

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

**Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)
(England) Regulations 2012 Reg12**

Statement of Consultation

***SUCCESSFUL PLACES: A GUIDE TO SUSTAINABLE
LAYOUT AND DESIGN***

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT



Undertaken by Chesterfield Borough Council also on behalf and in conjunction with:



July 2013

Contents

1. Introduction

- Background to the Project
- About *Successful Places*
- What is consultation statement?
- The Project Group

2. Initial Consultation on the Scope of the Draft SPD

- Who was consulted and how?
- Key issues raised and how they were addressed

3. Peer Review Workshop

- What did we do?
- Who was involved?
- What were the outcomes?

4. Internal Consultations

- What did we do and what were the outcomes?

5. Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment

- What is a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)
- Is a SEA required?
- What is a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)
- Is a HRA required?
- Who was consulted?

6. Formal consultation on the draft SPD

- Who did we consult?
- How did we consult?
- What happened next?

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Press Notice
- Appendix 2: List of Consultees
- Appendix 3: Table Detailed Comments and Responses
- Appendix 4: Questionnaire
- Appendix 5: Public Consultation Feedback Charts

1. Introduction

Background to the Project

The project was originally conceived in 2006 with the aim of developing new planning guidance on residential design that would support the local plan design policies of the participating Council's. Bolsover District Council, Chesterfield Borough Council and North East Derbyshire District Council shared an Urban Design Officer in a joint role, to provide design expertise to each local authority and who was assigned to take the project forward.


The core vision of the project was to prepare design guidance that would be utilised by all three participating Councils as a means of improving the quality, character and sustainability of all new residential development, across a wide contiguous area.

In 2006/07 the project began with an initial consultation concerning the scope and potential content of the guidance (see Appendix). Responses were sought from a range of consultees, including local authority officers, public agencies and community organisations. The responses were collated, but due to a change of staff in 2007 progress with the project interrupted, while the Urban Design Officer post remained vacant.

The appointment of a new officer enabled the project to be restarted in 2010, when the joint project group was re-formed with representatives from the participating local authorities and relevant Highway Authorities (see below). In addition, Bassetlaw District Council joined the partnership in 2010.

About *Successful Places*

The proposed SPD/guidance is a joint initiative between four local planning authorities (LPAs) Bassetlaw District Council (Nottinghamshire), Bolsover District Council, Chesterfield Borough Council and North East Derbyshire District Council (the participating Derbyshire authorities - see Map 1).



Map1: Area that will be covered by the SPD (shaded red)

The draft SPD will provide greater detail on policies within the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Local Plans of the participating Derbyshire Council's.

The draft document has been structured in four parts as follows:

Part 01 Introduction: Challenge and Purpose sets out the challenges and identifies the area that would be covered by the guidance, as well as how it would be used.

Part 02 Delivering Quality: The Design Process outlines the objectives and sets out a design process that requires an understanding of the local context by appraising the setting of the site and its surroundings and generating a sound design concept to create well-designed places.

Part 03 Place Making Principles: Good Urban Design Practice sets out 19 place making principles that seek to address many design issues that commonly arise with proposals for residential development.

Part 04 Management and Maintenance: Enduring Quality outlines matters relating to adoption and management of public areas to ensure that new housing has appropriate long term maintenance arrangements in place.

What is a consultation statement?

A consultation statement is a record of the consultation undertaken during the preparation stages of the SPD and at the formal public consultation stage. It explains who the consultees were, the key issues raised and how they were addressed in the final SPD.

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Statutory Instrument 2012 No. 767) includes certain requirements under Regulations 12 and 13 in respect of public participation, the submission of representations relating to the draft SPD document and making the documents available for public inspection during the period of consultation.

This includes the publication of a consultation statement alongside the document about which the local authority is seeking views, making this available at their principal offices and other appropriate places and publishing the statement on the local authority's website.

Following the current formal stage of public consultation, this statement has been updated to include the comments received during the consultation process along with details of how the local authority have responded to each matter raised.

The Project Group

A joint internal project group was established with representatives from all the participating local authorities, to direct and shape the development of the guidance. Representatives were also invited from both Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Authorities, reflecting the importance of the role of roads and streets in shaping the quality and character of residential development.

In addition, expertise was provided by an experienced independent consultant through the CABE Enabling Service. The members of this steering group are detailed below:

Partner Organisation	Officer/Representative
Lead Officer (Bolsover District Council & Chesterfield Borough Council)	Philip Smith – Senior Urban Design Officer
Bassetlaw District Council	Tom Bannister – Principal Planning Officer (Local Plans)
Bolsover District Council	Chris Doy – Development Management Manager
Chesterfield Borough Council	Paul Staniforth - Group Leader Development Management
	Scott – Senior Planning Officer (Forward Plans)
North East Derbyshire District Council	Adrian Kirkham - Planning Manager
	Bryan Harrison – Economic Development Officer
Derbyshire County Council (Highways)	Graham Hill - Principal Engineer Development Control
	Graham Fairs - Senior Project Engineer
Nottinghamshire County Council (Highways)	Martin Green, Principal Development Control Co-ordinator
Cabe Enabler/Maxim Urban Design	Graham Marshall

The Project Group has held a series of formal meetings since 2010 to develop and direct the project. The Project Group has also assisted with the progress of the project via e-mail, telephone and a number of informal meetings.

Information relating to the progression of the project has been posted on the Chesterfield Borough Council website, with links to the relevant web page from the planning pages of the participating local authority's websites.

2. Initial Consultation on the Scope of the Draft SPD

Who was consulted and how?

In 2006 an initial informal consultation took place on the proposed scope of the SPD and the accompanying sustainability appraisal (SA). A draft scoping document was consulted upon and an accompanying questionnaire sought comments on the proposed structure and content of the guidance (see Appendix).

In total approximately 140 individuals and organizations were approached on the scoping work. These included:

- *Development Control Sections (Council Employees)*
- *Building Control Sections (Council Employees)*
- *2nd & 3rd Tier Officers (Council Employees)*
- *Community Involvement Officers (Council Employees)*
- *Equalities Officers (Council Employees)*
- *District Councillors*
- *Parish Councils*
- *Chairs of Neighbourhood Partnerships (North East Derbyshire District Council)*
- *Chairs of Community Forums (Chesterfield Borough Council)*
- *Citizens Panels (Bolsover District Council)*
- *Community Strategy Representatives*
- *Key developers of major sites*
- *Organisations and people who have previously expressed an interest*

A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) consultation was also undertaken at the same time in 2006 to seek views on the scope of the SA that was to be undertaken alongside the SPD. However, subsequent changes to the Regulations governing the need for SA in conjunction with supplementary planning documents have since removed this requirement.

This amendment to the Regulations does not remove the requirement of local authorities to assess whether the project should be subject of a Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) or Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) which are governed by separate legal frameworks. These matters are addressed in section 4 (see below).

Key issues raised and how they were addressed?

The responses from received from this consultation were collated into a table. The Council's set out how they intended to respond to all the matters raised as a result of the consultation process.

As a result of this initial consultation a number of changes were brought about, including amendments to the objectives underpinning the guide. These included, adding reference to development that is adapted to Climate Change (Objective 2), reference to providing safe and secure environments (Objective 5) and the inclusion the draft SPD) an additional objective concerning accessibility (now Objective 6 page 17 of the SPD).

A full list of the comments received, the Councils response to each and the changes proposed is set out within a table of representations. This was published on the website (www.chesterfield.gov.uk/residential-design-spd).

3. Peer Review Workshop

What did we do?

A workshop was held at Westhorpe Business Innovation Centre on 8th February 2011 to debate and discuss the emerging contents of the Residential Design SPD. A series of workshops were held and presentations given to engage and inform the participants, with the aim of informing the direction and content of the draft document.

Workshop 1: Quality Streets Exercise

Groups reviewed a series 6 images of streets of differing character and listed the most appealing streets in order of preference. Salient features of the streets were also identified and discussed as a group. The aim was to establish that good design is not just a matter of subjectivity, but that common ground exists on which broad agreement can be reached on what constitutes good quality places.

Key messages

- Overwhelming consensus that certain streets were more appealing and attractive than others.
- Good quality places and design are not simply subjective as is often suggested. There can be agreement about good design, places and quality.
- The way that places are designed and 'put together' matters.
- The challenge is how the essence and quality of the places we find appealing can be captured and recreated in new situations.

Key features of popular streets identified as:

- Consistency of enclosure of the street edge/plot with a defined boundary/ edge.
- Well executed detailing and subtle variation between house types/buildings.
- Maturity and attractive personalisation of space, i.e. a bit of space to allow for individualisation.
- Built frontage - buildings defining the edges of street space.
- Trees and greenery.

Key features of unpopular streets identified as:

- Standardisation – highways and house types.
- Architectural detailing and materials in terms of functionality i.e. will it weather well? Is it robust or a future liability? Bland and crude.
- Blank frontages.
- Inward looking.

Presentation 1: The quality issue and a joint approach (Phil Smith, Urban Design Officer)

The issues of design quality were presented together with the idea of the 4 local authorities (and 2 County Highways Depts.) working collaboratively to provide consistent guidance.

Key Messages

- Collaborative/joint approach was generally endorsed.

- Consistency across a wide area seen as an advantage and a critical issue. A guide that helps provide a clear and predictable position on design issues was largely welcomed.
- Conformity without undue prescription (but which meets policy requirements).
- Consistency between both local planning authorities (LPA's) and County Highway Teams seen as essential. Where overlap occurs there should be a consistent design message from both areas of responsibility.
- Will LPA's have adequate time and skills to implement guidance? This linked to pre-application discussions with LPA's and the ability to access to planning teams at the right time.
- Consideration required about when to engage in pre-application discussions and what material needs to be provided at this stage? LPA's should also be willing to engage.
- LPA's need to be more assertive on design issues, be more explicit about they expect and reject struggling schemes where these are poor rather than continually negotiate. Otherwise this may slow down others also looking for advice.
- Endorsement of need for guidance.

Presentation 2: The development process (Richard Guise, Context 4D)

The development process diagrams were outlined as an approach in helping to:

- structure the guide.
- provide the basis of an agenda in discussions/negotiations.
- link to/provide the groundwork for the developer in preparing their design and access statement.
- cross reference to BfL criteria.

Appraising the context and the site is often overlooked or poorly done. There is a 'missing link' between the site appraisal stage and the detailed building designs. This missing stage is developing a clear design concept. This is the stage at which engaging in preliminary pre-application discussions would be effective and before time and money has been spent on more detailed design work.



Context appraisal presentation and workshop exercise

Workshop Exercise

A 'typical' site has been developed to help explain the appraisal stages and provide a narrative for the guide. Drawings show the site in its wider context and close up. Groups were asked to review these drawings and assess whether they missed any typical features commonly found that could help make them more realistic and whether they were helpful.

Key Messages

Wider context drawing:

- Would benefit from information relating to height. Ground to eaves height, not just storey heights.
- Example photo images to support the plan form, could be used to illustrate what types of places these might be like.

Site drawing:

- Services/easement could be a helpful typical addition.
- Habitats/ecological interest.
- Flood plain etc.
- Emphasise technical constraints.
- Link to cul-de-sac could be re-worked to make this more viable.
- Rights of way within adjacent development.
- Desire lines. Do rights of way match desire lines?

Who was involved?

