

**Residential Design Guide – LDF Advisory Group Meeting 211009**

**Meeting Notes and Officer Response**

<b>Member Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
<p><b>General Comment</b> David Hopkins</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Danger of 'single design city' with same designs replicated – so the design guide is good to try and move away from this problem</li> <li>• Some photos not so good (eg dual carriageway grid road required)</li> <li>• Guidance needed on rural areas</li> <li>• Need to separate pedestrians from traffic – don't like shared surfaces</li> </ul>	<p>Design Guide addresses this issue through identifying walkable neighbourhoods as being required at masterplan scale, each neighbourhood requires its own identity. It also calls for more modern/distinctive architecture on key frontages</p> <p>Will relook at photos, but which ones aren't liked?</p> <p>Section 2.4 does address Rural Villages, Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings. Rural areas all vary so can't provide guidance on each one .</p> <p>Tables 3 and 4 on pg 25-26 should help in ensuring any new development in rural village / conservation area reflects positive design attributes/elements of that area</p> <p>Will better understand issues and then propose design solutions. Will discuss with David Lawson.</p> <p>The Guide does call for Primary streets with verges separating footpaths from carriageway</p> <p>Regarding shared surfaces – is the problem not more about the design of them rather than the principle of them as they are supported by national guidance / best practice. Propose that the Guide understands what the problem with them is and then what the design solutions are.</p> <p>Potentially very monotonous streetscape will be created if no shared</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will there be further consultation with the LDF Advisory Group?</li> </ul>	<p>surfaces are allowed. Shared surfaces allow for a hierarchy to be created and work well where there is low through traffic</p> <p>Yes, in December prior to formal consultation</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there any best practice on Design Guides produced by other councils?</li> <li>• Submitted to CABE – OK to circulate?</li> <li>• Good “first pass” to go out for consultation.</li> </ul>	<p>A number of good design guides out there but no common template. Have incorporated good ideas from other design guides where appropriate to MK. This Design Guide has developed in response to specific MK issues.</p> <p>An early version was submitted to CABE.</p>
<p><u>Roger Bristow</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is good design? The existing communities should be asked this as part of the consultation?</li> </ul>	<p>The Guide sees design as the total environment and is trying to make it less subjective by making clear via design guidance what makes for overall good design of a new development. By completing tables 3 and 4, the subjectivity of good design in this latter context should be minimised because any new development must reflect the positive design elements of the surrounding area.</p> <p>The design guide is a Technical piece of work and specific consultation with school children is not therefore seen as appropriate. The latter would probably be more interested in what different elements make up for a sustainable community/neighbourhood and the Guide does not talk about this. This would be done on a site specific scale via a masterplan.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density is an issue – there is too much intensity of development. Higher densities should also have access to open space /play areas</li> <li>• Materials is very important – concern about deterioration of materials</li> <li>• Guide must emphasise the need to protect environmental quality</li> <li>• Need more family houses – but how do you classify a family – it can be 3,4,5 or 6 people (ie 2 bed to 5 bed houses)</li> <li>• Original MK design of gardens for all houses has gone; it is now public green space – no longer private = bad.</li> </ul> <p><u>Brian White</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are houses for – today and in the future, need to ensure more flexibility to accommodate people working at home, kids still living at home, elderly parents wanting to stay on plot (eg need space for an annex)</li> <li>• MK has a history of sustainable design and Guide should reiterate this more</li> <li>• What are we consulting on, what can people comment on (what can be amended and what can't). Include executive</li> </ul>	<p>The design guide is encouraging developers to introduce a greater range of densities. The guide includes examples of lower densities in MK to show where it has happened. In terms of housing facing open space, the guide should not be prescriptive about this – both low and high density are appropriate depending on context. The Council's Leisure SPD determines the amount of open space a developer need to provide, based on number of houses built</p> <p>Agree. Para 4.4.36 states that "materials should normally be selected that wear well with age and last a long time."</p> <p>Agree</p>
	<p>Section 3.3 deals with this. Is this also not market led? Lower density areas will by definition have more family housing PPS3 requires a mix of housing that reflects the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and other local evidence. PPS 3 makes clear that where family housing is proposed that the needs of children are met through good provision of recreational areas including private gardens.</p>
	<p>Agree with point. The Guide does include a section on Flexible Homes (pg 40) It is not believed to be the role of this Guide to identify site specific requirements for individual sites – that is the role of individual site specific development briefs</p> <p>Agree this can be beefed up with more examples of Energy World etc. Will include under section 2.1 a section on Sustainable Design (eg Energy World)</p>

