

**LDF Advisory Group**

Design Guide : New Housing Development

Individual Comments received subsequent to the 21 October meeting

<b>Jenni Ferrans</b>	
The name is confusing as people will expect it to refer to the design of houses, whereas it refers largely to the design of fairly large residential areas. I would suggest retitling it as the Design Guide for New Residential Areas.	Whilst a lot of the content is more applicable to larger residential areas, it also applies to small-scale infill development. Propose to call it ' <b>Design Guide for New Residential Development</b> ' if that helps.
General – we've complained before about the difficulty of commenting on documents with un-numbered sections. This goes the other way and numbers each paragraph. That's actually confusing, because people expect new numbered sub-sections to start new topics. If it's not constrained, sub-section numbering would be better for comprehension in the final document, unless that's dictated by law.	Numbering paragraphs makes it easier to relate comments made by respondents/consultees back to the draft document. No change therefore proposed
Para 1.1.3 I'd suggest replacing "density" with "characteristics"  Introducing the word density is distracting and misleading I think. Densities are usually dictated overall by the top level local policies. There are many other aspects which should not be constrained by the surrounding areas. If PPS3 explicitly says density, can it be taken to mean the much wider meaning given here?	This is a direct quote from PPS3 (we can include in inverted commas), within a section relating to efficient use of land. No change therefore proposed.
Para 1.1.4 – not sure what the point of this is- development per se, or dense development? Either is fine with me. Conservation areas distracts from the point either way as some of ours are some of our most dense areas!	This text in PPS3 is related to intensification of existing areas. Delete text.
Para 1.1.6-1.1.8 1.1.6 belongs better as the first para of the next section. The section would be better with an example or two of the sort of criteria that building for life addresses. Or the 20 headings might be worth listing to stress the importance of this perhaps, as is done in the next section.	Make "Building for Life" a sub-heading of PPS3.  The text signposts the "Building for Life" website which provides more detail on the criteria. Given the need to avoid the document becoming too big would prefer not to list the criteria.

<p>2.1.3 Residents believe that “A high level of greenery on most streets” and “high levels of environmental sustainability” have also been a defining characteristic of all the housing MK has ever chosen to build (as opposed to the occasional designs wished on us!) Could we add them?</p>	<p>Will include “sustainable design” and “street landscaping” as defining features.</p>
<p>2.1.4 JB’s comment about the stress of this is the wrong way round – it should say something like “integral flood protection drainage filling the double function of green open space, and wide transport corridors filling the double function of nature reserves”.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p>
<p>2.1.7 This sounds as though we don’t want it (green streets) now. Change wording to “In many estates” perhaps? It’s not just the early ones – it’s most of them. There are very few non-green ones.</p>	<p>It reflects the feeling that more recent developments have not reflected the green character of MK.</p> <p>In para 2.1.4 we also make similar statement (giving Fishermead as an example). Suggest rewording to make the point that landscaping within estates was a characteristic of early estates but that this has been lost in later developments.</p>
<p>2.1.14 Could add “In this respect, the result mimics the pattern of many older cities, developed by absorbing a variety of old villages and small towns, each with their different styles, and filling in the gaps.”</p>	<p>Disagree. The grid roads prevent this happening. What we’re saying is that each grid square has a different character rather than it being influenced by existing development as in historic towns.</p>
<p>2.16-2.18 Not sure why identikit housing on the 2.17 examples is so much worse than the Conniburrow identikit design in 2.18. It was the architectural quality, not the standardised visual appearance, that was the problem, so I’m not sure that this point holds. Would be a better example if you showed two different estates, wide apart, named, with identical poor designs.</p>	<p>Para 2.1.16 is critical in recent estates all having very similar identity (will remove the middle left hand photo on pg 18) Conniburrow is in our opinion more distinctive than housing on Monkston Park</p> <p>The Conniburrow photo is making a different point to the two photos above (as explained in the captions).</p>
<p>2.2.2 In answer to your question, I think a few chunks of 400-600 with common features binding them, making up one estate, are better, providing that there is a mix of economic bands etc within each. 1000+ is too big – people get</p>	<p>Accept that there needs to be variety within the neighbourhood. However, don’t feel that setting an arbitrary limit on size of sub-areas of the neighbourhood is the appropriate solution. Within each</p>

