



Great Place • Great Community • Great Future

**Statement of Consultation – Residential Design Guide SPD**  
**August 2017**

This statement sets out comments received and the Council's response to Surrey Heath Borough Council's consultation on the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

The Consultation ran for six weeks from the 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017 to 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2017.

Letters and e-mails were sent out to residents and organisations on the Council's Local Plan database, neighbouring authorities, Parish Councils and statutory consultees. Printed copies of the document were also available to view at Surrey Heath House, libraries and Parish Council offices. In addition, the consultation was advertised on the front page of the Council's website.

**In summary, the changes to the Residential Design Guide SPD following consultation are as follows:**

- Page 15, Paragraph 6.5 – remove the following text which begins after the phrase ‘legible way’: *‘Although the Council does not wish to create vehicular rat runs through residential areas, cul de sac layouts will generally be resisted unless connectivity to surrounding areas can be introduced via open space or footpath/cycle links.’*  
Replace old text with the following new text: *‘If cul de sac layouts are established, connectivity to surrounding areas can be introduced via open space or footpath/cycle links.’;*
- Page 17, paragraph 6.8 – add the word ‘usually’ between the words ‘should have’ to the first sentence reads, *‘Residential streets should usually have building height to street width ratios that provide for a good sense of enclosure without overwhelming people who are using the streets.’;*
- Page 30, paragraph 7.10 - remove footnote 3 which states *‘Urban, local and town centre locations are defined as Camberley, Bagshot, Frimley, Watchetts & Frimley Green.’;*
- Page 33, Paragraph 7.21 – add the sentence, *‘The Council also encourages applicants to consider criteria for Building for Life in their development design schemes.’* to the end of paragraph 7.21, after the phrase *‘accessible, adaptable and flexible.’;*
- Page 44, Principle 8.5 – remove the first sentence of Principle 8.5 which states, *‘A minimum of 10sqm of communal open space per flat should be provided.’*  
Replace with *‘Flatted developments should provide outdoor amenity space for each unit. In flatted developments, communal open space will be expected.’;*
- Page 47, Principle 9.1 – Remove text after the phrase ‘panel fencing’ which states: *‘is considered an unacceptable boundary treatment when visible from the public realm.’*  
Replace with the following text after the phrase ‘panel fencing’: *‘will be discouraged when visible from the public realm.’;*
- Page 49, Paragraph 9.9 – add the sentence, *‘The size of shared bins should be based on the standard of 45 litres per person living in the premises.’* after the phrase ‘care homes.’;
- Page 49, Paragraph 9.10 - add the phrase, *‘both to residents and waste and recycling collection vehicles’* between the words ‘accessible and ‘and’;
- Page 49, Paragraph 9.11 - add the phrase, *‘but still easily accessible for refuse and recycling collection vehicles.’* after the phrase ‘public realm’;
- Pages 59-62, Table 11.1 – renumber each row in the ‘Check point’ column modify the table by renumbering unintentionally blank cells.

**Responses to the Draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Council's Response</b>
Anthony Wilsdon	Sorry, I got rather put off by the planning approval for Tesco in Lightwater which went against the Lightwater Village Design Statement. So much for local involvement by way of consultation.	Noted. No change
CBRE Ltd on behalf of Fair Oaks Garden Village Ltd	<p><b>PRINCIPLE 5.2 (PAGE 5)</b>            This Principle states that developments of 10 or more dwellings will be required to provide plot plans to clearly identify ownership boundaries and public/private spaces. FGVL considers that the generic requirement for plot plans is unlikely to be realistic or appropriate for larger developments, given that this level of detail would not necessarily be known for proposals seeking outline planning permission. FGVL therefore suggests that this requirement should be applied to detailed and/or smaller proposals only.</p> <p><b>PARAGRAPH 6.8 (PAGE 17)</b>            FGVL supports the principle of achieving appropriate street width to building height relationships and the important role this plays in high-quality placemaking. However, FGVL is concerned that as drafted, the Guide is overly prescriptive with no flexibility provided, which may stifle good design and placemaking. FGVL suggests that this could be addressed through the removal of the ratio table and inclusion of the following sentence within paragraph 6.8: "It is important that the proposed height to width ratios have clear design rationale. In larger scale masterplans it is important to demonstrate that a variety of types of street will be included."</p> <p><b>PRINCIPLE 6.7 (PAGE 23)</b>            This Principle seeks to ensure the attractiveness of building frontages and street scene is maintained through good design of car parking provision, which is a</p>	<p>Noted. No change. This has been applied previously in planning applications for 10+ units.</p> <p>Noted. Amend to add in word <i>usually</i> so the paragraph reads, "<i>Residential streets should usually have building height to street width ratios...</i>"</p> <p>No change. This can be achieved through the design of policy areas.</p>