Attendees came from both the public and private sector, including planners, architects, urban designers and those involved in the development industry. The list of delegates is set out below:

Representative	Organisation
Bryan Harrison	North East Derbyshire District Council
Allison Westray-Chapman	North East Derbyshire District Council
Phil Smith	Chesterfield Borough /Bolsover District Council
Graham Marshall	Maxim Urban Design
Scott Nicholas	Chesterfield Borough Council
Paul Staniforth	Chesterfield Borough Council
Richard Guise	Context4D
John Coleman	William Davis
Jillian Mitchell	Project Logistics Architecture
Neil Baker	Baker Barnett
Brian Harrison	Baker Barnett
Andrew Clarke	Taylor Young
David Fenton	Fentech Building Design
Roger Lomas	escape urbanists
Martin Lindley	Hallam Land Management Ltd
Stephen Haslam	Mitchell + Proctor
Tim Stubbins	Mitchell + Proctor
Nicola Howarth	DLP Planning Ltd
Tony Veitch	JVN Architecture
Chris Brown	Westleigh Developments Ltd
Russell Short	Koyanders
Officer Representative	Environment Agency
Stefan Kruczkowski	North West Leicestershire District Council

What were the outcomes?

The workshop established a consensus that the guidance would be both helpful and necessary to the industry and that achieving coverage across a number of local planning authorities the guidance would provide a 'level playing field', reducing inconsistencies between local authorities and creating and greater certainty to the development industry as to what was expected when preparing their schemes.

The structure of the guide was seen to be broadly correct and this has formed the basis of the subsequent draft. The link to the Building for Life (BfL) assessment method has also been incorporated into the guidance, by highlighting the relevant BfL questions against each place making principle.

There was a consensus that the involvement of the highway authorities was crucial to ensuring consistency between planning and highway authorities. In response to this concern, a good working relationship has developed with key officers from both Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Highway Authorities. Representatives of the Highway Authorities have been closely involved, attended project meetings and provided advice as well as important inputs into the draft document.

The site and context appraisal drawings reviewed in Workshop 2 have been amended to incorporate some of the suggested common features that arise on many schemes. While not all of the suggestions could be incorporated directly into the drawings a number of additions have been made, including:

- Photographs of the character areas to illustrate what types of places these might be like.
- Area liable to flood now included.

In addition, text accompanying the drawings details typical site constraints that may need to be addressed or incorporated within a design, in order to capture some of the other key considerations that could not all be illustrated on the drawings.

4. Internal Consultations

What did we do and what were the outcomes?

Following the peer review, an initial draft of the SPD was prepared and two rounds of internal consultation were carried out.

In April 2011 Officers of each participating local authority were consulted upon the draft SPD. The Urban Design Officer gave presentations to Planning Officers from each Council and officers were asked to review the draft guide and provide feedback.

Feedback from the local authority's raised a number of issues in respect of the accessibility of the document and omissions in terms of important design considerations that officers considered should be included in the next draft of the SPD. Some of the key suggestions included:

- Improved navigation of the document suggested;
- Greater clarification of the suggested Development Process;
- A suggested additional section addressing green and blue infrastructure;
- More information on matters relating to local distinctiveness, particularly greater discussion about the character individual areas;
- Additional content addressing how to treat development on the edges of settlements;
- Additional content addressing density;
- Additional content addressing character;
- Additional content addressing street design and the issues highway authorities are concerned with.

Following the first round of internal consultation the draft document was re-formatted from portrait to landscape format, section headings were introduced to make them more understandable and each section heading page listed the contents of that section to make it easier to find the different parts of the guide. Each section was also colour coded to differentiate the different sections and make navigating the document easier. In addition, a section on '*How to use Part 03 of this guide*' was also added to assist users of the document.

Additional sections were drafted and included in the second draft to address the matters identified above). In addition, more illustrations and photographs were added to assist with the interpretation of the guidance.

The second draft of the document was consulted upon within the Project Group in November 2011. This resulted in some further feedback, including:

- A colour coded contents page to reflect the colour coding used throughout the draft guide;
- The addition of a 'How to use this guide' section at the very beginning of the document;
- Slight re-ordering of contents (bringing forward objectives with further discussion about climate change);
- Further content concerning good design;

- Introducing a ‘Step by Step’ approach to the section on the design process and linking each step more clearly with the design process diagram (pages 24-25);

Further changes

Following the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the draft SPD was revised to reflect the changes to national planning policy.

Internal advice

Throughout the preparation of the document expertise and advice was been sought from the relevant internal officers where specific input or detail is required. These have included:

- Environmental Heath and Leisure Officers - The relationship between play areas and residential amenity;
- Highway Officers – Street Design and Adoption and Management;
- Waste Management Officers and Contractors – Servicing, bin storage and bin carrying distances and refuse collection vehicle sizes.
- Development Management Officer – Privacy/day lighting and residential amenity requirements.

5. Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment

What is a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

An SEA is an environmental report that is prepared to identify the significant effects of a draft plan or programme. It involves carrying out consultation on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report and taking into account the environmental report and the results of consultation in decision making.

The need for an SEA is a requirement of the European Directive 2001/42/EC (SEA Directive). This Directive was converted into UK law by The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations). This places an obligation on local authorities to undertake a SEA on any plan or programme prepared for town and country planning or land use purposes and which sets the framework for future development consent of certain projects.

Is a SEA required?

When considering whether an SEA is required, the first step is to carry out a screening assessment to determine whether or not the draft SPD/Guidance are likely to have “significant environmental effects”. If so, it would trigger the need for a full Strategic Environmental Assessment in accordance with the European SEA Directive (2001) and associated the SEA Regulations (2004).

A screening report was been prepared and made available for inspection on the website (www.chesterfield.gov.uk/residential-design-spd). The report concluded that draft SPD/Guidance would not be likely to have significant environmental effects and therefore does not trigger a need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment.

What is a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)

A HRA is an assessment of a plan or project to determine whether would have a harmful impact on a ‘designated site’ (protected habitats of national or international importance).

When considering whether an HRA is required, the first step is to carry out a screening assessment to determine whether or not the draft SPD/Guidance are likely to have a harmful impact on a designated site. If so, it would trigger the need for a full Appropriate Assessment (AA).

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (commonly referred to as the ‘Habitats Regulations’) places a requirement on local authorities to assess the impact of their plans or projects on sites of European significance. Land use plans must be subject to Appropriate Assessment (AA) where they might have a significant effect on a Natura 2000 site (these are commonly known as Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and RAMSAR sites).

The assessment is to ensure that any significant effects are identified and that a subsequent Appropriate Assessment is undertaken would consider the likelihood of harm and have full regard how these can be mitigated by measures in the plan.

Is a SEA required?

In order to determine whether an Appropriate Assessment was required, a screening assessment was undertaken to determine whether the draft SPD/Guidance would be likely to have a significant effect on sites protected under the Habitats Regulations.

A screening report was been prepared and made available for inspection on the website (www.chesterfield.gov.uk/residential-design-spd). This concluded that the guidance was not likely to have a significant effect on the designated sites considered as part of this assessment. As such a full Appropriate Assessment is not required.

Who was consulted?

The three statutory consultation bodies, Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency were consulted on both the HRA and EIA Screening Reports and given 5 weeks to submit responses. No objections were raised concerning their conclusions. These organisations will also be formally consulted as part of the wider public consultation and the screening reports updated as required.

6. Formal consultation on the draft SPD

Who did we consult?

A period for formal public consultation was undertaken in the Autumn 2012 in order to seek views on the draft SPD document, *Successful Places*.

The consultation was co-ordinated by Chesterfield Borough Council (CBC) on behalf of all the partner local authorities to reduce unnecessary duplication and expense. In addition to the consultation letters and emails sent by Chesterfield Borough Council, the partners also wrote to their own parish and town council's, as well as a number of organisations and individuals on their own consultation lists. The consultation ran for a period of 6 weeks between Monday 25th October and Monday 26th November 2012.

Core project information and documents were hosted on the CBC website, and letters and emails sent out by CBC to professionals and organisations operating within each local authority area. As indicated above, each individual local authority undertook its own steps to notify Parish Councils and other locally specific consultees directly about the project and consultation advising that any responses should be directed to CBC.

The proposed guidance seeks to influence the design of residential development with the aim of achieving more sustainable, better quality homes and places. As such, the guidance is directed towards the house building industry, architects, designers and other built environment professionals involved in the commissioning, design and layout of housing schemes. It is also intended to assist local authority officers and decision makers when negotiating with applicants.

The guidance therefore has a professional audience which was canvassed for their views. We wrote to developers, architects, agents and builders to tell them about this consultation, where they could find the information and how to respond.

In addition to the professional development related industry, the draft SPD will also be of interest to a range of community based organisations as well as individuals who may have an interest or become involved with proposals for housing development. The guidance will therefore also have a broader public interest.

The public consultation was structured to try and reach these audiences.

How did we consult?

Direct notification

Given the wide geographical area that would be covered by the SPD and the range of both professional and community interests, likely interested parties have been notified about the consultation in writing, either by letter or email.

Letters and questionnaires were sent out, complete with a pre-paid self addressed reply envelope to encourage recipients to reply.

In addition, emails were also sent containing details about the consultation, together with an electronic copy of the letter and accompanying questionnaire.

Contacts were drawn from the consultation databases of the participating Council's and the agents and developers identified as having submitted applications within the Chesterfield Borough within the preceding four years.

The list of those contacted directly as part of the formal public consultation process is set out in Appendix 2 (List of Consultees).

Press Notice

A press notice was issued and arranged to appear within all relevant newspapers with local circulation covering each of the local authority areas. A copy of the press notice can be seen in Appendix 1.

The press notice appeared in the following publications:

- Alftreton Chad
- Derbyshire Times
- Mansfield Chad
- Worksop Guardian

Press Release

A joint press release was been published and circulated to local press to notify them and help publicise the project and the period of public consultation.

Raising Awareness

In the lead up to the start of the public consultation, officers attended the meetings of a number of local groups to advise them of the draft SPD, tell them about the public consultation and how they can get involved. The following groups were addressed:

13 th September 2012	50 Plus Forum at Chesterfield Town Hall
14 th September 2012	Local Equalities Panel, Sherwood Lodge, Bolsover
09 th October 2012	Bolsover Youth Council, Sherwood Lodge, Bolsover
29 th November 2012	Chesterfield & North East Derbyshire Pensioners Association.

Short presentations were given to each group to explain about the project and advise them of the dates of forthcoming public consultation dates and where they will be able to find copies of the document and associated information about the project. Leaflets containing information about the website and the consultation were distributed at each event (see below).

The Youth Council event was held in Bolsover Council Chamber and in addition to explaining about the draft guide and consultation a short workshop exercise was run (similar to that run at the Peer Review in February 2011) to demonstrate the range of streets and variations in quality and character of different places. A scoring matrix was used to collate the responses and the findings prompted discussions about why groups had rated certain streets as good or poor quality places (see below).

It was explained that, ultimately, the objective of the guidance is help improve the quality of new development, so that we achieve more examples of the better quality places and avoid creating more of the poor examples.

Public Consultation

**Successful Places:
 A Guide to Sustainable Housing Layout
 and Design**

*Interim Supplementary Planning Document
 for Public Consultation*

*This draft guidance sets out the principles that
 will help deliver better quality housing*

**"TELL US WHAT YOU
 THINK"**

From: **15th October** To: **26th November 2012**

View the document and questionnaire at your
 council office, local library or online at:
www.chesterfield.gov.uk/Residential-Design-SPD

Email your comments to:
forward.planning@chesterfield.gov.uk

or write to:
**Forward Planning, Planning Services,
 Town Hall, Rose Hill, Chesterfield, S40 1LP**

	FEED BACK	TIPS	BOYS	SPUR WORDS	HERITAGE	SKILL
A	1	3	3	1	1	✓2
B	4	8	5	6	4	×5
C	2	4	2	2	3	✓3
D	6	1	4	5	2	1?
E	5	6	6	4	6	×6
F	3	2	1	3	5	4

An example of the information leaflet distributed at each awareness raising event

Scoring matrix results from Youth Council workshop exercise

What happened next?