<p>lost and there is not enough opportunity for variety to suit different tastes. Historically people haven't built such large chunks until recently so character areas elsewhere haven't been as big as 1000. Breaking it up doesn't affect people's identity with the estate (eg Great Linford). What does affect it is one area being stigmatised by being the affordable housing area, with appearances that allow easy recognition (eg Heelands near the shops).</p>	<p>neighbourhood there could be a range of characteristic materials/elements, which would establish the local identity but still allow for sufficient variety. Existing natural features, different street types, open space and landscaping, local facilities will all help to create variety and legibility.</p> <p>Amend text to state that within design codes a selected range of materials and elements would need to be outlined for each neighbourhood.</p> <p>No number ranges proposed to identify a group of houses that can all look the same</p>
<p>2.2.4 Table 1. Can you substitute street landscaping? Trees aren't the only possibility!</p>	<p>Trees are particularly important in establishing the character of streets. However, there are other landscaping elements that can be incorporated. Change to read "Street trees and other planting".</p>
<p>2.2.6 Back garden parcel boundaries is fine providing they deal with the time in between one development and the one behind. It's caused real problems in the past – but street boundaries have caused even more, so go ahead. The problem is giving security to residents from the first plot when the neighbours back gardens behind that will eventually be their security don't yet exist. Typically the developer puts up a heavy duty continuous site boundary fence at the back, which isn't maintained, and is difficult of residents to replace, and then all hell breaks loose when they take it down to put the eventual joint boundary up! A double fence at the back, one the final residents fence, and another heavier duty for temporary security might do it, but with the requirement that the fence and the no man's land both get maintained. Perhaps add a comment about the need to provide for the period when one development is occupied and the other not yet built, here, and add something about designing in the eventual boundary treatment and adequate interim protection from the start, in a later section.</p>	<p>These are operational matters rather than design issues – no change proposed.</p>

<p>2.2.7 Given this, definitely include the green streets in the earlier list!</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>2.2.9 reword to reflect the council's grid road policy and the retention of the verges for possible future mass transit schemes.</p>	<p>Won't mention grid roads at all here. Suggest that text is reworded to state "The masterplanning of new developments particularly on the periphery of the city must ensure that where possible existing linear open space corridors are extended into new developments."</p>
<p>2.2.11 Add "the palette should include trees with roots that grow downwards, rather than horizontal, suitable for roadside and path-side planting." It's costing us a fortune.</p>	<p>Para 4.1.43 refers to street trees and cross-references to Highway Design Guide. Para 4.1.42 requires developers to liaise with the Council's Landscape Architect before submitting any application.</p> <p>Amend third sentence of para 4.1.43 to state that "when selecting species of trees, developers should bear in mind their likely size and root systems when mature."</p>
<p>2.2.12 add "grass verges and green front gardens"</p> <p>What are the cost and maintenance time implications of green roofs for householders? We cannot go on imposing designs which absolutely require frequent maintenance on residents who aren't always gardeners. They have a choice in front gardens, but front hedges, trees and things like green roofs and walls are more difficult to redo. We have built too many over the years which needed 3-weekly pruning all summer, for instance!</p>	<p>Accept the point, although not sure we should promote grass verges over other landscaping. Add "verges and green front gardens".</p> <p>Green roofs, as well as contributing to the greening of the city, have significant environmental benefits (as outlined in para 2.2.13).</p> <p>Maintenance – depends on type of roof. Some (intensive green roofs) are essentially roof gardens and will need same level of maintenance as normal garden. Other systems (extensive roof gardens) use wildflower meadows or sedum mats and require minimal maintenance.</p>
<p>2.2.17 Table 2 (green points) great idea! – can we make it tree or 2m+ high bush? Bushes don't cause the same root problem that trees do,</p>	<p>Bushes do not provide the same benefits as trees and require more regular maintenance. The green points system allows for</p>

