined that development control is not an infringement of human rights; the House of Lords in the Alconbury case refers. Individual cases may be considered on their own merits and applicants have the right to appeal against development control decisions.</p>	<p>Amend text so that document reads as guidance rather than a prescriptive code. See amendments proposed against T C Hounsome's comments.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
WWDC Southern Area Planning Committee 11 Dec 2003	Suggest that the guidance should address the issue of flat roofs.	The guidance includes comments on flat roofs under the section "roof forms", 3 <sup>rd</sup> para.	No change.