The formal period of public consultation closed on the 26th November 2012, after which all the responses were be analysed and collated. This statement of consultation has been updated to reflect the comments received through the formal consultation stage.

A table was prepared setting out all the comments received, our response to each issue raised and whether it has resulted in a change to the draft document. Interested parties will be notified at the appropriate stage. The Table of Detailed Comments and Responses is set out in Appendix 3.

The draft SPD has been reviewed and amended in light of the comments and recommended changes. It will then be brought before each Council for adoption and respondents will be notified where they have requested to be kept informed.

Appendix 1: Press Notice

**CHESTERFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
BOLSOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL
NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
BASSETLAW DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004
Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012**

**SUCCESSFUL PLACES: A GUIDE TO SUSTAINABLE LAYOUT AND DESIGN
- INTERIM SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

The above Councils are consulting on a draft of the above document that provides detailed guidance on the implementation of certain saved policies in the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy (adopted 2011), Bolsover District Local Plan (2000), Replacement Chesterfield Local Plan (2006) and North East Derbyshire Local Plan (2005) in relation to the layout and design of new housing development. The document covers the whole administrative area of all four participating local authorities.

The draft document will be subject to a six week consultation period from **Monday 15th October to Monday 26th November 2012**. Chesterfield Borough Council is managing the consultation on behalf of all four participating local authorities.

Copies of the draft SPD, questionnaire response form, sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations reports are available to view and download at Chesterfield Borough Council's website at: www.chesterfield.gov.uk/Residential-Design-SPD

Copies of the draft SPD document and questionnaire forms are also available for public inspection at the Councils offices listed below:

Place:	Days/times
Bassetlaw District Council, Queens Buildings, Potter Street, Worksop, Notts, S80 2AH	Mon to Fri: 9am - 5pm
Retford Office, 17B The Square, Retford, Notts, DN22 6DB	Mon to Fri: 8:40am - 5pm
Bolsover District Council, Sherwood Lodge, Bolsover. S44 6NF	Mon to Fri: 9am - 5pm
Clowne Contact Centre, 9 Church Street, Clowne, S43 4JR	Mon to Fri: 9am - 5pm
Shirebrook Contact Centre, 2A Main Street, Shirebrook, NG20 8AW	Mon to Fri: 9am - 5pm
South Normanton Contact Centre, The Hub, Shiners Way, South Normanton, DE55 2AA	Mon to Fri: 9am - 5pm
Chesterfield Borough Council, Town Hall, Rose Hill, Chesterfield, S40 1LP	Mon to Thurs: 8.30am - 5pm Fridays: 8.30am - 4.30pm
Staveley Area Housing Office, High Street, Staveley, S43 3UX	Mon to Fri: 08.30 - 5pm (closed between 1-2pm daily)
North East Derbyshire District Council Office, Council House, Saltergate, Chesterfield, S40 1LF	Mon to Thurs: 8.30am - 5pm Fridays 8.30am - 4.30pm
Clay Cross Housing Office, Market Street, Clay Cross, S45 9JE	Mon to Fri: 9am - 4pm (Weds office closes 2pm)
Dronfield Housing Office, High Street, Dronfield, S18 1PD	Mon to Fri: 8.30am - 5pm
Eckington Housing Office, Gosber Street, Eckington, S21 4DA	Mon to Fri: 9am - 4pm (Weds office closes 2 pm)
Killamarsh Housing Office, Stanley Street, Killamarsh, S21 1EL	Mon to Tues: 9am - 2pm Weds: Closed all day Thurs to Fri: 9am - 4pm
North Wingfield Housing Office, North Wingfield Community Resource Centre, Whiteleas Avenue, North Wingfield, S42 5PW	Mon to Fri: 9am - 4pm

In addition, the draft SPD document can also be inspected at all public libraries within each of the participating local authority areas. A full list of locations where the documents can be inspected together with their opening times is available on the website.

Comments can be made via:

Email: forward.planning@chesterfield.gov.uk

Post or by hand: Forward Planning, Chesterfield Borough Council, Town Hall, Chesterfield, S40 1LP

Fax: 01246 345809 (marked for the attention of Forward Planning)

Representations should be received before the **26th November 2012**.

Any representations received after this date may not be able to be taken into account.

H. Bowen

On behalf of Chesterfield Borough Council

Appendix 2: List of Consultees

Appendix 2 – List of Consultees

Organisation	Contact
Basstlaw District Council	
20 Society	
AB UK	P Kerr
Acis group	N Thornton
Acis Group	P Wisher
Adlington Care for older people	K Waters
ADS (Scunthorpe) Ltd,	A Cheffings
Aldergate Property Group	W Scholter
Allan Joyce Architects	A Joy
Alliance Environment & Planning Ltd	H Hudson
Alyson Linnegar Planning Consultancy	A Linnegar
Ancient Monuments Society	
Andrew Martin Associates	D Peck
Anglian Water	J Dean
Anglian Water	
Antony Aspbury Associates	M Aspbury
Appletree Homes Ltd	N Small
B & L M Kent & Sons	R Kent
Barratt Homes	J Sutton
Barton Willmore LLP	N Traverse-Healey
Baslidon Council	M Winslow
Bassetlaw PCT	J Walker
Bassetlaw Play Forum	D Badger
BCVS	
Bedford Stainless Engineering	J Cooke
Bolsover District Council	A Rhodes
Bramall Construction	C Bradbury
Bridgend	L Stevens
Brimble, Lea and Partners	J Montgomery
British Waterways	I Dickinson
Broadleigh Associates Limited	A Barratt
Brown and Co	J Baguley
BSP Consulting	T Bowey
Building Link Design	D Roe
Campaign for Real Ale Ltd	J Mail
CBRE	J Reilly
CGMS	C Telford
Chesterfield Canal Partnership	S Reaney
Chesterton Humberts	J Ester
Civic Trust	
Coal Authority	R Bust
Community Engagement Consultants	J Garrett
Conservator Forestry Commission- East Midlands Conservancy	A Brady
Consort Homes	G Owens
CPRE	L Hopkinson
CPS Leisure Limited	
David Smith Planning	D Smith
David Wilson Estates	P Martin
Derbyshire Council Council	C Massey
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	A Rue
Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	D Kitson
DHA Planning	J Buckwell
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	J Johnson

DPDS Consulting Group	D Bowyer
DPP	R Ford
Drevery and Wheeldon	I Willows
Drivers Jonas	M Meadows
Drivers Jonas Deloitte	B Simpson
DTZ	C Davies
E Blagg (and sons)	E Blagg
East Midlands Airport	J Hockley
Energy Review	T Garnett
English Nature	N Tribe
Entec UK	D Holdstock
Environment Agency	N Doughty
F Walter & Sons Ltd	A Walter
Fairhurst	K Brown
First City	A Watkiss
Firstplan	K Matthews
Firth Partnership	G Firth
Fisher German	M Stacey
Focus on Young People in Bassetlaw (FOYPIB)	V Rawson
Forestry GSI	F GSI
FPD Savills	A Pearce
Framework Housing Association	A Redfern
Framptons Planning	P Frampton
Friends, families and Travellers	S Staines
Fusion Online Ltd	A Scott
Gaiteboards	D Fulwood
Garden History Society	G Society
Georgian Group	G Group
Gladman Developments Ltd	C Still
Globe Limited	G Planning
Grovevill	
GVA Griley Ltd	Kirby
Hallam Land Management Ltd	R Walters
Hammans Associates Limited	H Thorton
Health and Safety Executive	N James
Heaton Planning	J Conway
Highways Agency	O Walters
Ian Basley Associates	N Basley
Indigo Planning	S Grundy
Jackson Design Associates Ltd	L Fleet
JAS Martin	
JH Walter	T Atkinson
Jones and Co Solicitors	M Sharp
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd	J Hodson
Kilton Golf Club	B Wiggett
Knight Frank LLP	L O'Dea
Lafarge Aggregated Limited	D Atkinson
Lambert Smith Hampton	T McAteer
Land Improvement Holdings	K Turner
LDP Planning	A Korzonek
Line One	M Wood
Loveden Estates Ltd	J Brown
Mansfield DC	
Manton Neighbourhood Manager	R Edwards
Marrons	J Gardner
Martin Hubbard Associates	M Hubbard
Mc Inerney Homes Yorkshire	
Merry Vale Development	D Brown

Miller Strategic Land	V Cole
Mobilshop.com Limited	F Atkinson
Nai Fuller Peiser	A Willis
National Farmers Union	P Tame
National Trust	A Hubbard
Natural England	
nbpt	
Newark and Sherwood District Council	
North Kesteven DC	A Steer
Nottingham Community Housing Association	J Wilson
Nottinghamshire County Council	
Nottinghamshire Local History Association	D Walker
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	P Learoyd
Notts CC Play	A Ward
Oakbourne Investments Ltd	T Layhe
Omnivale Limited	A Bisson
PBC	T Garnett
Peacock and Smith	S Worthington
Peel Airports Limited	S Gaines
Pegasus Planning	G Longley
Persimmon Homes	J Abbott
Phoenix Planning	P Money
Planit-X Town & Country Planning Services Ltd	C Wilkinson
Planning Potential ltd	K Sewell
Play England	C Lissaman
Play Nottinghamshire	M Bentley
Quantum Constructions Services Limited	D Warren
Rapleys	A Pharoah
Retford Civic Society	B Barnett
Rhubarb Farm	J Street
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	A Duncan
Rotherham Sand and Gravel Co. Ltd.	N Scholey
Savills	R Serra
Savills Ltd	A Galloway
Sennett Brown Limited	D Brown
Severn Trent Water	P Davies
Shuldham Calverley	T Shuldham
Signet Planning LTD	J Hobson
Smith Stuart Reynolds	L Stones
Smiths Gore	J Bailey
Spawforths	K Mistry
Strutt and Parker	M Collison
Sure Start Children Centres	S Penn
Tarmac Ltd	N Beards
Taylor Wimpy	A Roberts
The Ministry of Justice	Hopkins
The Planning Bureau	Z Thomas
The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain	M Mellor
The Taylor Trustees	L Hudson
Turley Associates	S Louth
Tuxford Academy	G Lloyd
Victorian Society	
Vincent Gorbing	D Rixon
Wagstaff Homes	P Wagstaff
Water Lane Allotments	M Williams
Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	G Robinson
Westdale Services Limited	
Westdale Services Limited Westdale Services Limited	

William Davis Ltd	R Jays
Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc	
Worksop Golf club	S Webster
WRAG	A Birch
WYG	C Palmer
Wynbrook Homes Limited	

Bassetlaw District Council: Parish Council's

Babworth Parish Council	
Barnby Moor Parish Council	
Beckingham-cum-Saundby Parish Council	
Blyth Parish Council	
Bothamsall Parish Council	
Carlton In Lindrick Parish Council	
Clarborough and Welham Parish Council	
Clayworth Parish Council	
Cuckney Parish Council	
Dunham-on-Trent with Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	
East Drayton Parish Council	
East Markham Parish Council	
Elkesley Parish Council	
Everton Parish Council	
Gamston, West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	
Gringley-on-the Hill Parish Council,	
Harworth/Bircotes Town Council,	
Hayton Parish Council	
Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council	
Hodsock Parish Council	
Holbeck and Welbeck Parish Council	
Laneham Parish Council	
Lound Parish Council	
Markham Clinton Parish Council	
Mattersey Parish Council	
Misson Parish Council	
Misterton Parish Council	
Nether Langwith Parish Council	
Normanton-on-Trent with Marnham Parish Council	
North Leverton with Habbleshthorpe Parish Council	
North and South Wheatley Parish Council	
Rampton Parish Council	
Ranskill Parish council	
Rhodesia Parish Council	
Scrooby Parish Council	
Shireoaks Parish Council	
South Leverton Parish Council	
Sturton le Steeple Parish Council	
Styrrup-with-Oldcotes Parish Council	
Sutton Parish Council	
Torworth Parish Council	
Treswell with Cottam Parish Council	
Tuxford Town Council	
Walkeringham Parish Council	
West Stockwith Parish Council	