<p>though they take more space at ground level.</p>	<p>“plants with good sources of nectar, berries, seeds and/or nuts”.</p>
<p>2.3.4-8 I think these should be reworded. We’re talking about major new development areas here, not infill sites. Most of the time there will be little or no context except at the very edges of the site on what they overlook, and we’ve just said that there should be different designs in different neighbourhoods. So maybe replace with something like:</p> <p>a. where the development sits within an area of development and is not surrounded by non-residential roads and sites, the area should relate to the positive characteristics of the areas surrounding it in height, granularity, materials, etc, and travel lines and parcel size should be used to determine whether the new development should have a distinctive character of its own, or be in sections matching the characters of the surrounding development</p> <p>b. Where it is surrounded by non-residential roads or sites, the interior need not relate to them and should have a distinctive character of its own</p> <p>c. North Bucks has a distinctive architectural style, evident in the surrounding villages, that owes more to the shire counties and the wide variety of local brick and ... stone (what is the yellow stone so prevalent in the northern villages? Is it Cotswold or something else?) than to East Anglia and developers should reflect this if they choose “traditional” styles, but they should be free, on developments that are not integral within existing development, to choose more modern or different styles</p> <p>d. The characteristic Milton Keynes grid layout leads to only a few buildings being visible from across grid roads. Buildings visible across boundaries should relate in height and granularity to those opposite, with some common character features, and some features that set occasional buildings apart as landmarks. The side that faces into the estate should relate to the height, granularity and character of the</p>	<p>We will reword this to include 3 headings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Development within built up areas</li> <li>2) Development on greenfield sites</li> <li>3) Development within ruarla villages/conservations areas and proximity to listed buildings</li> </ol> <p>We will also put the tables in an Appendix</p>

<p>estate development.</p> <p>e. And then it needs some of the process stuff that's in the current version.</p> <p>f. Table 4 therefore needs a column Applicable? to indicate whether this aspect applies on this site or not, as per b, c, d above.</p> <p>I have still to be convinced that flat large surfaces of any colour and material stand the test of time anywhere near as well as brick – and white the worst of all - but the chalets in Great Linford, 35+ years old, seem to have stood up well, as do some of the houses in Woolstone and elsewhere, though I'll talk to my friends about maintenance costs. I am not against other materials, but they do need to prove their viability. I'd love to see us find glass and metal designs that would work without cooking or freezing the occupants, for this modern city. I would not want to rule other building materials out. Hence my suggested design statement above.</p>	<p>The Design Guide states in para 4.4.36 that "materials should normally be selected that wear well with age and last a long time". In a place like MK with little existing context it would seem to be unreasonable to unnecessarily restrict the available choice of materials, particularly when there is a desire to create variety.</p>
<p>2.4.1 – MK has a clear tradition of building round but not integrating in to existing villages where they are currently isolated from the wider world. (eg Broughton, MK Village, Loughton, Simpson). Do we want to keep or change this? Personally I would keep it, as it allows some small very different environments. But this would only sensibly apply to a village or border areas thereof which was isolated, not well-connected areas like the main part of Woburn Sands. So maybe add something like:</p> <p>Villages (and areas within larger villages) vary in their separateness from the world around them. Building adjacent to relatively isolated village areas should seek to prevent disturbance of the village character by designing access to new areas around them rather than through them. Where the community has not made its wishes clear in documents such as Village Plans, Design Statements, etc. community involvement mechanisms should be used to make the decision.</p>	<p>While I agree with keeping them separate I do not think that it is the role of the Design Guide to decide whether existing villages should be kept separate from new development. This is policy not guidance in my view. It furthermore might require being assessed on a village by village basis which this Guide can't do.</p>

<p>2.3.4 The table needs to include local desire lines in the movement section. Too often we've seen estates with long paths to the local secondary schools or health centres for instance.</p>	<p>Agree. Include "local desire lines".</p>
<p>3.1.1 Add "Where the development is adjacent to a main through road, consideration should be given to the reduction of "rat runs" through the development</p>	<p>Accept that movement networks should encourage traffic to use the most appropriate route for their journey. Use of the term "rat run" is dangerous, as one person's "rat run" is another's direct route to their destination.</p> <p>Diagram to be included within street hierarchy section to show relationship between different levels of street within the hierarchy.</p>
<p>3.2.4 remove the "short" and prohibition on nesting cul de sacs as per discussion at the meeting but leave the requirement for good connectivity and legibility</p>	<p>Disagree. Can't have long nested cul-de-sacs and maintain good connectivity and legibility.</p> <p>This is not supported by the Crime Prevention Design Advisor either</p>
<p>3.2.5 There are two 3.2.5s!</p>	<p>Accepted – will change</p>
<p>3.2.5a Table is not on page 22 it's on page 20. Generic: Once you've decided on the eventual numbering system, I suggest you remove page references and refer to section numbers to avoid problems when reformatting, pdfing etc.</p>	<p>We need to check document before publication to ensure that cross-referencing is correct.</p>
<p>3.2.5b Do you mean <i>sufficient</i> on-street parking, where there are buses, or <i>off-street</i>?</p>	<p>This is intended to cover the same point that is made in para 4.4.14 – i.e. on-street parking shouldn't narrow the street below the width required to allow two buses to pass. Will delete the sentence from this paragraph as the design of the street (including width) is better covered in para 4.4.14.</p>
<p>3.2.6 need to expand the diagrams to show the relationship with the surrounding grid square or main roads. Building in rules about connections or lack of them to grid roads is difficult since it will depend too much on the nature of that particular main road. But we do need effective anti-rat-run designs. Don't know what you'd</p>	<p>Will delete diagrams. The diagrams are a bit fuzzy and are merely repeating best practice guidance (Urban Design Compendium).</p> <p>Include diagram in "street hierarchy" section to show relationship between different</p>