	<p>principle supported by FGVL. However, FGVL considers the specific limitation on the number of parking bays without intervening landscaping is overly prescriptive and requests that this specification be removed from this Principle. For larger developments, securing the objective of this Principle should be considered on a case by case basis having regard to the characteristics of the site and the nature of development proposed.</p> <p>PRINCIPLE 6.9 (PAGE 24)  This Principle relates to car parking courts and suggests that these should be designed with active frontages and should be multi-purpose. FGVL supports this Principle, however, considers that rear parking courts may not be realistic or appropriate for all new developments and that the first sentence of this Principle should be amended to state: "Parking courts should be overlooked by the homes they serve and larger courts should include some homes fronting the court" Additionally, FGVL suggests that the last sentence is amended to state: "Where parking courts are provided to the front of development they should be designed with a strong landscape structure to avoid cars dominating the street scene".</p> <p>PRINCIPLE 6.10 (PAGE 25)  This Principle relates to the provision of on-street parking and states that where bays are provided, they should accommodate no more than a cluster of 3 cars. FGVL supports the principle of achieving high-quality parking integrated with the street scene but considers this requirement is overly prescriptive. FGVL requests that the specific car bay cluster limit is removed but inclusion of a requirement to ensure clusters of parking bays are punctuated and broken up by regular soft landscaping.</p>	<p>No change. The principle applies to frontages onto rear parking courts.</p> <p>No change. Can be achieved through the design and layout of car bays.</p>
--	---	---

	<p><b>PRINCIPLE 6.11 (PAGE 26)</b>  This Principle relates to boundary treatments and suggests that these should be at least 1m in height in residential environments. FGVL considers that this will limit variation across proposed developments and it is suggested that this Principle is amended to state: “There should be clear definition of public and private boundaries. Different types of boundary treatments will be appropriate for different locations and a choice should be made that is in keeping with the overall street character and the expected intensity of vehicular, pedestrian and cycle movement”.</p> <p><b>PARAGRAPH 6.32 (PAGE 26)</b>  This paragraph relates to the definition of public and private space and states that it is important that the boundaries between public and private space are clearly defined. FGVL is of the view that it is also important to reference shared private gardens or pocket neighbourhoods, which can be valuable in contributing towards the provision, and definition, of public and private space.</p> <p><b>PRINCIPLE 7.1 (PAGE 27)</b>  This Principle relates to set-backs in developments, seeking a common building line. FGVL requests that further consideration is given to this as this only allows for very uniform building lines, which could result in a lack of variety. This Principle should be expanded to explain that different approaches to front building lines will be appropriate for different character areas. For example, formal in-line continuous frontages, staggered frontages with varied set-backs, and continuous building lines with a particular rhythm of detached and/or semi-detached homes all have their place in the ‘place making toolbox’. FGVL considers that this Principle should be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>No change. The principle is sufficiently flexible to allow for different types of boundary treatment.</p> <p>No change. The need for shared amenity space and adequate green infrastructure is considered in paragraph 6.12 where pocket parks and community gardens are specifically referenced.</p> <p>No change. Principle 7.1 is flexible enough to allow for varied set-backs. Paragraph 7.2 also advises that careful consideration will be given to all forms of setbacks.</p>
--	---	--

	<p><b>PARAGRAPH 7.10 (PAGE 30)</b>  This paragraph relates to building heights and suggests that these can be varied in tighter urban environments and can often be in excess of 3 storeys. In urban local and town centre locations, residential buildings of 3 storeys or more will be encouraged. FGVL requests that consideration is given to the wording of this paragraph to acknowledge other areas where increased heights could be acceptable, such as in the creation of new settlements, where varied building heights add interest, assist with orientation and creates character of place. This can also include locations for landmark or feature buildings of increased height. FGVL considers that the draft Guide should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p><b>PRINCIPLE 7.6 (PAGE 33)</b>  This Principle states that as a minimum, the Council will expect new housing development to comply with the National Internal Space Standards. FGVL appreciates that in principle, National Space Standards are beneficial in maintaining the quality of residential accommodation, however consideration must be given to the Government's ambition to review the Nationally Described Space Standards to ensure greater local housing choice, as referenced within the Housing White Paper. FGVL considers that the Guide should reflect the outcome of the Government's review process. It is critical that flexibility is provided so that development proposals can optimise space standards whilst also responding positively to local market conditions.</p> <p><b>DIAGRAM 7.5 (PAGE 33)</b>  Diagram 7.5 provides a pictorial glossary of architectural features to consider when designing built form. The diagram reflects a traditional style of architecture. In order to avoid ambiguity, FGVL considers that the Guide needs to clarify that this is not necessarily intended to dictate architectural style;</p>	<p>Note. Remove footnote 3 so the defined urban local and town centre locations are not prescriptive.</p> <p>No change. The Council will seek the Government's Technical housing standards, which are relevant at this point in time. Any subsequent amendments to this technical document will be a material planning consideration.</p> <p>No change. The diagram sets out architectural features only and does not preclude other designs.</p>
--	--	---