Bassetlaw District Council:

Individuals with a registered interest in planning	683
--	-----

Bolsover District Council	
	R Bayes
Access Bolsover - Survey Officer	K Willis
Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd.	
Adams Homes Associates	S Philpott
Adrian Russell Associates	A Russell
Advance Land and Planning Ltd.	A Williams
Age Concern	
Alzheimer's Soc.	
Alzheimer's Society	
Amber Pass Ltd	S Pass
Anderson Partnership	N Robinson
Andrew Thomas Plans	
Antony Aspbury Associates Ltd	M Downes
AP Building Design	A Pearson
ARC	
Architectural Designs	G Clay
Atkinson Builders & Contractors	D Atkinson
Barton Willmore Planning	K Ventham
BEAP	
Ben Bailey Homes (Yorkshire)	
Bi Design Architecture	D Buttrill
Bilton Hammond Solicitors	M Bilton
Bolsover Civic Society	B Haigh
Bolsover Older Peoples Forum	J Griffiths
Bond Pearce	S Holmes
Bovis Homes Ltd.	B Herrod
Boyer Planning	C Wilmhurst
Brian Barber Associates	K Tate
Brodies W S	N Collar
Brown & Co	T Silcock
Brownill Vickers Ltd.	R Curtis
Bryan J Frewin MRTPI	B Frewin
c/o Gill Pawson Planning	P Leverton
CAMTAD	
Cannane Town Planning	S Kirkpatrick
Carlton Design Associates Ltd	S Lammiman
Carter Jonas	D Boulton
CDR	R Watson
Chapman Brothers Ltd	I Chapman
Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	W Kemp
Chesterfield & District MS Society	
Chesterfield Filipino Community Assoc	
Chesterfield Samaritans	
Chesterfield Volunteers Centre	
Chetwood Planning	S Baker
Chris Cave Consulting	C Cave
Christian Centre	A Pell
Cicada Land & Property Investments	D Aris
Cliff Walsingham &Co	F Lloyd-Jones
Clive Keble Consulting Ltd	C Keble
Clowne & Barlborough Walking For Health Group	R Spencer
Clowne And District Community Transport	J Meads
Clowne Community Association	B Young
Clowne Old Age Pensioners Association	E Rusby
Clowne Wildlife Group	N Machen

Cluttons LLP	
Colin Buchanan & Partners	M Twigg
Colliers International UK PLC.	A Pyrke
Community & Voluntary Partners	L Wallace
Conway Land Management	A Thomas
Copelands	R Smith
Country and Metropolitan Homes	
Country Land & Business Association	M Coe
CPRE	M Hicken
Crest Homes Limited	M Jones
D Huckle & Son Building Contractors	
D P S Consulting	D Bowyer
David L Walker Chartered Surveyors	N Brooke
DCIL	
Derby & Derbyshire Race & Equality Commission	
Derbyshire Assoc for the Blind	
Derbyshire Carers	
Derbyshire Constabulary - Designing out Crime	K Beswick
Derbyshire Estates	S Pass
Derbyshire Federation of Women's Institutes	
Derbyshire Friend	
Derbyshire Sexual Health Promotion Service	
Derbyshire Unemployed Workers Centre	
Derek Lovejoy Partnership	A Postlethwaite
DLP (Planning) Ltd	N Howarth
DORA	
DPDS Consulting	C Lindley
DPP Ltd.	C Whittaker
DUWC	
East Midlands Development Ltd	J Rye
East Midlands Housing Association	A Daykin
Edge & Ellison	C Towner
Elmton Community Association	A Davies
Elmton With Creswell Village Forum Community Association	L Clifford
EMAC	
Enable Housing Association	
English Churches Housing Group	
ENTEC	J Hall
Fairhurst	K Halliday
Fairhurst Consulting Engineers	J White
Fisher German Chartered Surveyors	I Calverley
Fitzwise Ltd	C Ballam
Foster Bilton and Co. Solicitors	
FPCR Environment and Design Ltd.	T Jackson
Framptons	L Cusdin
Frank Haslam Milan Ltd.	N Jones
Frank Shaw Associates	C Dowson
Fred Webster Builders	
Freeth Cartwright LLP	C Waumsley
Friends of the Earth	C James
George Shipman & Son Ltd	
George Wimpey Homes	
Gerald Eve	E Powell
Gleeson Homes Northern	M Baxter
Grimley	J Young
GVA Grimley	D Cutler
Hallam Land Management	P Burton

Hallam Land Management	R Walters
Hammond Siddards Edge Solicitors	M Walker
Hammond Suddards	
Harworth Estates	A Murray
Healey & Baker	B Raven
Heaton Planning Ltd	S Heaton
Hepburn Owens	
Higham & Co.	A Mealing
Hodthorpe Community Association	D Potts
Holmes Antill	B Holmes
Home Builders Federation	H Mawson
Homes and Communities Agency	A Barker
Home-Start (Bolsover & Clay Cross)	
Howard Sharp and Partners	M Barnesy
Hunter Page Planning Ltd	G Wakefield
Hyder Consulting	A Hepworth
Ian Baseley Associates	R Fletcher
Ian Hewitt Associates	I Hewitt
IG Land & Planning	I Gidley
IMC	R Green
Indigo Planning	K Girling
Isherwood McCann	D Isherwood
Jackson Design Associates	D Turner
James Barr Consultants Ltd	S Cameron
JMW Planning Ltd.	J Wren
John Church Planning & Development Consultant	J Church
John German Chartered Surveyors	A Thomas
jrp associates	L Mephram
JVH Town Planning Consultants	E Cratchley
JVN Architecture Ltd.	T Jenkins
Keepmoat Homes	
Koyander Architects Ltd.	R Short
L Healey – Special interest in housing design for vulnerable and disabled people	L Healey
Lambert Smith Hampton	B Huckerby
Land and New Homes Area Director	S Thrower
Land Use Consultants	
Latham Associates	J Phipps
Leicester Housing Association	
Leith Planning Ltd	R Booth
LHA The New Housing & Regeneration Agency	Mr Luan
LINKS	
Local Planning Group	
M G Harrison FRICS	M Harrison
Marrons Solicitors	
Mather Jamie	R Cole
McDyre & Co	G R Bridge
Merriman Ltd.	P Sutton
Metropolitan Housing Trust (SPIRITA)	
Michael Yeo MCIAT	M Yeo
Mike Worthy & Associates	M Worthy
Mitchell Proctor & Partners	T Stubbins
N Derbyshire Alcohol Advisory Service	
N Derbyshire Domestic Abuse Action Group	
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	J Hill
Neil Boddison Associates Ltd	N Boddison
Newlands Property	S Jackson
Noble Estates	G Clarke

North Country Homes Ltd	
North Derbyshire CAB	
Northern Counties Housing Association	
Northern Trust	S Caldwell
NVDA	
Oldfield King Planning	
Our Vision Our Future	
Over 50s Forum	
Over 50s Forum	
Parker Design Associates Ltd	G Parker
Paul Butler Associates	P Butler
Peacock & Smith	M Eagland
Peter Wigglesworth Planning Ltd	P Wigglesworth
Pinfold Securities Ltd.	S Jones
Pinsent Masons LLP	E Bennett
Places for People Housing Association	
Planning Issues Ltd.	N Fisher
Planning Potential Ltd.	C Boyes
Planning Precision Ltd	P King
Portford Homes	P Colebrook
Property Intelligence	A Hollingsworth
Purearth plc	P Barringer
Radleigh Homes	A Galloway
Rapleys	A Murphy
Redrow Homes	J Acres
Relate	
Rippon Homes	M Payne
Robert Turley Associates	R Purser
Robin Ashley Architects	P Ashley
Royal Estates	R Manrot
RPS Group Plc.	J Standen
RPS Group Plc.	C Simkins
Sanderson Weatherall	
Savills plc.	
Shoosmiths	M Woody
Signet Planning	J Hobson
Smith Stuart Reynolds	S Smith
Smiths Gore	J Hadland
SNAP Development Group	
Sol Homes	S Torrington
South Yorkshire Housing Association	
Spaven Ltd	B Kitts
Spawforth Planning Associates	P Bedwell
SPODA	
Standen Homes Holdings Ltd	Standen Homes
Strata Homes	J England
Strutt & Parker	C Noel
Studikraft	C Brown
T & G Architectural Services Ltd	I Goodwin
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	A Roberts
Terence O'Rourke Ltd.	S Beale
The National Trust	A Hubbard
The Planning Bureau Ltd.	A Jackson
Townsend Planning Consultants	M Townsend
Trident Housing Association	
TTL Developments Ltd.	L Burgin
W A Barnes LLP	
W.T Frow & Son	J Gregory

Walker Morris Solicitors	
Waystone Limited	H McLoughlin
Welbeck Estates	R Green
Wellbourne Developments	
Wellbro' Developments Ltd.	M Fretwell
Westleigh Developments Ltd.	M Moore
Whelmar Homes Limited	J Harrison
Wilkins Vardy Residential	D Hunt
William Davis Ltd.	J Coleman
Wilson & Company	T Wilson
WJ Blagg & Son	A Blagg
WJ Parker	A Foster
WYG Group	D Hunter
Young & Pearce	

Bolsover District Council: Parish Council's	
Ault Hucknall Parish Council	Clerk To Ault Hucknall Parish Council
Barlborough Parish Council	Clerk To Barlborough Parish Council
Clowne Parish Council	Parish Clerk
Elmton With Creswell Parish Council	Parish Clerk
Glapwell Parish Council	Parish Clerk
Hodthorpe and Belp Parish Council	Parish Clerk
Old Bolsover Town Council	Town Clerk
Pinxton Parish Council	Parish Clerk
Pleasley Parish Council	Parish Clerk
Scarcliffe Parish Council	Parish Clerk
Shirebrook Town Council	Town Clerk
South Normanton Parish Council	Parish Clerk
Tibshelf Parish Council	The Clerk to the Council
Whitwell Parish Council	Parish Clerk

Chesterfield Borough Council	
2H Architecture	
A P Wright Construction	
A1 Housing	J Richards
AA2L Limited	A Bailey
Ace Developments (Chesterfield)Ltd	
ACIS	
Ackroyd & Abbott	J Turner
Acorn Christian Ministries	M Evans
ACS Architectural CAD Services	M Novell
Aedas Building Surveying	D Proctor
African Caribbean Community Association	
Age Concern (Chesterfield & District)	
Age UK Derbyshire	K Pugh
AIM Property Investments	
AJA Architects	J Peck
Alfred Jones (Warrington) Ltd	
Alfred McAlpine Capital Projects	Woodford c/o HOW Planning
Alfred McAlpine Homes	J Thiede
Alliance Planning	G Sweeney
Alliance Planning	
Allotment Association	
Alyn Nicholls & Associates	