suggest?	levels of street within the hierarchy.
Maybe add something to this section about the need for walking blocks to be smaller than driving ones, so footpaths part way along roads, pedestrian-permeable cul-de-sac ends, etc. but designed with Safety by Design in mind.	Disagree. This implies segregating footpaths from roads which in the main is not supported in national best practice or the councils Design Prevention Crime Advisor. The idea is to encourage walking and therefore all blocks should be walkable. Para 4.1.40 deals with pedestrian routes from cul-de-sacs and provides the right emphasis in my view.
3.2.8 expand diagrams to show grid roads as in 3.2.6	Disagree. This is based on an existing example in MK (Stantonbury Park which does not have a grid road nearby). The point being made by the diagram isn't about grid roads and could apply anywhere in MK.
3.2.9 Seems to be mixing up two points, the need for a clear public/private distinction and the need for surveillance. Your diagram only covers one of them, and actually depicts a design that has been used variously for both public highway and private shared driveway. But it does have surveillance. I think you should separate the points, and be clear whether private shared driveways are still to be allowed or not. Obvious cost implication if not, need for design guidelines if allowed. Pity we didn't take a photo of the Monkston Park case of no clear public-private distinction before it was redesigned! Please can we remove any reference to rear parking courts? I see absolutely no excuse for them in this sort of context. A different building line with front courts should be used.	<p>There is some confusion about the use of the term "private space". This is not about private shared driveways, but whether a space feels public or private (i.e. whether a visitor should be in that space and how comfortable they would feel). Active frontages and clear public/private distinction are both factors that determine whether a space feels "public".</p> <p>Suggest amend paragraph to make it clear what contextual reasons would lead to a route which doesn't have active frontages on both sides (this would be for example to serve streets with no direct access)</p>
3.2.10 why is width more important – and why block size not plot size? - for what? Insert context please.	Width is important in that it dictates what housetypes can be provided (narrow or wide frontage), garden depth, setbacks from street, whether you can get active frontages on both long sides of the block. In the UK masterplans and design codes tend to divide sites up into blocks rather than plots. Plot sizes imply



	garden sizes and can we dictate garden sizes?
3.2.16 Text is fine, but we need a separate paragraph on density distribution and we need to talk and think through options on this I think. Issues are how best to ensure density of residents rather than of buildings, then need of high density housing to be near green space since they have none of their own, the wish of low density housing to be fairly private, and not to have play areas, well-used footpaths etc. on their boundaries, (or alternatively to be posh houses fronting onto a well-adult-used and thus well-surveilled street or square)	Habitable rooms per hectare is a measure used by some authorities and included in London Housing Design Guide as a proxy for persons per hectare. However, current Local Plan policy refers to dwellings per hectare. Suggest that this is an issue which should be resolved through the Development Management DPD.  Whilst I agree we should be attempting to ensure that higher density of residents are close to public transport and facilities, I don't think we should be prescriptive about the relationship of different housing to green space.
We need to think through the designs better. Double-parking is a nightmare, and cars separated from house as in the detached example are even worse! Why not have cars parked in front of the house where they've always been? Designs like that in high price brackets sell well. What is the advantage of your example?	Change 18dph block structure to remove tandem parking. However, tandem parking will be necessary to achieve the densities above 34 dws per hectare.  We could add Tandem Parking is not allowed for HIMOS
3.2.18 "design is more important than material quality" – evidence please? Materials for what? Add street furniture and play equipment to the robust list please.	The point being made is that better to invest in the quality of the design rather than using expensive materials. However, will delete this sentence.  Play areas are covered in para 4.5.6 – could state that play equipment should be robust. I would envisage that the Highway Design Guide would go into more detail on street furniture, but will include sentence on street furniture.
3.2.21 Add "and as a last resort, apart for flats"	Think this refers to para 3.2.22. Will add that it is a last resort
3.3 should be combined with 3.1. These are the overarching aspects and come before the stuff in 3.2	Section 3.3 are more detailed issues and don't affect the layout and block structure of the development. Therefore feel that they follow better after 3.2. No change proposed