rather, it is simply a diagram to aid the glossary – similar architectural principles could be applied to more modern architecture. FGVL also notes that there would appear to be some inconsistencies with the following paragraphs within the draft Guide, which should be reflected within a revised diagram:

- Paragraph 7.15, which recommends using roof spaces to provide green infrastructure
- Paragraph 7.16, which recommends contemporary styles
- Paragraph 7.25, which illustrates that development can take a contemporary or traditional approach and can be designed with formal or informal styles.

PARAGRAPH 8.4 (PAGE 36)

Paragraph 8.4 relates to solutions for maintaining privacy in new development and with neighbouring properties. This states that a minimum distance of 20m is the Council's generally accepted guideline for there to be no material loss of privacy between the rear of two storey buildings directly facing each other. This further states that for two storey rear to side relationships it may be possible to reduce the separation distance to 15m. FGVL considers these distances to be generous, and there will be instances where the objectives of this Principle can be achieved with reduced distances. For example, 18m between back to back residential properties and 11m for back to side residential properties are more appropriate. A more flexible approach will help SHBC in achieving the density aspirations that are identified in Principle 6.4 of the draft Guide. In order to allow for flexibility, the following wording is recommended to be added to the first paragraph under 'Distance' at paragraph 8.4: "However, innovative solutions that reduce separation but maintain privacy would be acceptable and will be considered on a case by case basis".

No change. Paragraph 8.4 recognises alternative design solutions to maintain privacy.

	<p>PRINCIPLE 8.4 (PAGE 43) Principle 8.4 and Table 8.1 provide minimum outdoor amenity space size standards for houses. FGVL considers that the minimum standards are overly onerous and could result in unduly thin plot widths, and that overall areas of gardens should be flexible and must be considered alongside the efficient use of land. As such, FGVL recommends that this Principle is reconsidered to remove the standards and to add greater flexibility.</p> <p>PRINCIPLE 8.5 (PAGE 44) Principle 8.5 suggests that a minimum of 10sqm of communal open space should be provided per flat. FGVL requests that this requirement is considered in conjunction with Principle 8.6, which states that flatted developments will be expected to provide private outdoor amenity space for each unit. In combination, these requirements may become overly onerous, particularly for large-scale developments. Sufficient flexibility is needed to enable the level and nature of private and communal space to be considered on a case by case basis.</p> <p>PRINCIPLE 8.6 (PAGE 45) Principle 8.6 is concerned with private outdoor amenity space to be provided for flatted developments. This suggests that all ground floor flats should have access to a well-defined private area of amenity space and unless conservation, privacy or heritage issues negate against the use of balconies, all flats above ground floor should be provided with balconies of specific sizes. Whilst FGVL supports the provision of private outdoor amenity space, flexibility should be maintained to consider developments on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>No change. The approach allows for flexibility. Layouts and designs should ensure that plot widths are not unduly thin.</p> <p>Amend principle 8.5 to ensure consistency with principle 8.6 which states – ‘<i>Flatted developments will be expected to provide private outdoor amenity space for each unit.</i>’ Remove Principle 8.5’s requirement for 10sqm of communal open space per flat and replace with: <i>“Flatted developments should provide outdoor amenity space for each unit. In flatted developments, communal open space will be expected.”</i></p> <p>Noted. However, as set out in paragraph 1.11 of this SPD, it is recognised that the principles set out in this guide may not be applicable in all situations.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>PRINCIPLE 8.7 (PAGE 45)</p> <p>Principle 8.7 states that usable, high quality private outdoor amenity space will be required for all new Residential Care Home developments. FGVL supports this Principle, but considers that this should be applied flexibly balanced with the provision of generous communal outdoor space as part of care home developments. FGVL suggests that this should be reflected within the Guide.</p>	<p>No change. Amenity and communal space would be considered in such applications.</p>
Historic England	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above document. Historic England is pleased to endorse what is, in our view, a very thorough, well researched and well-presented guidance document. We have no doubt that if applied robustly the guidance will result in a significant improvement in standard of design of new developments and an enhancement in the overall quality of the built environment in the borough, and will support appropriate conservation of the character of historic areas.</p> <p>We have not detailed comment to offer on the content of the document.</p>	<p>Noted. No change</p>
Ian Phillips	<p>My response is that you should be focussing all your attention and resources on a new local plan before you lose any more appeals with costs, rather than messing around with this nonsense.</p>	<p>Noted. No change</p>
Surrey County Council	<p>Adaptable Homes</p> <p>As the responsible authority for adult social care we very much welcome the section on adaptable homes and principle 7.7 that buildings should be designed so that they have longevity and can be adapted over time. Surrey has a rapidly ageing population with older people understandably preferring to remain in their own homes for as long as possible. We therefore fully support the view expressed in the document that it is important for homes to be flexible and adaptable for</p>	<p>Noted. No change. The Residential Design Guide SPD encourages Lifetime Homes Standards.</p>