Amber Valley Borough Council	
Amblers Estate Agents	
Anchor Trust	T Damm
Ancient Monument Society	
Andrew Granger and Co	J Welch
Andy Cudworth Architecture	A Cudworth
Anthony Short and Partners Architects	S Harris
ARC Aassociation for Real Change	Y Furze
Architect	J Brabban
Architectural Design Studio	A Jenkins
Architectural Property Planning and Design	A Cresswell
Architek Designs Ltd	G Holmwood
Area Manager	
Armstrong Burton Architects	C Chaplin
Armstrong Burton Planning	
Ash Design Services (Matlock) Ltd	P Bartle
Ashfield District Council	
Ashton Associates Ltd	F Gratton
Asian Association Chesterfield (NED) Secretary	N Rastogi
Assent Planning	A Rushley
AT CAD Draughting Services	A Thomas
Atkins	J Clayton
Avocet Design Associates	P Oldfield
Axis Architecture and Design Management	L Simmonite
B H Developments Limited	
B3 Architects	
Baker Barnett	
Bakewell and Partners	S Heathcote
Barbara Bowman Architect	B Bowman
Bardill Barnard Surveyors	
Barnett and Burgin Architectural Design	M Burgin
Barratt Homes North Midlands	H Broadhurst
Barratt Homes North Midlands	M Jones
Barratt North Midlands	C Oxley
Barrow Hill & Whittington Community Forum	B Bingham
Barton Willmore LLP	V Ryan
Barton Wilmore	A Bower
BDCS	A Tingle
BDN Limited	G Ward
Beam	J Kelly
Beaumont and Cowling	F Moss
Beaumont and Cowling	J Holmes
Bell Associates	
Bentley Durose	M Bentley
Berrys	L Clements
Birchall Properties Ltd	
Birkett Cole Lowe Architects	N Cole
Black and Veatch	R Kelly
Bloor Homes, JS Bloor (Services) Ltd	
Blue Deer Limited	
BM3 Architecture Limited	Z Khan
Bmd Architects	D Farage
Bolsover and Staveley Methodist Circuit	
Bolsover District - Landlord Services	D Bonsor
Bond Bryan Architects	B Raw
Bothams Mitchell Slaney	A J Terry

Boyce Associates	R Grundy
Bradbury Hall Developments	
Brampton Manor Recreation Ltd	
Brayshaw Harrison Partnership	B Harrison
Brimington & Barrow Hill Methodist Church	Rev G Robertson
Brimington & Tupton Community Forum	M Hicken
British Horse Society	J Benest
British Rail Property Board	
British Telecom	
British Wind Energy Association	K Adderly
Brooke Architecture	M Brooke
Brooker Flynn Architects	R Bodhani
Browne Jacobson LLP	
Bryan Wolsey (Planning) Ltd	B Wolssey
Building Design Consultancy	D Formon
Building Link Design	C Jubb
Building Logistics	A Witham
Business Development Manager	H Maitland
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)	L Hopkinson
Carey Jones Architects	M Harris
CBP Architects	T Gu
Central Networks plc	c/o DTZ Piedad Consulting
Cerda Planning	V Lane
Chadwick Properties Ltd	
Chandlers Building Surveyors	G Fountain
Chesterfield & District Branch Ms Society	
Chesterfield & NE Derbyshire Pensioners Action Association	C Philpot
Chesterfield & North Derbyshire NHS Trust	A Jones
Chesterfield 50+ Forum	V Webster
Chesterfield Action for Access	D Langan
Chesterfield and District Civic Society	P Whiteley
Chesterfield and North East Derbyshire Ramblers Association	B Merry
Chesterfield Area Regeneration Team	S Reader
Chesterfield Astronomical Society	R Gasser
Chesterfield BC Landlord Service	A Craig
Chesterfield Borough Council	R Farrand
Chesterfield Canal Partnership	J S Reaney
Chesterfield Canal Trust	R Auton
Chesterfield Canal Trust	R Stonebridge
Chesterfield Care Group	J Parsons
Chesterfield Central Area Community Association	H Ward
Chesterfield College	M Thackery
Chesterfield College	
Chesterfield Cycle Campaign	A Meikle
Chesterfield Gospel Trust	R Smith
Chesterfield Gospel Trust	A Rowles
Chesterfield Muslim Association	Deen & Da Awah Centre
Chesterfield Muslim Welfare Association	
Chesterfield Primary Care Trust Estates	H Wardle Capital & Estate Development Manager
Chesterfield Royal Hospital NHS	

Chesterfield RUFC	I Baker c/o Opus Outsourcing
Chesterfield Walk This Way	J Conner, c/o Poolsbrook Country Park
Chesterfield Waterside Ltd	
Chevin Housing Group	
Chinese Association	T Wong
Chinese Community Association Secretary	M Cowen
Chris Carr Associates	C Carr
Chris Gothard Associates	M Bailey
Chris Wait and Associates	C Wait
Church Commissioners For England	R Wheeler c/o Smiths Gore Chartered Surveyors
Churchway Homes	D Hadfield
Churchway Homes Limited	
Civic Voice	I Harvey
Cliff Walsingham and Company	
Clifton Fenton Associates	D Fenton
Coda Studios	M Bowker
Colliers International	C Day
Commission For Racial Equality	P Oteng
Common and Garden Properties Limited	
Community of Reservoir Terrace and Prospect Terrace	M Tomasz
Complete Technical Services	C Booth
Corr Design Limited	N Corr
Corus UK Ltd. - Property Department	Peters
Council For The Protection Of Rural England	T Ingram
Covidien Mallinckrodt Chemicals	D Hagg
CPR Developments	
CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire Branch	J Spottiswood
Crown Estates Commissioners	Crown Estate Office
Crystal Design and Developments Limited	S Jones
D H Builders	
D J Deloitte	F Brereton
D Walsham Design	D Walsham
Dales Housing	
DAS Building Design Services	D Savage
David P Formon Building Design Consultancy Limited	D Forman
David Parsons Associates	
David Wilson Homes North Midlands	
Department for Transport	M Moseley
Derbys & Notts Chamber Of Commerce	
Derbyshire & Peak District Transport 2000	W Carey
Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce	N Arbon
Derbyshire Archaeological Society	B Foster
Derbyshire Coalition For Inclusive Living	C Holmes
Derbyshire Community Health Services (DCHS)	
Derbyshire Constabulary	Estates Services Police HQ
Derbyshire County Council	I Stephenson
Derbyshire Dales District Council	P Wilson
Derbyshire Economic Partnership	A Sharman
Derbyshire Fire & Rescue Service	
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	S Spencer
Derbyshire Historic Buildings Trust	A Hambleton
Derbyshire Urban Studies Centre	G Cass
Derbyshire Wildlife Trust	N Law
Derek Trowell Architects	D Trowell
Derwent Living Housing Association	
Design Kitts Ltd	J Kitts
Design Services	

Development Planning Partnership	
Diamond Builders Limited	
Dovetail Architects	S Finnis
Dowling Homes Limited	
Dr Wickham MRTPI FRICS	Dr R. Wickham
Drivers Jonas Deloitte	
DTZ Piedad Consulting	M Jackson
Duncan Thorpe Design Ltd	
Dunston Community Group	L Shore
Dunston Moor & St Helens Community Forum	C Smedely
Dunston Residents Action Group	J Charter
Dykes Associates Architects	P Goldsworthy
E Austin, Planning and Building Services	
E C Harris	C Lane
e*SCAPE urbanists	R Lomas
East Midlands Councils	
East Midlands Electricity Plc	M Jackson
East Midlands Housing	
East Midlands Housing Association	
East Midlands Planning Aid Service	H Metcalfe
East Midlands Strategic Health Authority	
Ellis Riley & Son	S Riley
Enable Housing Association	
England Design Services	K England
Environment Agency	C Storr
Equity Housing Group	
Erewash Borough Council	
Eximius Design and Consulting Limited	A McBain
Extend Design and Build Limited	S Jones
F G Sissons (Chesterfield) Ltd	P Benson
Fantom Properties	
Fastdraft Ltd	G Edwards
Fentech Building Design	D Fenton
FFT Planning Friends	S Staines
Firstplan	K Matthews
Fitzwise Ltd	
Fletcher King Howard	D Loe
FLL Ltd	M Fletcher
FLP	J Davies
Frank Belshaw	D Fleming
Frank Shaw Associates	L Piekarsky
Friends of the Trans Pennine Trail Ltd	R Haynes
Fuller Peiser	J Dunshea
Fusion Online Ltd	A Scott
Fusion Online Ltd	B Butler
Futures Housing	J Heithus
G C Fountain	
G Dem UK Ltd	R Gomersal
G M Clay Architectural Designs	M Clay
G9 Design	A Chetwynd
GB Development Solutions Ltd	c/o J Suckley, HOW Planning
George Wimpey South Yorkshire Ltd	A Roberts
GFP Construction	T Pepper
GL Hearn	M Taub
Glapwell Community Development Group	R Hibbert
GMS Design	G Stringer
Gough Planning Services	R Gough
Grandex Design	

Greater Manchester Pension Fund	B Thynne
Green 2K Design	N Hopkinson
Grontmij – UK	K Kalsi
Groundwork Creswell	C Martin
Groundwork Creswell	T Witts
Guinness Northern Counties	A Haywood
Guinness Trust Northern Counties	C Rellen
Hall Construction Services Ltd	
Hallam Land Management	R Walters
Harris Lamb Chartered Surveyors	J Hollyman
Haslam Homes	D Herron
Hasland and St Leonards Community Forum	
Hawksmoor	B Egerton
Haywood Design	
Hazel Homes (Duckmanton)	
Heath Avery Architects	
Heath Family Properties	
Henry Boot Developments Plc	
High Peak Borough Council	G Roscoe
Hollingwood Residents Association	S Parker
Holmebrook & Rother Community Forum	I Edmundson
Home Builders Federation	P Cronk
Home Builders Federation	J Molyneux
Home Housing Group	
Homes and Communities Agency (Leeds)	A Barker
Housing 21	
Housing Service Manager	
HOW Planning LLP	D Brown
How Planning LLP	A James
I G Architectural Services Ltd	I Goodwin
IGL Surveying	
In Touch	D Littlewood
IND Design Ltd.	I Dennis
Inhaus Solutions Ltd	
Initial Design Services	I Sawyer
Inkerman Developments	c/o C Waumsley Freethcartwright LLP
Insignia Projects Limited	C West
'Inspire' 50+	R Londt
Inspire Design & Developments	C Russell
Irox Development	S Rimmington
James Beake Partnership	J Brabban
James C Harbord Chartered Architect	
James Design Services	J Barley
James Totty Partnership	L Black
JAS Associates	J Stocks
Jefferson Sheard Architects	M Fannon
Jeffrey Keays Associates	J Keays
Jennings Design	H Jennings
JJK Project Services Limited	K Richardson
JMF Architects	J Firth
John Beever Design	J Beever
John Botham Architect	
John C Goom Architects	J Goom
John Dixon and Associates	
John Goodyear and Co Ltd	J Goodyear
John Hill Associates	
John Taylor Architects Ltd	J Taylor
'Johnnie' Johnson Housing Trust Ltd	T Hennon

Johnson Robson Ltd	S Johnson
Journeyman Design	C Latham
JPC Commercial Services	J Pass
Keith Reynolds Associates	K Reynolds
Kevin Bradbury Architects	R Bradbury
Key Land Developments	M Naylor
Kier Homes Northern Limited	N Adams
King Sturge	J Hooper
Knight Benjamin & Co. Chartered Surveyors	W Knight
Knight Frank	R Marshall
Knight Frank	J Patel
Koyanders Associates	C Wiles
L D Parnterhsip	M Wainwright
Lafarge Aggregates Ltd	J Curtis
Lamar Exell Design Limited	T Nutter
Land Securities	N Duffield
Land Securities Properties Limited	
Lane End Securities Limited	
LDA (Civils and Transportation) Limited	M Longden
Leicester Housing	
Leicester Housing Association	Home Choice Manager
Liam Doherty Architects	L Doherty
LID Architects	J Scholes
Lindale Design Partnership	A Mills
Lion Design	c/o N White
Lister Property Developments	A M Hudson
Living Streets	C Brown
Longden Homes	R Colley
LSP Developments	
M B Developments Ltd	
M D Stapleton Developments Limited	
M Littlewood	
Maber Architects	S Doering
Malcolm Smith Associates	M L Smith
Malcolm Smith Associates	M L Smith
Mansfield District Council	
Marden Estates Ltd	J Marsden
Mark Smith Architectural Design	M Smith
Market Design	D Smith
Markwick Architects	T Markwick
Marshgate Developments Limited	D Warburton
Matthew Montague Architects	G Atkinson
MAW Design	M Wainwright
Melling Ridgeway & Partners	T Neal
Merebrook Construction Ltd	
Merlin Design and Survey Partnership	B Hodgson
MFA Building Control Limited	D Savage
Mike Worthy Associates	M Worthy
Miller Homes Ltd	
Miller Homes Ltd	M Morton
Ministry Of Design	A Sherwood
Mitchell & Proctor	T Stubbins
Modern Homes	
Moorhay Construction	C Atack
Morgan Est plc	G Gledhill
Morrison Design Limited	I Webster
MPSL Planning and Design	