<p>summary with consultation material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough said on Sustainability (in terms of energy efficiency) and green architecture. Can the Sustainable Construction SPD be included as part of this Guide?</li> <li>• Design uniqueness of MK is being taken away = blandness</li> <li>• High density does not have to be bad – Stony Stratford is an example of high density people like. Others disagreed with this statement</li> </ul>	<p>The whole document is being consulted on. An Executive Summary will be included Will state that this was a key feature of early developments in MK (eg Energy World) but the Sustainable Construction SPD covers this issue. It is not proposed therefore to include this in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Design Guide intended to mitigate this problem. The introduction of neighbourhoods as character areas each requiring own identity and Tables 3 and 4 provide a response to this issue.</p> <p>PPS 3 makes this clear and the Design Guide shows examples of varying densities across MK – all seen as good examples of design.</p>
<p><u>Jenni Ferrans</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have adoptions officers look at Guide in terms of maintenance costs of proposals around shared surfaces and public realm</li> <li>• Have DC officers looked at Guide</li> <li>• The Guide should focus on lessons from areas on what not to do eg shared surfaces in Monkston Park</li> <li>• 6 week consultation is not long enough</li> <li>• Design Guide is simply a guide; must not be prescriptive.</li> </ul>	<p>Will get adoptions officer to look at this, but as this Guide does not into Technical details it is more likely the sister Highway Design Guide that needs more careful scrutiny of ongoing maintenance implications. Para 3.2.18 states that “hard landscaping materials need to be aesthetically pleasing, structurally robust, have good weathering characteristics and only require simple maintenance.”</p> <p>DC officers from MKC and MKP have looked at Guide extensively</p> <p>Agree with this point. The Guide does provide drawings / photos with ticks and crosses to illustrate both good and bad examples. We have included reasons why shared surfaces don’t currently work well</p> <p>Agreed an 8 week consultation period</p> <p>It is Guide in that it is not linked to any specific development but it</p>

<p><u>Andrew Geary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not like modern new development in Newport Pagnell – does not fit in with Newport Pagnell. The design guide does not provide solution to this</li> <li>• People in MK like green spaces and low densities – design guide does not seem to address issue of access to open space</li> </ul>	<p>does need to be prescriptive on certain issues</p> <p>Table 3 and 4 should deal with this issue which requires any new development to identify and build on positive design features of surrounding area which should ensure a level of synergy in design between new and old</p> <p>Not the role of design guide to identify open space – this is done at site specific masterplan level. A section on public open space is included in section 3 while local plan policies cover open space requirements</p>
<p><u>Andrew Morris</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not say enough about “green” issues e.g. greywater recycling, renewable energy</li> </ul>	<p>The Council has an adopted SPD on Sustainable Construction. The Design Guide references the SPD (para 1.5.5). Achieving the Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 requires these sort of issues to be addressed</p>
<p><u>John Bint</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guide does not look at how ‘suburbs’ will look/function/operate in the future</li> <li>• Recognises work put in to the document and agrees that it tackles the right issues</li> <li>• Historical MK single storey development has been lost.</li> <li>• Materials are important – must be long lasting</li> </ul>	<p>Agree this is an interesting point but it is a very strategic issue and is not relevant for this Design Guide – more relevant for suatamnabale community strategy and / or core strategy. Site specific masterplans and design codes furthermore will identify a vision for individual sites. The design guide is a technical document and is a Development Control tool to assist DC and developers. The Design Guide is however through the guidance aiming to show how to create sustainable neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Section 3.3 and Flexible Homes encourages a range of housing types Agree. Para 4.4.36 states that “materials should normally be selected that wear well with age and last a long time.”</p>