	<p>residents over time. We would however like to see a clearer requirement for applicants to demonstrate that, when presenting designs for new homes, they have sought to address as many of the lifetime homes criteria as possible.</p> <p>We would suggest that applicants should additionally be required to consider all of the criteria for Building for Life in their development design schemes. This is the industry standard for new homes and provides another set of criteria that address the design quality of new developments. It refers to the character and community of the area in which the homes are situated; streets, parking and pedestrianisation in the locality; and design and construction of the buildings themselves. The government expresses the intention in the recent Housing White Paper to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to recognise the value of design standards and Building for Life is specifically mentioned in this context.</p> <p><b>Waste and recycling storage</b></p> <p>We would recommend that paragraphs 9.9 to 9.11 are amended as below:</p> <p><b>9.9</b> Shared bins may need to be provided in flats or care homes. <i>The size of shared bins should be based on the standard of 45 litres per person living in the premises.</i></p> <p><b>9.10</b> It is important that the waste storage requirements are handled in purpose built spaces that are sufficient in size, easily accessible <i>both to residents and waste and recycling collection vehicles</i> and which do not generate offensive smells or negatively impact on street scenes.</p> <p><b>9.11</b> The Council's strong preference is for refuse storage areas to be located to the rear or side of dwellings where they are invisible in the public realm, <i>but still easily</i></p>	<p>Noted. Add sentence in Adaptable Homes section which states, <i>'The Council also encourages applicants to consider criteria for Building for Life in their development design schemes.'</i></p> <p>Noted. Paragraphs 9.9-9.11 will be amended as indicated in italics.</p>
--	--	--

	<p><i>accessible for refuse and recycling collection vehicles.</i> Bin stores in front of dwellings, even when well screened have a poor negative visual impact on the street.</p> <p>For information and for possible inclusion within the document we would advise, with regard to paragraph 9.9, that the size of shared bins would be based on an allocation based on current standards of 45 litres per person living in the premises. (For example a two bedroom flat with a maximum of 4 people residing would need a capacity of 180 litres per fortnight) the 45litres per person waste capacity allocation is derived from the fact that individual houses, where on average four people live, are given one 180 litre wheeled bin, which is sufficient to contain the waste produced over a fortnight (to meet the current waste collection frequency). Therefore the current allocation per person living in flatted accommodation where waste is collected fortnightly will be 180 divided by four; i.e. 45Litres.</p>	<p>Noted. Amend paragraph 9.9 to include reference that the size of shared bins should be based on the standard of 45 litres per person living in the premises.</p>
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>While we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic this Supplementary Planning Document covers is unlikely to have major effects on the natural environment, but may nonetheless have some effects. We therefore do not wish to provide specific comments, but advise you to consider the following issues:</p> <p><b>Green Infrastructure</b> This SPD should consider making further provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area. The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should plan <i>'positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure'</i>. The Planning Practice Guidance on Green Infrastructure provides more detail on this. Urban green space provides multi-functional benefits. It contributes to coherent</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Paragraphs 6.5-6.7 of the Layouts Chapter encourages green corridors and green infrastructure.</p>