3.3.6 Structure – add “Note that this also applies to the shared public realm around houses, where differing house types may lead to differing expectations of the uses of the public realm.”	This paragraph is simply repeating the guidance from Safer Places. Adding this text would imply that it was from Safer Places. No change therefore proposed
3.3.9 add “and the additional parking required for commercial unloading or client parking”	Agree – include some reference to issues regarding parking and unloading.
3.3.11 add “positioning of staircases and services to facilitate using the space as a few large rooms or several small rooms	Already refers to “buildings with capacity for internal flexibility or adaptation”.
4.1.1 Suggest you specifically add “large HGVs supplying small shops” as they are being overlooked at present and are getting ever larger.	This diagram is taken from Manual for Streets. Policy T1 of the Local Plan has a more limited hierarchy (pedestrians, cyclists, public transport/taxis/motorcyclists, others. Consequently, I don’t think there is a policy basis for amending it further. No change proposed
4.1.2 We need discussion with the cycling group about how best to provide for cyclists.	Cyclists groups will be included as part of the consultation on the draft Design Guide.
4.1.3 Best deterrent to speeding drivers is actually on-street parking, not pedestrians.	Both are relevant.
4.1.4 People love the green pathways most of the time, providing privacy and security of the backs of properties is adequately protected by landscaping – people come here because they like greenery. Not sure that they do fear going down green footpaths once they get used to it and providing the lights are maintained and the landscaping trimmed back. More discussion please – and maybe bring out the issues in the consultation.	Disagree. I don’t believe that this is a view supported by the Crime Prevention Officer and is not supported by national best practice. No change proposed
4.1.5 -4.2.10 Can you look again at this section please, and consider to what extent it duplicates and/or splits up the information between this and the sections that follow. I think this goes into too much detail too soon. Comments apply wherever the info ends up.	Feel that the structure of this section is ok, and duplication of information is kept to a minimum. No change proposed
4.1.7 add “and large shop supply vehicles” – the Highway guide needs correcting in this respect. New estate roads are damaged by HGvs to the	This is a matter for the Highway Design Guide. No change proposed

shops before they're even adopted.	
4.1.9 Suggest split off discussion of cases where front access is not permitted into a separate paragraph for clarity. Add reference to parallel access lanes and front parking courts as possible solutions	Will include paragraph that identifies parking solutions that would result from lack of frontage access (including service lanes and rear courts).
4.1.13 Can we find a solution that doesn't involve tree roots digging up all our main roads? The cost of this is horrendous! And why do we prescribe that they must be tree lined avenues? The greenery might be in the middle around a parking court or public green space. Maybe replace with "Primary streets should have some public greenery along their length, adding to their width, eg. as a tree lined avenue, public green space, or green-edged parking court." No minimum width given?	The presence of trees gives the street the presence required to indicate its place at the top of the hierarchy. Appropriate species to be included with roots that don't dig up roads included in para 4.1.43  Guidance on street width is to be included in the Highway Design Guide.
4.1.15 Need mention of parallel access lanes and front and central parking courts as a solution to permit family housing along primary routes. Text does not offer enough parking except for flats in rear courts and people who live in flats are not the ones who need to be nearest the services in general. Need more discussion along with density map.	Parking solutions, including front courts and central reservation parking, are considered within the section 4.3.  Will include parallel access lanes (like Conniburrow Boulevard) as a parking solution.
Some confused reasoning between shared surfaces, simpler cheaper surfaces, and slow surfaces.	Section on shared surfaces to be redrafted.
I would advocate: Slow surfaces for any street with less than 100 movements an hour, but block paving is costing the borough a fortune to maintain, so consider abandoning it. (Highways are – it gets mended with tarmac in many places.) Can you give us street examples of the other surfaces so we can look at them and can you check with highways about lifetime costs?	Redrafting of section to include requirement that in shared streets "no section of the street should serve more than 25 dwellings."  Highways (Adoptions Officer) has indicated that block paving is not significantly more expensive than tarmac.
I'd restrict shared surfaces to small cul de sacs where I'd suggest pavement and slow surface at the entrance, and to small single sided roads where traffic movement will be very low indeed. Target below 25 traffic movements an hour.	Redrafting of section to include requirement that in shared streets "no section of the street should serve more than 25 dwellings."
Park fronts aren't a viable category as they vary	Redrafting of shared streets section to include requirement