<p><u>Rex Exon</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing – these are the primary culprits when it comes to poor design</li> </ul>	<p>Housing associations have to meet HCA standards so should be at least as well designed as private housing.</p>
<p><b><u>Character / Identity of New Development</u></b> General Discussion</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Common design elements are needed yet diversity is also required – common design theme needed for every 200-330 houses</li> <li>Neighbourhoods should be “walkable”</li> <li>Neighbourhoods should have a focal point – that draws the community together</li> </ul>	<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 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>The Design Guide outlines this as a requirement</p> <p>All walkable neighbourhoods are by definition based around a focal point of open space/shops/facilities – stated in the Guide para 2.2.2</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Houses must be fit for purpose – minimum sizes required??</li> <li>What is the natural area for new developments in MK (need to establish the context as MK is fairly flat)</li> <li>Natural features can help to establish character</li> </ul>	<p>See earlier comment on section on Flexible Homes. Should the Guide include minimum house sizes??</p> <p>Tables 3 and 4 deal with this</p> <p>Section 2.2 Design Principles on page 19 refers to development</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to have bungalows – Guide needs to advocate this</li> <li>• Designing out Crime – the Guide does not emphasize this enough</li> </ul>	<p>incorporating and responding to natural features Guide in section 3.3 and Flexible Homes section encourages variety of house types</p> <p>There is a section on Community Safety on pg 39 and the Crime Prevention design Advisor has commented on the draft and is happy with what it says from a Designing out Crime point of view. The Guide reflects the best practice contained in <i>Safer Places</i>. The LDS includes an SPD on Secured by Design.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design Guide needs to state what other documents need to be read</li> <li>• Treat landmark buildings appropriate to the context</li> <li>• Spread facilities, specifically play areas, around neighbourhood to encourage walking. For example parents/children often visit different play areas.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree – will amend</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Accept that play areas can be spread around but neighbourhood-scale facilities should be provided within a local centre. Local play areas could form the focus of smaller groups of housing within neighbourhoods with a common design theme (addressing John Bint’s comments). Each play area could also have a distinctive design to aid legibility and provide variety in play provision.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graphics of drawings – are they implying straight streets</li> <li>• Graphics – need keys on drawings to understand them better</li> </ul>	<p>No they are not – just easier to produce like this Will explore this further to aid understanding</p>
<p><b>Densities</b> General Discussion</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design Guide needs to state that a ‘People Density Gradient’</li> </ul>	<p>Will use the ratio of average 2.3 people per house to work out people</p>

<p>is required (areas of high du/ha must also have high people du/ha a variation/mix/range of density is required @ a gross density of 35/ha</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design Guide must include timeline of MK innovativeness</li> <li>• Need to have clear distinction between public and private realm</li> <li>• High densities need access to open space / parkland/public transport</li> <li>• 2.1.3 (2<sup>nd</sup> point) needs to be the other way around</li> <li>• Design Guide to call for design competitions, young designers</li> <li>• Must include large plots that can be sub-divided to allow for flexible family demand for housing (eg extensions can be built)</li> <li>• Pepperpotting of affordable homes – not to be done on a cluster basis – but rather individual homes</li> </ul>	<p>per hectare.. This may be difficult to apply in practice. How do you ensure that there is a high density of people? London Housing Design Guide uses habitable rooms per hectare as a proxy for persons per hectare. Densities to be established in forthcoming Development Management SPD</p> <p>This is included already in Section 2</p> <p>Agree – this is stated in the Guide</p> <p>Agree – this is stated in the Guide</p> <p>Did not know that – will amend</p> <p>Agree, but can we do this when MKC don't own the land?</p> <p>Agree and will be part of push for lower densities. Can include, but can it be enforced on developers?</p> <p>Comment noted and included</p>	
<p><b>Car Parking</b> General Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about Conniburrow Boulevard (with slip roads) as an example for dealing with parking on limited/no access roads</li> <li>• Don't like Oxley Park example of central reservation parking as</li> </ul>		<p>Yes this is a possibility, but could create for a very bleak environment and a very wide cross section – difficult for pedestrians to cross the road. We can explore further as a possibility for limited access roads as a way of accommodating cars</p> <p>Disagree. Accepted not that green, but trees are still young and will</p>