	<p>and resilient ecological networks, allowing species to move around within, and between, towns and the countryside with even small patches of habitat benefitting movement. Urban GI is also recognised as one of the most effective tools available to us in managing environmental risks such as flooding and heat waves. Greener neighbourhoods and improved access to nature can also improve public health and quality of life and reduce environmental inequalities.</p> <p>There may be significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments. These can be realised through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• green roof systems and roof gardens;</li> <li>• green walls to provide insulation or shading and cooling;</li> <li>• new tree planting or altering the management of land (e.g. management of verges to enhance biodiversity).</li> </ul> <p>You could also consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans. Further information on GI is include within <i>The Town and Country Planning Association's "Design Guide for Sustainable Communities"</i> and their more recent "Good Practice Guidance for Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity".</p> <p><b>Biodiversity enhancement</b></p> <p>This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit.</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 6.7 advises that designers will be encouraged to make use of green infrastructure in the form of street trees, planted verges, green walls and gardens. Paragraph 6.12 recommends inclusion of pocket parks, roof gardens, green walls, community gardens and communal amenity space.</p> <p>Noted. Section 4 (Design Themes) p.11 advises that opportunities should be maximised to ensure that housing supports biodiversity and protects important ecosystems.</p>
--	--	---

	<p><b>Landscape enhancement</b>  The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might make a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts. For example, it may be appropriate to seek that, where viable, trees should be of a species capable of growth to exceed building height and managed so to do, and where mature trees are retained on site, provision is made for succession planting so that new trees will be well established by the time mature trees die.</p> <p><b>Other design considerations</b>  The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity (para 125). Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 4 (design Themes) p.10 states that landscape, streets, open spaces buildings and fine details should be used to create or reinforce places of strong positive identity.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD will not be amended in a way that significantly affects its impact on the natural environment.</p>
<p>David Davies on behalf of the Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan Group</p>	<p>Thank you for arranging for a copy of the draft SHBC Residential Design Guide to be sent to me. I have circulated this to members of the Windlesham NP team, and we wish to express support for the document. This will provide a good back up for our own NP. We were however, surprised that we did not have discussions with the authors of the Design Guide while we were preparing our own Plan. From our perspective, the omission of a statement on the number of car parking spaces per household required is disappointing,</p>	<p>Noted. No change. Surrey County Council set the current parking standards applied by Surrey Heath Borough Council in the Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance Document (2012).</p>

	unless this is covered elsewhere.	
Cyril Pavey	<p>Paragraph 6.28: Parking Courts  Parking provision for new developments of flats is invariably inadequate. That may be due to standards devised by Surrey CC, who should take note of this consultation. An example close at hand is Dorchester Court on the corner of London Rd and The Avenue, Camberley. Its residents regularly park a long way along The Avenue. The number of parking spaces allocated for residents should equate to the number of bedrooms plus an extra 10% for visitors. If that means less room for buildings than the developer would like, so be it. Granting planning consent for a development that predictably will generate the need for on-road parking is unacceptable.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.3: Amenity and privacy  Restrictions on balconies should be tighter if house-holders are to be able to enjoy private outdoor spaces without being overlooked or overheard. Some years ago alterations were made to No. 31 The Avenue, Camberley, next-door-but-one. I did not receive a letter from SHBC. I was aware work was going on but assumed it was entirely internal. In fact it included a balcony at the rear of the house. The former occupant of the part of the house that included the balcony made extensive use of the balcony, which gave him a grandstand view of that part of our garden where we sit out in the summer. Moreover, he chose to make long, loud telephone calls, which we could hear clearly in our garden, while he was standing out on his balcony. I blame myself for not informing myself about the extent of the alterations; at the same time I do not understand why the planning authority permitted the balcony (and it would of course have been helpful had SHBC been a little more generous in informing neighbours). Hence my plea for more stringent controls on</p>	<p>Noted. No change. Surrey County Council set the current parking standards applied by Surrey Heath Borough Council in the Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance Document (2012).</p> <p>Noted. No change. The Residential Design Guide SPD recognises the importance of private space. Each application is determined having regard to the impact on neighbouring properties.</p>