<p>too much. Many are fairly long and/or through routes so traffic movement isn't low enough for shared surfaces. Shared would be OK if they meet one of the other category criteria. But we need to think about the density map.</p>	<p>that in "no driver should have to travel more than 100 metres on a shared street without having the opportunity to change to a higher level street".</p>
<p>Ban Mews please. The old use is no longer viable as people won't use rear parking courts and the new use leads to accidents and real problems with access and parking. They feel really dangerous. Even flats entry ways need a pavement if possible.</p>	<p>Disagree. Mews are an option which increase variety in living conditions and built form. Redraft text to strengthen design requirements for mews which will mitigate current issues.</p>
<p>Lanes in this sense I think are OK but the same comment about the choice of surface applies. (These residents complain even more loudly about the state of them!) Maybe explicitly restrict them to low densities because they've been advocated in much higher densities and lead to very poor legibility and all sorts of problems with parking space, safe footways, etc.</p>	<p>Existing text suggests that lanes are more appropriate to lower density areas.</p>
<p>4.1.38 Not clear about the connection between length and fire hose access – is this cause water hydrants will be on main roads? Vehicle size still needs to be accommodated. Even people in cul de sacs get goods deliveries and removal vans and need bins emptied!</p>	<p>Add sentence to clarify relationship between length of cul-de-sac and access for fire appliances.</p>
<p>Disagree about banning nested cul de sacs, but effectively we need a separate category for main cul de sacs, as minor residential streets, fairly straight, with standard road surface, pavement, and potentially cul de sacs off them.</p>	<p>Disagree. In my view the Guide provides a balanced approach to culs-de-sac – promoting a connected movement network, whilst allowing them in contextually appropriate situations.</p> <p>Will delete drawing of nested cul-de-sac and replace with new one</p>
<p>Circular or square shapes etc are often reasonable for small end cul de sacs but visitor parking needs careful planning.</p>	<p>Visitor parking within any shape of cul-de-sac can be a problem.</p>
<p>4.1.40 Why not pavements? Cul de sac exits onto main residential streets feel really dangerous with no pavements as cars still go at the street speed. Mandatory pavement at</p>	<p>This para is not saying pavements not allowed, but generally on a cul-de-sac because it has low through traffic</p>

<p>entrance perhaps?</p>	<p>separate footpaths are not needed.</p> <p>Will include a drawing that shows hierarchy so that shared street at bottom of hierarchy does not join a street at the top of the hierarchy</p>
<p>4.1.42 Add reference to suitable species to avoid surface root problems by roads and footpaths</p>	<p>Believe that Highway Guide will cover this.</p>
<p>I'd permit footpaths to aid pedestrian permeability but secure by design.</p>	<p>Not sure what this relates to.</p>
<p><b>John Bint</b></p>	
<p>The "branched culdesac" marked with a cross in the draft manual is a popular form of street design and is used in many of the streets with the best community spirit in my ward - Passmore, Castle Rose, Baskerfield Grove, Clare Croft, Ealing Chase, how many more examples do you need. I regard the attempt to prohibit this layout, and the attempt to introduce a layout modelled on some of the least successful areas of MK, as another effort by officers to "normalise" Milton Keynes - ie to dilute what residents love most about the place, and to make MK more like other places (ie more like the places many MK residents moved away from).</p>	<p>Will delete this drawing and replace with better one</p> <p>Disagree. Culs-de-sacs aren't unique to Milton Keynes and many of the early estates were based around connected streets. In my view the Guide provides a balanced approach to culs-de-sac – promoting a connected movement network, whilst allowing them in contextually appropriate situations.</p> <p>We have a long e-mail from the Crime Prevention Design Advisor explaining why they <u>don't</u> support long branched cul-de-sacs</p>
<p>Shared use surfaces (streets with no pavements). As discussed!</p>	<p>Will redraft section on shared streets to include clearer design requirements which will hopefully make them more suitable, removing many of the current problems that make them undesirable.</p>
<p>Deliberately encouraging parking in inconvenient places that damage the streetscene, damage the verges, damage road safety, reduce pedestrian usage of the streets, and encourage the car owner to drive the car again as soon as possible: all you have to do, to achieve all these negative effects, is to keep creating fewer planned parking spaces than the predictable levels of car ownership.</p>	<p>Parking standards are established within the Residential Parking Standards SPG. No change proposed</p>
<p>The place for ost flats is in the heart of the city, and perhaps right next to district shopping centres or transport hubs, not way out in the suburbs.</p>	<p>In order to provide variety in densities there will be a need for apartments within suburban areas. However, these should be located near facilities and public transport stops. No change</p>