Mr Andrew Birch	A Birch
Mr Mike Robinson	M Robinson
Mr Nicholas Hopkinson	N Hopkinson
Mr Terry Marah	T Marah
MSC Planning Ltd	M Crook
MWE Architects	
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	D Gregg
National Playing Fields Association	R Cole
National Trust	T Bardill
Natural England	C Smith
Natural England	D Abrahams
Natural England	N Pike
NC & DR Property Developments Ltd	
NED Industrial Archaeology Society	
Neil Whitehead Building Design	N Whitehead
Network Rail	J Bradshaw
Network Rail	R Thompson
Newark and Sherwood District Council	
Newbold & Brockwell Community Forum	J Mannion-Jones
Newbold Community Association	C Lowry
Newland Dale Community Group	A Pugh
NH Architecture	L Hopkinson
NHA Architecture	N Hopkinson
NHS Derbyshire County	H Stockton
NHS Derbyshire County Primary Care Commissioning	D Beardow
NHS Estates East Midlands Division	A Carter c/o Inventures
Niche Architects LLP	J Emmerson
Nick Marriott Architecture	N Marriott
NJSR	D Chapman
NJT Design Limited	c/o N Taylor
Noble Hardy Ltd	
Norseman Holdings Limited	D Ashby
Norseman Holdings Limited	L Hambleton
North Cheshire Housing Association	
North Country Homes Group Limited	Mr Paul Stock
North East Derbyshire District Council	K Perkins
North East Derbyshire Primary Care Group	H Finegan c/o North Derbyshire Health Authority
North East Derbyshire Rural Transport Partnership	J Lomas
North Lincolnshire District Council	G Moore
Northern Counties Housing Association Limited	L Allot
Nouveau Homes and Land Ltd	
Npower Renewables	C Stevenson
NTR Design and Build Ltd	
Oakwood Developments	
Oasis Urban Design and Architecture	A Harries-Porter
Oldfield Design Limited	A Schofield
Oldroyd Associates	P Benson
OMI Architects	
Orchard Architectural Services	J Wilson
Orchards Properties (Chesterfield) Limited	
Orchid Properties Limited	
P & B Builders	
P and C Draughting Services	J Bates
Paul Gaughan Building Consultants	P Gaughan
Paul Newbould Planning & Building Design Services	
Paul Owen Associates	J Dearlove
Paul Williams	P Williams

Peak And Northern Footpaths Society	
Peak District National Park	B Taylor
Peak District Rural Housing Association	A Clamp
Peak Drawing and Design Ltd	S Keats
Pegasus Planning Group LLP	M Duffy
Persimmon	J Abbott
Persimmon	S Miller
Persimmon Homes (South Doncaster) Ltd	S Feneley
Peter K McAndrew and Co	A Collier
Peter Knowles Architect	P Knowles
Philip H Thurston	
Phoenix Beard	T Hussain
Phoenix Brick Company Limited	
Phoenix Planning and Design Services (UK) Limited	D Edwards
Pinfold Securities Ltd	S Jones
Planarch Design Ltd	
Planning Design Practice	A Gore
Planning Policy Manager, Built Environment, Doncaster Council	J Stimpson
Plot of Gold Ltd	R Taylor
Poolsbrook Tenants and Residents Association	G Fox
Povall Worthington	
PRC Survey and Design	P Davy
Project Logistics Architecture	J Mitchell
Providence Estates Limited	
R V Construction (Chesterfield) Ltd	
Race Cottam Associates	T Robinson
Radleigh Homes	A Galloway
Rae Watson Development Surveyors	C Watson
Railway Paths Ltd.	M Thornborrow
Rainbow Alliance	G Mathews
Rapleys	A Arnold
Ravenside Investments Ltd	
Rhodia UK Limited - Rhodia Eco Services Ltd	J Moorhouse
Richard Mundy Building Design	R Mundy
Robert Turley Associates Ltd	
Robinsons & Sons Ltd	
Roger Tym & Partners	R Crolla
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	B Knight
Royal Mail Property Holdings	
Royal Society For The Protection Of Birds	C Wilkinson
RPS Planning, Transport And Environment	P Aldridge
RVA Design Ltd	R Vaughan
Rykneld Homes Ltd	
S T Building Consultant Limited	S Taylor
Savills Commercial Planning	
Sc-design	S Creaney
Scott Wilson	S Betts
SEA Planning Limited	S Elliott
Severn Trent Water	P Davies
Severn Trent Water	
Sharplink Designs Limited	C Maw
Sheffield City Council	R Thompson
Sheffield City Region LEP	
Sherrington Brown Developments Limited	
Sight Support Derbyshire	
Simon Wrigley Architectural Services	S Wrigley

SLA Design	B Simpson-Lyons
Smith & Roper Architects & Surveyors	
SMP Architects Limited	
South Derbyshire District Council	G Hague
South Yorkshire Housing	
South Yorkshire Housing Association	J Hill
Space Studio Ltd	A Ahmed
Spire Building Services Limited	J Nightingale
Spire Estates Ltd	M Barnes
Spirita Housing Association	
Sport England	T Aitchison
Springbank Centre	S Waterhouse
St Gobain Pipelines	L Foulger
Stacia Architectural Design	M Osbaldiston
Staveley Community Forum	J Morehen
Staveley History Society / Staveley Community Forum	J Marlow
Stephen Ballinger Architect	
Stephen George & Partners	R Bentley
Steven Adams Architects	S Adams
Stewart Ross Associates	L Ross
Street Design Partnership	S Walker
Styles and Wood Store Planning	C Northey
Suon Ltd	
Sustrans Limited	P Foster
Sutherland Craig Partnership	R Craig
Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd.	
Taylor Young	
Terence O'Rourke	M Miller
Tesella Building Consultancy Ltd	S Stone
Tetrix Design	R Fretwell
TGN Construction (Yorkshire) Ltd	
The Boyd Partnership Chartered Architects LLP	A Acheson
The Friends of Poolsbrook Country Park	E Tidd
The Garden History Society	K Gibson
The Georgian Group	A Martindale
The Harris Partnership	J Bunney
The Manser Practice	R Noble
The McDonald Partnership	
The National Trust (East Midlands)	M Stevens
The Noble Consultancy	
The Planning & Design Practice	P Nellist
The Planning Bureau Ltd	L Jackson
The Rennie Partnership	R Rennie
Thornfield Developments	M Finch
Threadneedle Property Investments	Hirons
Transition Chesterfield	B Leverett
Transition Town	L Moore
Transition Town Chesterfield	A Holdaway
Trevor Birchall Design Limited	
Turley Associates	B Fordsham
Turner Investments	J Vardy
UK Coal Mining Ltd	A Murray
Unwin Jones Partnership	
Urban Designs Ltd	A Rice
Victorian Society	
Viridor	T Frankiln
Viridor Waste Management	I John
Vista Architecture and Urban Design Limited	A Makley

Walbrook Housing Association	V Thomas
Walton & Co	V Richardson
Walton A and I Design	J Walton
Walton and West Community Forum	
Ward McHugh Associates	A Madaj
West Hart Partnership	I Humphries
West Lindsey District Council	
Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd Nottingham Region	
Westcliffe Properties Ltd	
Western Power Distribution	
Westwood Knowles Design	J Beever
Wheeldon Brothers Ltd	T Wood
Whelmar Homes	S Gamble
White Lamb Developments	
White Light Design Services	R Taylor
White Young Green	S Morgan
White Young Green Planning	
WHP Wilkinson Helsby	D Hosker
Wilcon Homes	S De Vere
Wildgoose Construction Ltd	
Wilkins Vardy	
William Sutton Housing Association	H Forkin
Wilson Bowden Developments	D Ward
Windle Cook Architect	M Cook
Woods Hardwick Architects	R Turnbull
Woodthorpe Residents Association	C Taylor
Woore Watkins Limited	D Wright
Worksop Home Planners	A Greaves
WPL Design and Management Ltd	
Wrightson Associates	G Wrightson
Yeme Architects Ltd	A Hussain
Yorkshire Water - Land Use Manager	S Walden
Yorkshire Water Services	Land Property & Planning Team
Young at Heart	M Shapland
YP4U (Yorkshireplans4U)	P Parsons

Chesterfield Borough Council: Parish and Town Council's

Brimington Parish Council	L McCormack
Staveley Parish Council	G Challands

Chesterfield Borough Council:

Interested party planning/design matters	2
--	---

North East Derbyshire District Council

Ability	A Lunn
Across Trust	J Burns
Amber Valley Borough Council	D Stafford
Amethyst Ltd	M Scoot
Andrew Martin Associates	C Whitmore
Armstrong Burton Planning	V Lane
Ashley Travel Ltd	Powell
Ashton Plumbing and Heating	H Pickering
Aspin Consulting Ltd	A Hoffman
Bakewell & Partners	S Heathcote
British Wind Energy Association	A Dodds

Building Research Establishment	
Cadenza VM Ltd	I Drabble
CB Richard Ellis Limited	C White
Cerda Planning 2	V Lane
Chesterfield Canal Partnership	G Coles
Clay Cross and District Environmental Action Group	G Elvidge
Colin Rae Associates	C Rae
COTEP	J Gower
Danesmoor & Clay Cross Tenants and Residents Assoc	L Dung
Derbyshire Constabulary	R Drury
Derbyshire County Council	C Massey
Derbyshire Fire and Rescue	P Bryan
Derbyshire Fire and Rescue	R Mackie
Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service	S Helps
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	A de la Rue
Derbyshire Primary Care Trust	A Ebbage
Derbyshire Rural Community Council	
DLP Planning Ltd	L Fitzgerald
DPDS Consulting Group	D Bowyer
DPP LLP Ltd	R Ford
Dr Malcolm Bell Ltd	M Bell
Drivers Jonas LLP	R Bailey
Dronfield & District Tenants and Residents Group	J Keay
Dronfield and District Labour Party	J L Wearing
Dronfield Civic Society	J Harvey
Eckington Focus Tenants and Residents Group	C Holmes
Eckington Parish Footpaths and Bridleways Group	J Jesson
English Heritage	C Searson
Environment Agency	C Storr
Environment Agency	P Thorpe
Federation of North East Derbyshire tenants and re	A Jess
Fisher German	K Davies
Footpaths Groups	P Wheelhouse
Friends of the Earth	T Sander
Friends of the Peak District	J King
Fusion Online Ltd	A Brudelle
Fusion Planning	
GL Hearn	M Taub
Gleeson Strategic Land	S Hunt
Guinness Northern Counties	L Tierney
Hallam Land Management Ltd	P Jackson
Hasland Hall Park Community Association	B Arrandale
Hawksmoor	B Egerton
Highways Agency	G Wise
Holmgate Tenants and Residents Group	A Jess
Homes and Communities Agency	A Barker
JS Bloor Services Ltd	M Whitehead
Keith Hill Planning	K Hill
Killamarsh RAGE	P Johnson
Killamarsh Tenants and Residents Group	K Cawthorne
Local resident	J Connolly
Longhurst Group Ltd	N Worboys
Member of Parliament	N Engel MP
Mickley Tenants and Residents Group	S Jones
Mono Consultants Limited	C Wilson
Moss Valley Medical Practice	S M Ryalls
National Farmers Union	P Tame
National Trust	A Hubbard