	<p>approving balconies.</p> <p>General</p> <p>Even if there is no statutory requirement for the Council to inform neighbours of developments it would be kind and friendly if you extended your coverage a bit. After all, the cost of sending a few extra letters is pretty minimal - and in any case could be charged to the applicant.</p> <p>I seem to remember that the Atrium plans were approved even though in some cases they breached the Council's own planning rules (height of buildings, I think, was an example). Can we move to a system where, the Council having freely designed planning regulations, it rigidly adheres to them?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Not relevant to Residential Design Guide SPD consultation. No change.</p>
David Chesneau	<p>The guide is excellent and a welcome addition to the council's planning documents. The challenge is going to be to implement its guidance firmly, yet without leading to 'box-ticking' and unnecessary bureaucracy.</p> <p>Just one thing. Section 5 shows the Concept Plan as being part of Step 2. Yet Principle 5.1 says that the Concept Plan should be included in the Design and Access Statement, which is part of Step 4. I found this confusing. Thought it might be the intention, some clarification would be helpful?</p>	<p>No change. The concept plan is required at step 2. Step 4 seeks refinement of the concept plan, if required after community and neighbour engagement and following pre-application discussions, where undertaken.</p>
Hugh Cowan	<p>In response to your request for comments on the attached, please find my considerations below:</p> <p>1) Cul de sacs are the ideal place to bring up children in a safe environment. Whilst I agree with your comments about connectivity between areas by cycle and footpaths that should not detract from the advantages which cul de sacs bring. The document gives too much emphasis on the demerits of such streets and not enough of the merits. I would rather see something like "Cul de sacs will only be approved in there is</p>	<p>Noted. Amend paragraph 6.5 as follows: Remove: <i>"Although the Council does not wish to create vehicular rat runs through residential areas, cul de sac layouts will generally be resisted unless connectivity to surrounding areas can be introduced via open space or footpath/cycle links."</i></p>

	<p>access between all such streets by both foot and cycle paths". If you make all the roads through roads then you either end up with a rabbit warren (e.g. the Flowers estate in Bisley) or a rat run (e.g. the Wellington Park estate).</p> <p>2) Parking and road widths. All developments should allow for off street parking of at least two normal sized saloon cars. I concur with your emphasis on parking at the side, rather than at the front of the houses. However, home owners tend to have visitors who also bring their cars. Hence the streets need to be wide enough to allow for cars to be parked on both sides of the street and still give access to single file traffic. There is no sense in having a idealistic view that visitors should come by public transport and not bring their cars. That simply will not happen. Indeed, common sense says that vehicle traffic will only increase and so streets should be future proofed in this regard.</p> <p>3) Mixing detached and terraced housing in a single development simply does not work. An example of this is the development next to the new Waitrose in Bagshot. I most certainly would not want to live there despite the advantage of having a supermarket on my doorstep. Keep the housing types separate. A good example of this is the Arethusa Way development in Bisley. Both types of housing are present but they are subtly separate. Forcing a mix is merely social re-engineering at its crudest form.</p> <p>4) I would like to see the comments about bins and meters strengthened. I would prefer to see a comment that all bin storage must be at the rear or side of the property and that the meters should be in exterior enclosures at the side or rear but must be accessible by the meter readers if required. This latter requirement will slowly disappear with the conversion to Smart</p>	<p>And replace with:  <i>"If cul de sac layouts are established, connectivity to surrounding areas can be introduced via open space or footpath/cycle links."</i></p> <p>No change. Paragraph 6.10 recognises the need for shared streets which include parking areas incorporated into the streetscape. Paragraph 6.31 advises that streets must be purposefully designed to accommodate on-street parking where it is proposed.</p> <p>No change. The approach taken in paragraph 6.14 reflects the Council's approach in policy to provide for a range of home sizes. Dwelling types do not preclude the tenure and 'social mix' of the dwellings.</p> <p>Noted. No change. Paragraphs 9.7-9.12 address waste disposal in detail with diagrammatic explanations. Paragraph 9.16 recognises the need for balance in the location of metres in relation to how accessible and conspicuous they are.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Meters. There should be no meters at the front of any property. The environmentally friendly houses which are on the A322 opposite Sainsbury's in Knaphill are examples of meters being an eyesore.</p>	
<p>Mike Tierney</p>	<p>Urgent Action please to protect Camberley Town Centre [TC] Residents.</p> <p>Please find below, a prompt email reply from Inspector Darkens, in which he confirms that Surrey Police have withdrawn Camberley TC Police presence. Since his email, I have spoken to the Inspector who understands very well the issue we face. Likewise, we the Town centre residents appreciate [that without resources] his team can no longer provide the dedicated Police Officers. We therefore, have a fundamental change in Camberley TC Risk assessment. Residents of Camberley Town Centre require SHBC to act immediately [please implement by May 1st 2017]</p> <p>SHBC want Camberley Night Time economy, BUT they can't / or will not fund appropriate Surrey Police resources.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SHBC must not fail in their role to protect residents from the effect of Camberley Cumulative Night time Chaos</li> </ol> <p>To reduce the impact, the following action is required.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Sadly those TC establishments along Camberley High Street and Obelisk Way must now close at 23:00.</li> </ol> <p>For the reasons of road safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have asked Police to support the closure of St Georges Road and Obelisk Way when SHBC/SCC close the High Street.</li> <li>• Please remove TAXI rank from Camberley Town Centre. Out to Knoll Road, the car parks and/or the Broadway.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are not relevant to the Residential Design Guide SPD. No change.</p>