	proposed
MK needs more bungalows.	Para 3.3.13 states that developments should incorporate a range of house sizes and types. Not for the Design Guide to specify house types.
What we need alongside transport corridors is more people per hectare, not more dwellings with fewer people in each of them! And we need the dwelling-types with lowest income occupants, and with little or no gardens, to be nearest to the nicest public open spaces!	Whilst I agree we should be attempting to ensure that higher densities of residents are close to public transport and facilities, I don't think we should be prescriptive about the relationship of different housing types to green space.
We want buildings to be durable and to look durable. Most wood cladding isn't, and doesn't. Natural, unpainted cladding in particular looks low-cost and high-maintenance.	The Design Guide encourages the use of materials that have low embodied energy, last a long-time and are easily maintained. In order to comply with the Code for Sustainable Homes, developers will increasingly <u>need</u> to use materials with lower environmental impacts over their lifecycle (BRE's Green Guide).
We need parking spaces to be big enough to actually get a car into and open the doors. Garages "big enough to get cars into rather than the usual size" (to quote from a developer!) would be a good idea. tandem parking as a bad idea.	The Highway Design Guide will establish appropriate sizes for parking spaces. Design guide will say tandem parking not allowed for HIMOS
For the record, the aspects of urban design that seem popular and effective which we looked at included: Green streetscenes - hedges, front lawns, trees; Parking not dominating the streetscene (because provision of convenient spaces matches car ownership levels) Range of densities, range of property values; Pepper-potting of social housing Houses made of materials that are durable and appear durable Pavements! Houses with gardens Enough space to leave cars at home; enough space to get a bus or fire engine through, late in the evening. Drives, garages and parking spaces actually big enough to use. A clear hierarchy of residential through-roads and culdesacs	Noted. These points have mainly been addressed in responses above.  Paras 4.5.1-4.5.2 states that provision should be made for gardens where family housing is proposed.

<p>The aspects we looked at which are widely regarded as inappropriate to MK or to be avoided for other reasons include:</p> <p>Streetscenes with little or no green;  Mono-cultures; large numbers of almost identical sized homes, lack of varied density, lack of price variety  Apartments (especially inappropriate in large numbers on the urban edge)  Insufficient space for the inevitable (predicted) levels of car ownership, leading to less attractive street scenes, less likelihood of nearby residents travelling on foot, increased tendency to drive again at the earliest opportunity, and insufficient space to get a bus or fire engine through - creating an overall impression of parking dominating and congesting the street scene.  Houses that will need major maintenance after just a few years (or that look as if they will)  Tandem parking  Garages, drives and parking spaces too small to be usable  Tenure segregation rather than pepper-potting.</p>	<p>Noted. These points have been addressed in responses above.</p> <p>This seems to contradict your earlier comment that low income people with little or no garden should be located closest to open space</p>
<p><b>David Hopkins</b></p>	
<p>Rural sites and their relationship in design terms to the existing built environment</p>	<p>Feel that this is already adequately covered in the Design Guide in section 2 – it varies for each context and guide can't provide guidance on each one.</p>
<p>Concerns over the virtual monopoly fears of one developer replicating designs again and again across the city</p>	<p>Noted – guide is specifically aiming to avoid this</p>
<p>The use of the photo to provide an example of a grid road – ensure it is one showing a dual carriageway as this is the style the council policy ensures will be replicated and extended in to the SR and SDA areas</p>	<p>Agree. Will change.</p>
<p>Clear outline of the dates for the public consultation and the review programme prior to being submitted to Cabinet</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>John Bints excellent point with regards to the dimensions of car parking spaces and garages – although this should perhaps have been captured in the review of residential parking standards?</p>	<p>Agree. This is an issue for the Highways Design Guide.</p>
<p>Avoid opening out from residential dwellings on to 'shared spaces' – disaster in the example in</p>	<p>Agree – don't want design whereby residents exit house into</p>