Natural England	R Hoskin
Natural England	E Newman
North Country Homes Group Limited	P Stock
North East Derbyshire Liberal Democrats	D Mortimer
Old Dronfield Society	A Brown
Parker Design Associates	G F Parker
Peak District National Park Authority	B Taylor
Pegasus Planning Group	M Duffy
Pentland Ltd	J Scott
Planning Potential	H Sewell
Planning Prospect	R Riley
Project Logistics Architecture	J Mitchell
Renishaw Forward Tenants and Resident Group	S Fidler
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	A Duncan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	N Bell
RPS Planning	J Pyatt
RPS Planning	P Hill
Scott Wilson	S Betts
SDDC	I Bowen
Severn Trent Water Limited	Y Ejjunmi
Severn Trent Water Limited	D Williams
Severn Trent Water Limited	Growth & Development
Sheffield City Council	P Rainford
Smith Stuart Reynolds	S Smith
Sport England	
Stewart Ross Associates	L Ross
Stoneleigh Planning	A Jones
The Co-operative	A Elliott
The Development Planning Partnership	W Martin
The Garden History Society	K Gibson & L Groves
The Planning Bureau Limited	A Bateman
Totley Residents DEDT	S Davis
UK Coal Mining Ltd	A Murray
William Davis Ltd	R Jays
Woodview Residents Group	B Simmonite
Yorkshire Electricity Distribution Plc	D Ingram

NEDDC: North East Derbyshire Parish Council's

Barlow Parish Council	A Preston
Brackenfield Parish Council	W McCartney
Brampton Parish Council	E Boswell
Calow Parish Council	J Taylor
Calow Parish Council	D Whitworth
Clay Cross Parish Council	D Kershaw
Dronfield Town Council	E Boswell
Eckington Parish Council	P Staniforth
Grassmoor, Hasland & Winsick Parish Council	R Ackrill
Heath and Holmewood Parish Council	K Howe
Heath and Holmewood Parish Council	S Coldwell
Holmesfield Parish Council	E Boswell
Holymoorside & Walton Parish Council	K Brailsford
Killamarsh Parish Council	S Coldwell
Morton Parish Council	P Goodwin
North Wingfield Parish Council	Y Colverson
Pilsley Parish Council	J Bradley
Shirland & Higham Parish Council	M Johnson
Stretton Parish Council	J Taylor

Sutton cum Duckmanton Parish Council	P Goodwin
Temple Normanton Parish Council	C Stewart
Tibshelf Parish Council	
Tupton Parish Council	D J Massey
Unstone Parish Council	K Kennan
Wessington Parish Council	S Leighton
Wingerworth Parish Council	M Taylor

NEDDC:	
Individuals with a registered interest in planning	63

Appendix 3: Table of Detailed Comments and Responses

Successful Places Draft SPD Public Consultation Feedback: Detailed Comments and Responses Table

Respondent No.	Organisation/Respondent	Comment No.	Comments	Officer Comments/Response	Recommendation
SPD-0001	Mickley Tenants and Residents Association	1	Not seen draft document. The first we know about it.	Noted. Consultation draft is the draft version.	No change
SPD-0002	Individual Response	2	Urban and rural.	Agree – Section 1.3 .3 identifies that the SPD will apply to both urban and rural scenarios.	No change
SPD-0003	Moss Valley Medical Practice	3	Endorse the concept of designing around people not cars.	Noted.	No change.
		4	This section is understood, although the connection with Sheffield is unclear.	Housing Market Area and Sheffield City are defined in the margin.	No change.

n/b rows shaded grey indicate a change to in response the comment received

SPD-0003	Moss Valley Medical Practice	5	Query who designs the actual houses. If 'expert' designed this may be suited to their own taste and not reflect the views of existing residents. Local people may be more appropriate than 'experts'.	Houses are architect/developer designed, although opportunities for community inputs can arise at pre-application and application stages.	No change
		6	Allowance should be made for growing nos. of mobility wheelchairs and dropped kerbs.	Dropped kerbs will normally be provided within new developments where it is safe and there is a desire for pedestrians to cross the street i.e. primarily at junctions. These are mainly laid out with tactile paving. Along the street itself some specific provision can be made but there are invariably a high number of individual vehicle access points where the kerbs are dropped anyway – these would not have tactile paving but would be able to facilitate crossing for mobility scooters etc. If however there is a path crossing the street, a specific crossing point with tactile paving would normally be provided on the desire line.	No change.
		7	Section 3.5.8 - Patina - flowery language.	Noted, although language used is a direct reference from an external source.	No change.
		8	Dislike formal blocking (3.7.1).	Noted, although diagram illustrates the generic points in respect of formal blocks, including their negative associations.	No change.

		9	Providing children's kick about areas is vital, but in a way that is safe/overlooked, avoids damage to property, is neighbourly with greenery/water and benches with backs to assist the elderly.	Play space requirements are set by other policies. The amenity and safety considerations are addressed in Sections 3.2.13 and 3.11	Include reference to benches with backs in section 3.10 Public Realm under <i>Reduce Clutter</i> . Rename as <i>Street Furniture</i> .
SPD-0004	Individual Response	10	Support - Return to Parker Morris Standards and enforce them. Save time and money on standards.	Noted. No national space standards exist at present. Space standards therefore difficult to justify in the absence of any higher level policy requirement.	No change.
SPD-005	Wilkins Vardy Residential	11	Support - a well presented and helpful document	Noted.	No change.
SPD-006	Individual Response	12	Plenty of room to park cars to keep roads clear for emergency and service vehicles.	Noted. Section 3.8 Parking (3.8.4 Levels of Parking) outlines the approach to parking provision and the need to avoid both under and over-provision of parking. Section 3.9 Street Design outlines highway requirements and street widths to satisfy technical standards, including need to demonstrate service vehicle accessibility through vehicle tracking.	No change.
SPD-007	Individual Response	13	Questionnaire completed, although no detailed comments provided.	Noted.	No change.
SPD-008	Stan White Farms	14	No copy of the guide to see.	Noted. Details of where the document was available for inspection outlined in original correspondence.	No change.
SPD-009	Equality & Human Rights Commission	15	No Comments.	Noted.	No change.

n/b rows shaded grey indicate a change to in response the comment received

SPD-010	Community Safety Corporate Services Derbyshire Constabulary	16	<p>Request revisions to the following:</p> <p>3.8.20 Parking courts... block... They can help reduce...</p> <p>After the word 'BLOCK insert...' <i>Large rear parking courts should be avoided as they are less private and offer opportunities for crime, ASB and for those who should not park there. If they are to be used they should be small in size and have at least one property located within the court to give a sense of ownership and security. Multi accesses should be avoided and there should be sufficient lighting in the court so that users feel safe during the hours of darkness.</i></p>	Agree.	Amend text/reformat pages 66-67 to include these points and accommodate changes, subject to space constraints.
		17	<p>3.7.10 Culs-de-sac request change or add in "over long cul de sacs should be avoided as well as those with footpaths at the bottom".</p>	Partial Agree. Overlong culs-de-sac can be problematic. However, joining footpaths at the ends can be appropriate where these are adequately overlooked and safe.	Amend text/reformat page to make reference to "over long culs de sacs should normally be avoided".
SPD-011	Heath Village Hall Management Committee	18	Advice to be given in 3.8.4 for higher parking levels in areas where there is not good public transport.	Noted, although this is implied in para. 3.8.5, that levels of parking should be informed by the location/site specific circumstances. This allows for potentially higher levels of parking to be provided.	No change.
SPD-012	Individual Response	19	Only west facing semi-detached homes built.	Noted. However, only building west facing semi-detached homes would result in uniformity and standardisation, which goes against the objective of building in response to the context of a site and would be likely to result in repetitious townscape.	No change.

		20	Wet rooms to be included.	Noted. Building to Lifetime Homes standard, which includes downstairs WC capable of conversion to a wet room, is encouraged. Local planning authorities have insufficient control over internal arrangements to insist on such requirements.	No change.
SPD-013	Killamarsh Parish Council	21	Great information to show anybody wanting to use the guide how and why housing is set out and why it is done this way.	Noted.	No change.
SPD-014	Individual Response	22	No more design disasters please, such as social housing with ghastly flat roofs.	Noted. Each case must be assessed individually and using designs with flat roofs cannot be precluded in some circumstances. However, the guidance encourages designs to respond to their context.	No change.
SPD-015	Clay Cross Parish Council	23	Town and Parish Councils are under immense pressure to accept planning initiatives to that are not always in the interests of the best town planning. We have no planning designations or national park status to protect us. With few planning controls available we are in danger of becoming a large servant of Chesterfield or Alfreton.	Noted. This is a broader issue that is beyond the scope and remit of the guidance.	No change.
		24	The lack of any kind of affordable housing is critical to the challenge	Noted, although discussion in Section 1.1 identifies the link between the quality of housing and supporting the local economy. The supply of affordable housing is a broader topic beyond the scope of the guidance.	No change.

SPD-015	Clay Cross Parish Council	25	Local Council's are under immense pressure to provide housing that is affordable, which conflicts heavily with the quality/value of a building.	Noted, although well designed places should not preclude affordability, the fallback position being that poorly designed places are acceptable.	No change.
		26	Parish/Town Council's require a much stronger say from the representations of town/parish which are often overturned by District and County Planners.	Noted but this objective is a broader topic that is beyond the scope and remit of the guidance. Neighbourhood Plans offer the potential to strengthen the role of local Town and Parish Councils in shaping the way in which their area is developed.	No change.
		27	It is highly generalistic.	It is a technical document, largely aimed at the development industry and design professionals. It therefore requires a balance of appropriate use of design language but which also accessible to other non-professional audience.	No change.
		28	Does little to explain how local councils are to achieve the ideal in portfolia.	Guidance is considered to be relatively detailed within each subject area, without undue prescription. Part 2 also sets out the design process in some detail with a 'step by step' approach. Its success and implementation will rely on how well it the guidance is applied.	No change.
		29	Too generalistic and sanitised. We can aspire to the ideal, but this does not reflect the reality.	Rather than prescription, guidance is based around good practice principles which are relatively detailed for each subject area. If new developments are perceived as being poor, the guidance will assist in bringing about improvements.	No change.

SPD-015	Clay Cross Parish Council	30	All too often small Councils are left holding onto what little recreation space they have left.	Noted. This is a broader issue that is beyond the scope and remit of the guidance.	No change.
		31	Recent proposals viewed as inappropriate seek to fill the smallest possible area with large amounts of housing. None of this idealistic information makes an ounce of difference.	Noted. Such schemes will have been designed prior to the publication of the guidance. If new developments are perceived as being poor, the guidance will assist in bringing about improvements.	No change.
		32	The present economic climate is driving force, not community aspirations.	Noted. The current poor economic climate is a constraint but not permanent situation.	No change.
		33	Even local authorities are driven to cheap housing, shoved together for the greatest net returns.	Noted. If new developments are perceived as being poor, the guidance will assist in bringing about improvements.	No change.
SPD-016	Dronfield Civic Society	34	Highway design measures to limit vehicular speeds in residential areas to 20mph.	Noted/Agree. Para. 3.9.6 addresses this point. Guidance in Manual for Streets also seeks to achieve 20mph speeds within residential street design.	No change.
		35	Lighting design for security and safety.	Noted/Agree. Lighting design for adopted streets is managed through the adopting highway authority, having regard to the safety considerations.	No change.
		36	EA highlight requirement of water framework directive	Noted.	No change.