<p>John Mclaughlin</p>	<p>The points made by Mr Tierney in this email to you all are well made and factual. When the Council's licensing authority permits a 'night' economy then it is obligated to Police that policy properly. Mr Bob Darken's email confirms that there is usually no police presence at closing time. At 'closing time' Camberley's town centre becomes a dangerous place to be. Crime figures (anti-social behaviour etc) have risen by about 30% over the last two years. And those figures, I am sure, understate the case because there are no longer Police around to log incidents unless a call out is received! Please police your own Policy as required by your own policy!</p>	<p>Comments are not relevant to the Residential Design Guide SPD. No change.</p>
<p>Richard Browne</p>	<p>I looked at various documents (eg Camberley town centre 2011-2028). Sadly I came away with the conclusion that over the years Camberley has degenerated into a less attractive town in which to live. The addition of the Atrium with Vue has been one of the rare enhancements but where are the better quality shops and restaurants....Carluccios, Brasserie Blanc....Cote etc? The High Street has been allowed to look tired; is the new 'Wok Shop' going to have some new street scene furniture etc and is the area behind it going to be cleared up so we can all be proud of Camberley, the town in which we live? I didn't fully understand how the railway station redevelopment is going to take place and when. Is the redevelopment of Ashburn (?) House opposite to the station really going to house flats/appartments of luxury dimensions etc. It is also sad to see the flats being built in Middle Gordon Rd (opposite Optiplan) have no balconies. Is there an objection to balconies; apart from the occasional Juliet balcony? Could one of the initiatives to keep people better informed be to take one of the empty retail units and have on permanent display plans and models of the town centre and its surrounds with dates attached to give us hope that improvements are</p>	<p>Noted. No change</p> <p>Noted. No change. Principle 8.6 sets out the approaches for space standards for balconies.</p>

	taking place.	
West End Village Design Statement Group	<p>4.1 'human scale' is a strange phrase to use, perhaps a note to see glossary might be appropriate</p> <p>Whilst principle 6.3 is great the photo of shared space on page 19 is not demonstrating good space. It looks like a car park outside office space with a few token lollipop trees to distract from the horror of tall buildings. It feels claustrophobic. The only good part of the photo is the blue sign!</p> <p>Principle 6.4 Disagree. The Council should not seek to achieve the highest density possible. High density generally leads to low morale which is contrary to the Council objectives. Generous green infrastructure must be located very close to high density areas to be effective.</p> <p>On Page 22 the photograph shows a street dominated by parked cars (undesirable) as well as use of different materials to delineate</p> <p>6.25 As a minimum the Council should expect parking allowance to exceed Surrey CC highways number and size. Car sizes continue to increase. Also most households in Surrey now have 2 or more vehicles.</p> <p>Particularly support: Principles on Built Form (section 7) Principle 7.2 -Fully support this principle, to encourage passive solar design</p> <p>Table 11.1 – after point 12 there is a point with no number (passive solar design)</p>	<p>No change. Included in glossary.</p> <p>No change. The image demonstrates shared space.</p> <p>No change. Densities in themselves are not shown to demonstrate adverse impacts on residents.</p> <p>Noted. No change.</p> <p>No change. The Surrey County Council set parking standards applied by Surrey Heath Borough Council in the Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance Document (2012).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Amend table to add number 13 and renumber following check points.</p>
H A Prowse	Principle 5.1: Why distinguish between non-householder developments and any other? Why not have, say multi-storey	Noted. No change. This does not preclude such types of development.