<p>my ward (Taylor Wimpey – Nampak site in Woburn Sands) – unsafe, unpopular and one a rat run due to poor overall site design</p>	<p>‘unsafe’ street</p> <p>Where properly designed, shared surfaces can provide an acceptable pedestrian environment which is not dominated by cars. Amend Guide to set out clear criteria for the design of shared surfaces.</p>
<p><b>Mike Galloway</b></p>	
<p>I think it is too long and covers too much historic detail - but often in general terms without the necessary evidential detail/justification for the point made. Do we really want to be saying that a lot of the consents granted by MKC and EP/MKP over the past ten years have resulted in poor quality developments?</p>	<p>Will look at areas where the Guide can be shortened, such as the Planning Policy Section. Amend para 2 to state that “MKC and MKP are committed to creating high quality sustainable neighbourhoods with a distinctive identity This Design Guide is intended help fulfil this commitment”</p>
<p>Where particular things from the past are being criticised (or praised) then it would be better to identify these.</p>	<p>Remove criticism of past development.</p>
<p>Some of the photographs are largely irrelevant and could easily be omitted. In general any used ought to have a caption and those used simply for decoration to a minimum.</p>	<p>Some photos will be removed as a result of reformatting the document. All photos will have a caption.</p>
<p>Photographs and images would benefit from being larger so the detail etc that is being referred to can be seen. In general I think the guide would benefit from fewer by larger photographs.</p>	<p>Increase size of photos in document.</p>
<p>A number of the photographs and images are fuzzy - presumably not of sufficient resolution. (Which may come from the reduced resolution on the electronic copy - but my comment is based on the printed copy supplied which I assume was printed from a higher resolution version.) For example the MKP logo on the last page is fuzzy - I assume there is a high-res version we ought to be using for this! The street type layouts on page 31 are for a key concept but are not easy to understand as small and fuzzy as they are. (The resolution in the 8Mb file version is better but still not totally clear.)</p>	<p>Change MKP logo. Delete illustrations at bottom of page 31.</p>
<p>I think the page layout and font size does not help with readability. A layout more like the attached is I believe far better - using a larger font size (at least 12 point) and two columns. The line length as used is too long. (Attached is a page showing this sort of layout - from <a href="http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/policy-and-projects/sustainable-design-and-construction-supplementary-planning-">http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/policy-and-projects/sustainable-design-and-construction-supplementary-planning-</a></p>	<p>Amend format of document to two columns. Font size increased to 11pt. Increasing the font size to 12 pt would increase the length of the document.</p>



<a href="#">document.en</a> - the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD from Cambridge City)	
I doubt if it appropriate to include significant parts of other documents - such as draft National Policy, Core Strategy and Leisure Facilities policy. Is it not better they are just referred to rather than being repeated.	Accepted.
It would be worth giving the document a "Plain English" check. A superficial check indicates a number of sentences which are too long and words/wording which ought to be changed.	Noted
I don't find the diagrams on page 35 easy to understand - and I'm used to looking at plans, partly as there is no key. I can't be sure what is car parking, street, house and garden. There is an implication that the block plan represents Wolverton - but also refers to two on-plot parking spaces? There is an implication that Bletchley in general is 119 dw/ha, whereas I assume this is a new development somewhere - it ought to be identified as such. Similar considerations apply to other pages, in particular pages 34 and 50.	Will amend block structure diagrams, amend supporting text to explain relationship of concept plan and actual developments.  Check clarity of other diagrams.
In 2.2 Design Principles, the point is made about neighbourhoods - that this is 1,000 to 1,500 homes - but no evidential basis for this and no reference to number of residents and demographic mix. In 2.2.2 reference is then made to Two Mile Ash as being a successful estate - but no basis for this point (I'm not saying it is or is not successful) but one factor is that it is much larger than many other estates - far more than 1,500 houses.	Will replace Two Mile Ash with Shenley Brook End which falls within the suggested neighbourhood threshold.
In 2.2.1 the term "grid road reserves" is used - is this correct rather than to "grid roads"	Change to "grid road corridors."
In 2.2.3 a specific point is made about the South East SDA - I think this would be better as a general point about such circumstances rather than a direct reference to the SDA.	We will delete sentence.
In the section on Services (4.6) reference could also usefully be made to letter boxes.	Para 4.6.7 refers to letter boxes.