

APPENDIX 2

Development Control Team Comments on Consultation Draft Residential Design Guide SPD

Page No	Paragraph No	Comments / Suggested changes	
General comments:		<p>The advice should aim to be clear and succinct as possible whilst ensuring main points are covered.</p> <p>It is unclear what type of development the guide applies to and where? (infill, conservation areas) Needs to be clarified in the introduction.</p> <p>Introduction is lengthy and repetitive in parts (23 pages of preamble!). Need to pick out the essential points and present as bullet points to make it easier to read. Some editing would make it more user- friendly.</p> <p>Generally needs a balance between text and pictures with less of the former and more of the latter. Better use of graphics could highlight the key points, borders and colours would add to emphasis</p> <p>Planning Policy section could be shortened and moved to an appendix</p> <p>In places too prescriptive and contradictory. Must give a clear message to avoid being challenged by developers.</p> <p>Section 4 does not provide sufficient guidance on rear parking courts eg. surfacing treatments etc. This could be included at pages 56/57.</p> <p>Must try and avoid advocating personal architectural preferences which may restrict choice and flexibility. Also must stand the test of time as styles can go in and out of fashion.</p>	
6		First sentence is unnecessary.	
6	1.1.1	Need to define “large scale”, is this applications in “ major category” or larger schemes	

8	1.4.6	It is possible to score against all criteria for Building for Life	
9	1.4.13 – 1.5.1	Not relevant or not necessary.	
11		Better examples of photos would improve this.	
12	2.1.11	Too lengthy. Could be shortened to “Early Milton Keynes seen as a test bed for architecture.” Or could be removed.	
14	2.1.16 & 2.1.17	Expresses personal opinion and is not positive or necessary.	
16	table	Confusing/irrelevant. Explain or delete.	
18	photo	Does not illustrate a green wall . Better example needed.	
20	table	Too prescriptive. Amend to read “The following key elements may be incorporated”....	
20		Section on “context” should be at the start of this section.	
22	2.7.2	Refers to Table 3; this should read Table C2.	
25	3.2.2	This paragraph should be deleted until the outcome of the Core Spatial Strategy is known in respect of the grid roads.	
31	3.2.28	Need to define “parking in a block”. Does this refer to rear parking courts?	
32 & 33		Move 3.3.6 forward above 3.3.5 to reflect the status of Safer Places as the parent document setting out requirement for achieving community safety objectives. Add extra sentence at end of 3.3.6 stating “The above requirement can be achieved by obtaining a “Secured by Design” accreditation.	
3.3.7		Add a new paragraph to read as follows: The Secured by Design accreditation is to be achieved on all properties built on HCA land.	
34	3.3.15	Delete the last sentence. This is not a planning matter.	
34	After 3.3.15	Add new paragraph to read as follows: Developers need to be aware that residential space standards are required in the following circumstances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any dwelling on HCA land • Any dwelling which will attract funding through the HCA • Any dwelling which will be an affordable unit managed by a Registered Social Landlord. 	
36	4.12	No mention is made of lighting. Satisfactory lighting is required for movement networks and public open space.	
38		Bottom diagram is incorrect as it shows tertiary street off a tertiary street	
42	4.1.21	Milton Keynes Partnership does not support the statement that shared surfaces will not be allowed.	
43	4.1.26	Refers to shared surfaces so contradicts paragraph 4.1.21.	

47	4.2.24	Prefer for this to read “should be avoided “, rather than “ will not be allowed”.	
47	4.2.26	Prefer for this to read “should be avoided “, rather than “ will not be allowed”.	
48	4.3.1.	This should refer to the Council’s current parking standards	
49	4.3.13	Change “ under the control of a management company such as may occur for apartments” to read “ accessible to the general public”.	
54	4.3.28	Cannot enforce cars protruding in front of the building line. This is impractical and difficult to achieve..	
57	4.3.35	Delete last sentence of this paragraph.	
60	4.4.1. – 4.4.6	Introduction section is long does not add anything which has not been covered in the opening Introduction section.	
60	4.4.2.	Reference to Core Strategy is premature at this stage.	
60	4.4.5	This statement is contradicted by paragraph 4.4.6.	
60	4.4.6	See above comment.	
61	4.4.15	This is too prescriptive and may not be realistically achievable or enforceable. How would this be measured?	
63	4.4.31	Why not use bold render? There may be an acceptable rationale for doing so and this may form character.	
64	4.4.40	Example is shown on P16. “Should not overdominate the elevations” would be preferable to “should be avoided”.	
64	4.4.3	Photo above appears to have a complicated roof	
65	4.5.1	How is “ family housing” defined? By stating minimum garden depths this sets a “back to back” distance which is to be more flexible for new developments if a rigid layout is to be avoided.	
65	4.5.3	Is it realistic that all flats should have access to private open space? Where has this figure come from? If this is over and above public open space requirement, it will impact on density.	
65	4.5.5.	“Communal private amenity space” should delete “private”.- it can’t be both communal and private.	
82		Milton Keynes Partnership contact details should be added.	