<p>not enough greenery – it looks like a Tesco car park!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sizes of parking spaces must be realistically big enough</li> <li>Tandem parking is the 2<sup>nd</sup> last resort (after rear parking courts)</li> <li>Need to design for appropriate level and location of parking and then enforce against those who park inconsiderately</li> </ul> <p>Tension between green space and car parking in central boulevard – residents must know what purpose of green space is or will want it for parking. If green space is seen as having a function residents will respect that and not park there. If it is just seen as “sloap” they will colonise it as parking area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waterside is a good example</li> <li>Need a better picture of conniburrow parking example on pg61</li> </ul>	<p>grow. High quality paving does offset lack of current greenery. Agree – will emphasise, but Highway Design Guide is to primarily deal with this Will add – not to be permitted for HIMOS. Space standards to be sufficient for tandem parking – to be include din Highway Design Guide Agree, but enforcement issues are not relevant for design guide This is already stated in the section on ‘Public Open Space’ in section 3</p>
<p><b>Strategic Movement Network</b> General Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drawing of cul-de-sac on pg50 is not supported – cul-de-sacs off cul-de-sacs are acceptable</li> </ul>	<p>Waterside – Fenny Stratford – what are the lessons there Agree – will substitute</p> <p>Disagree – these don’t work on a number of grounds not least that it goes against best practice. The Guide states that cul-de-sacs are permissible but they need to be short, direct and not lead off another and be within a connected permeable grid. Large amounts of cul-de-sacs off cul de sacs lead to pedestrian safety issues and to isolated enclaves of development all feed off a single road that will have to take a lot of traffic. Too many cul-de-sacs also start to undermine the ‘publicness’ of neighbourhoods. The councils crime prevention design advisor does not on safety grounds support ‘nested’ or branched cul-de-sacs</p>

	<p>We will delete this drawing and replace with more suitable one</p> <p>The Guide does allow cul-de-sacs(see para 3.2.9 and pg 50) but there are constraints on them</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must avoid rat running therefore Guide must be careful about advocating a connected grid</li> <li>• Junctions: more guidance required on tight corners so car drivers can get good visibility around corners</li> <li>• Some of the block structures pages 35-36 don't meet parking standards and allow for tandem parking</li> </ul>	<p>Why does a connected grid result in rat running – in effect it provides more choice. The design guide advocates that both a connected grid (at a larger scale) and cul-de-sacs within the connected grid can take place – see example of Bradville on pg 50.</p> <p>Important point, but we believe this will be addressed in the Highway Design Guide</p> <p>Tandem parking is permissible but not for HIMOS.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More attention needs to be given to cyclists – cyclists should not have to give way at every junction (this is a problem with cross junctions?)</li> <li>• Redways as direct as possible – but still separation of redways/main roads</li> </ul>	<p>Redway already require substantial yielding – there are in fact fewer yields if cycling on street. Is this comment advocating larger blocks to avoid so many junctions?</p> <p>The cycling groups will be consulted on the draft document</p> <p>MK does have the redway network for longer trips</p>
<p><b><u>Shared Surfaces</u></b> General Discussion</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design Guide to state that Shared Surfaces are not permitted in MK</li> </ul>	<p>See comment on pg 1 – we would prefer to try and design out the problems than rule them out totally. Please see new section/ text</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curved streets preferred to straight streets (Jenni Ferrans disagreed)</li> </ul>	<p>The Guide does not rule out either and a lot will depend on the specific context. Significantly Curved streets can increase pedestrian/cycle walk distances and depending on the degree of curve can reduce legibility</p>

Other Comments	
Change the title of the document	Agree - Propose to call it 'Design Guide for New Residential Development'