	<p>blocks of flats above shopping centres? I had an excellent one in Germany over a DIY store.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.5: There is nothing wrong with cul de sacs.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.7: Perhaps there should be blanket tree preservation orders for every tree except Scots pine and silver birch, with nothing being felled except in response to a local request.</p> <p>Page 17: I have no objection to any of the illustrations.</p> <p>Principle 6.2: I object to so-called ‘traffic calming measures’ that make matters uncomfortable for, say, passengers in vehicles, while diverting traffic to roads that may not be as good or convenient. Of course, the only speed limit should be 30mph in built-up areas, and no others, anywhere else.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.11: Re ‘land for housing’. Please stop designation areas as ‘residential’, ‘industrial’, or ‘retail’, and let them mix freely. Paragraph 6.14 doesn’t go far enough. I once thought of running another building company converting industrial and office premises into micro-flats.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.12: Can we also have more trees?</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 6.5 to be amended to state, <i>“If cul de sac layouts are established, connectivity to surrounding areas can be introduced via open space or footpath/cycle links.”</i></p> <p>Noted. No change. TPOs are made in line with Part VIII of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended and in the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. No change.</p> <p>No change. This would be a policy approach, not an approach that can be set out in a design SPD.</p> <p>No change. Trees and green infrastructure are advocated in the Residential Design Guide. Paragraph 6.7 states, ‘Designers will be encouraged to make use of green infrastructure in the form of street trees, planted verges, green walls and gardens in</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Figure 6.2: there is nothing wrong with the right-hand layout.</p> <p>Parking: I knew the partner of Frank Gibberd, the architect of Harlow New Town. He had a rule of at least 1½ parking spaces per dwelling. I find many garages used as storage units – are they too small for the owners’ cars? Another builder I knew of insisted that every garage should be able to accommodate his Bentley.</p> <p>Principle 6.6: If on-plot parking is not at the front it will need more hard surfacing, which is not so good.</p> <p>Principle 7.2: Good idea.</p> <p>Building height: I have no objections to adding a couple of storeys to your proposed limits.</p> <p>Paragraph 7:10: I do not like the implication that ‘residential buildings of 3 storeys’ might not have shops and restaurants on the ground floor.</p> <p>Principle 7.6: I object to certain ‘national space standards’. Does this mean door-widths (for future wheel chair users) or room sizes? A statutory minimum room or property size encourages waste of space, unnecessary demand on our limited land and higher prices. The Japanese do very well with much smaller flats, which also do not encourage the hoarding of books, shoes, gadgets and general junk.</p>	<p>new residential development to help maintain the strong green character of the Borough. Principle 6.2 states that residential developments should use trees, vegetation, gardens and open spaces to create a strong soft, green character to streets.’</p> <p>Noted. No change.</p> <p>No change. The Surrey County Council set parking standards applied by Surrey Heath Borough Council in the Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance Document (2012).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. No change.</p> <p>Noted. No change. Paragraph 7.10 does not preclude mixed use developments.</p> <p>No change. The Government’s <i>Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard</i> is a technical planning document that sets out the standards that should be considered by Local Planning Authorities.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Principle 7.9: Windows provide a means to escape from fires, and should be so designed. My father was a fireman in the Blitz and we children take the subject seriously.</p> <p>Principle 8.4 and Table 8.1: No, not all residential properties need 'external private amenity space'. Balconies are very good, and so are Juliet windows.</p> <p>Principle 9.1: There is nothing wrong with a wooden fence – it might even be a transition stage between other varieties of boundary definition. Far better than the hedgerows hacked about by the council with chain saws. We often like physical barriers to keep out intruders.</p> <p>Page 49: At last. Someone has recognised the need for somewhere to put storage bins.</p> <p>Principle 10.5: Again, someone has realised the need for hard-standings to be porous.</p> <p>Principle 10.5 What about raising roofs to allow for additional floors?</p> <p>In defence engineering we look for ARM – accessibility, reliability and maintainability. Things such as plumbing and wiring should be accessible for repairs and also future upgrading.</p>	<p>Noted. This is determined through Building Control regulations.</p> <p>Noted. However, as set out in paragraph 1.11 of this SPD, it is recognised that the principles set out in this guide may not be applicable in all situations.</p> <p>Noted. Amend Principle 9.1 from <i>'Wooden shiplap or panel fencing is considered an unacceptable boundary treatment when visible from the public realm.'</i> to state <i>'Wooden shiplap or panel fencing will be discouraged when visible from the public realm.'</i></p>
--	---	--

	<p>Properties without letter boxes will need to be considered.</p> <p>I will never forgive you for desecrating Wellingtonia Avenue in Heatherside; it was one of the outstanding features of the neighbourhood and it has been taken away, ruining the area so that I can never go there again.</p>	<p>No change. Not relevant to the Residential Design SPD.</p>
--	---	---