SPD-017	Environment Agency	37	Flood risk zones identified on drawings in part 2 although not explicitly mentioned as an issue	Agree.	Add flood risk to 'Key site considerations' box. Also add drainage reference to 21 st Century House diagram.
		38	EA support/encourage incorporating SUDS but suggest this is mandatory.	Agree, but flood and Water Management Act (2010) which allows for adoption of SUDS by public authorities has not yet taken effect.	No change.
		39	EA recommends that SPD makes reference to any new dwelling should achieve 'water efficiency component' of level 3/4 of the code for sustainable homes (as a minimum).	Agree. Although, imposing this standard would require a policy decision and cannot be required through SPD. Include reference to Code for Sustainable Homes and encourage good practice in Section 3.16 Building Design.	Include Useful Ref. in Section 3.16 to Code for Sustainable Homes.
		40	We consider it imperative that local sewerage issues are understood and sewage undertakers are consulted before developments are approved, ensuring adequate capacity is available.	Agree. Water companies are already consulted on proposals for new housing development.	No change.
SPD-018	The Coal Authority	41	Coal Authority considers SPD to be comprehensive and helpful	Noted.	No change.
		42	Coal Authority suggest that ground conditions/instability mentioned as a possible constraint to development - suggest it could be referred to on P25 and P28	Agree.	Amend text/reformat to include ground conditions/instability under Step 1 Site Constraints. P. 25) and Key site considerations box (P. 28).
SPD-019	English Heritage	43	English Heritage welcome and support the general emphasis and contents of the SPD.	Noted.	No change.

		44	English Heritage feel that the guidance should be a useful aid for assessing planning applications and welcome the reference to the historic environment mentioned throughout the document.	Noted.	No change.
SPD-020	Natural England	45	Natural England generally welcomes the SPD and says that it will provide useful and comprehensive information.	Noted.	No change.
		46	Natural England strongly support the green and blue infrastructure section and welcome the last bullet point in the character areas section regarding the importance of a positive relationship with the edges of the site including any areas of open countryside.	Noted.	No change.
		47	Natural England suggests that guidance on the planting topic is strengthened. Mentioning that they would like to see additional paragraphs on 'Biodiversity by Design' as mentioned on the TCPA website	Agree. Add references to biodiversity.	Include Useful References link to Biodiversity by Design (TCPA website) in Sections 3.3 (green and Blue Infrastructure) and 3.10.10 (Planting).
		48	3.6.5 Variable density - welcome the aim of this section to arrange housing that will encourage walking and cycling, which will reduce carbon emissions.	Noted.	No change.
		49	3.6.22 Settlement density - Glad to note landscape buffer areas should retain trees and use native species for any new planting schemes.	Noted.	No change.
SPD-021	Homes and Communities Agency	50	The HCA support the SPD but have no comments to make at this stage of the consultation process.	Noted.	No change.

SPD-022	Bolsover District Council	51	Suggested it may be appropriate to look at interfaces with existing or proposed employment development. Requests information on distances/standoffs, noise criteria, layout considerations and acoustic treatments of employment unit service areas.	Noted. Specific guidance on mitigation measures and stand off distances etc. will vary according to particular land uses. As such, these will need to be judged on the merits of each case.	Include bullet point in 'Successful Places' box under 3.6 Layout re. Ensuring a carefully considered interface between residential and commercial uses and avoiding bad neighbour uses. Also, include a 'Good Practice' margin reference re. seeking advice from Environmental Health Dept. at an early stage, where potential conflicts may arise between residential and commercial uses.
SPD-023	MAXIM	52	Suggest removing 'ping' from landscape wherever it occurs replacing it with landscape architecture/design, planting or paving, whichever is relevant.	Agree.	Review and amend section 3.10 Public Realm.
SPD-024	Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service	53	Stresses the importance of housing that is well designed and addresses the needs of vulnerable people and that the fire service should be consulted on all applications and pre-application discussions.	Noted. Fire & Rescue Services are already consulted on all planning applications and receive a weekly list of new applications. Inclusion at pre-application stage falls outside the remit of this SPD. Development Management of each individual authority must determine the appropriate mechanism for pre-application consultation with the FRS.	No change.
		54	Suggest the introduction of sprinkler systems within new residential developments at a cost of £1500 per dwelling and 32mm mains water riser at a cost of £26 per dwelling.	Noted.	No change.

		55	Building Regulations already require the provision of fire protection measures at a cost of around £1200 per dwelling (plus additional costs for compartment walls and fire doors). Sprinkler systems offer more flexibility to developers in meeting BR requirements at a lower cost to traditional fire protection measures.	Noted. Fire protection measures are managed through the Building Regulations and are not a matter that can be dealt with through the planning process.	No change.
SPD-025	Sport England	56	No comments on this occasion.	Noted.	No change.
SPD-026	National Trust	57	Part 01 - Suggest making specific reference to the NPPF paragraphs 7-9 " <i>to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system</i> ".	Agree.	Include additional para. or highlighted quote to make reference to these NPPF paragraphs.
		58	Page 21 - C21 House drawing - bubble relating to 'low carbon' - this could better relate to the energy hierarchy. At present it indicates that, in effect that you can use as much energy as you like as long as its low carbon; New residential development should also assist in reducing emissions by reducing its energy requirements and incorporating high standards of insulation. Suggest that the better relate to the energy hierarchy. Expand bubble to include "low energy requirement".	Agree. Although, energy efficiency etc. are largely outside the direct remit of planning and are addressed through the Building Regulations and Code for Sustainable Homes. However, amended wording would avoid the negative inference identified.	Amend 'C21 House Low Carbon bubble, to refer to ' <i>Low Energy</i> ' requirement in lieu of Low Carbon.

SPD-026	National Trust	59	Design Process Diagram: Step 1 - Context. Landscape Character - (" <i>Are there any landscape character considerations?</i> "). Wording does not capture the essence of 'landscape character'. Wording closer to that in the preceding point on built environment would be more appropriate e.g. " <i>What is the landscape character of the site and its surroundings?</i> "	Agree. Although reference to relevant landscape considerations such as views, edges etc. remain pertinent.	Amend wording to read " <i>What is the landscape character and are there any landscape setting considerations?</i> " (views, edges etc)"
		60	Design Process Diagram: Step 1 - Site Appraisal. Natural features - would be better worded as "Determine the value of any natural features in terms of their contribution to <i>landscape</i> character and biodiversity"	Noted, although purpose of this point is assess and use such features to embed local character within the development. This stage is more focused on the site than the wider landscape area.	Amend wording to clarify the site focus and to read " <i>Determine the value of any natural features in terms of their potential contribution to site character and biodiversity</i> "
		61	No mention of light pollution and importance of preserving the "night sky" - suggests that this could be included.	Noted, although perhaps a slightly more peripheral design consideration. Nevertheless NPPF (para. 125) makes reference to limiting light pollution from artificial light on local amenity and dark landscapes among others.	Amend/reformat Section 3.6.22 (Settlement Edges). Add bullet point to Successful Places box to make reference to " <i>Carefully consider the design of lighting schemes on settlement edges to minimise the adverse impact of light pollution</i> ". Reformat photo to accommodate this change.
SPD-027	Chevin Housing Association	62	Comment 8. Lack of confidence with section 4.1. anticipation that dilution of design principles would be needed to satisfy highways requirements.	Noted. Always an issue that requires negotiation on a case by case basis. However, an aspiration to improve is an important starting point from which to move forward. Better street design must be considered alongside adoption needs.	No change.

SPD-027	Chevin Housing Association	63	Parking courts are mentioned as a solution to a sea of frontage parking, although little or no mention is made of their adoption and management. Poorly maintained parking courts can attract ASB. Will Council's adopt these areas?	Noted. Parking courts are only one of a suite of parking solutions outlined in the guidance. Their shortcomings are also identified. Such spaces are unlikely to become adopted by public authorities, although the use of management companies can provide a workable alternative.	Include reference to the provision of lighting within box.
		64	Depends on how each LA will stick to the principles. - suggests that in the current climate compromises will have to be made and the principles will be diluted somewhat.	Noted.	No change.
		65	Despite poor quality states photographed in document people still want to live there. As long as this is the case, developers will continue to build them.	Noted.	No change.
		66	There will come a point where the need to deliver more housing will need to outweigh some of the design principles. E.g. Para. 3.18.8 criticises housing associations for selecting low maintenance materials. However, housing associations operate extremely tight budgets and the difference between synthetic or traditional materials can influence whether or not a scheme can be built. Surely providing quality, affordable, well-maintained homes for those in need is more important than whether they are constructed in locally sourced materials?	Noted. This is always a balance, although drive towards better outputs should be the emphasis. Using more locally sourced materials can also have sustainability benefits.	No change.
		67	In terms of future maintenance considerations, it will be difficult to persuade the private sector to spend more on materials simply because they are cheaper to maintain in the future.	Noted, although this is not only an issue of long term maintenance, but also quality and integrity.	No change.

n/b rows shaded grey indicate a change to in response the comment received

SPD-028	Chesterfield & District Civic Society	68	Aims correct, but should also state why housing audits found East Midlands so poor.	Noted.	Review CABE EM Housing Audit. Include more detail if space allows.
		69	List Cabe Housing Audit on page 16 under Useful References	Agree.	Include additional ref.
		70	P. 14 para 1.3.1 Add 'service centres and employment site' as a reminder that the guide also covers mixed use and commercial developments.	Agree ref to mixed uses helpful in first para, but alternative wording suggested.	Include text '...and mixed schemes comprising both commercial uses and housing'.
		71	Heading 'Toxic assets' is jargon and will date the SPD.	Agree.	Change title to 'The costs of bad design'
		72	Typographical errors paras. 1.1.2, 1.2.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.7 - These run throughout the document and require correction.	Agree. Conversion of file format to PDF resulted in systematic error to specific letter combinations.	Errors to be corrected in final document.
		73	Overall, this section needs to grab the imagination better, including PINS, that normally only good contextual planning/design will be accepted. If context is not important there is still no excuse for poor design. To this end, page 12 and associated illustrations need to inspire as well as inform. Along with Foreword it should be the page which elected leaders / lead professionals quote and which accompanies relevant planning appeals	Agree.	Refer to NPPF text that requires good design. Include clearer ref to good design as the 'norm' within this section. Reformat text/page to accommodate changes.

SPD-028	Chesterfield & District Civic Society	74	Diagram showing LPA areas omits Nottingham and PDNPA, which is an LPA that covers part of NEDDC. This matter needs clarifying in section 1.2 as the PDNPA Design Guide SPD and other policies apply to the whole NP irrespective of local authority boundaries. Include PDNPA guide as a useful ref. with caveat that it applies to NEDDC within the NP.	Agree.	Add PDNPA boundary/area to location plan. Include only local authority areas directly adjacent to the project area. Nottingham and distant Districts are not considered necessary for the purposes of identifying the area covered by the guidance. Amend text/re-format 1.2 to accommodate suggested changes.
		75	Structure: Section on 'how to use' the guide is good and essential. It would be helpful to say what the guide does not cover and whether these areas will be covered at some later date.	Noted.	No Change - List of issues not covered by the guide could be extensive. It is considered more specific to state what it does seek to address. Currently no plans to address other subjects under SPD.
		76	Pleased to see policies in a separate section as policy revisions can be easily accommodated with little or no change to elsewhere.	Noted.	No change.
		77	Illustrations: Tempting to show bad examples. As there are many in the East Midlands why bother? It would be better to use more space to show good examples for all types of housing E.g. terrace, villa, garden city/model village suburbs, Arcadian (as Essex Design Guide where trees, walls and spaces dominate, village to higher density suburban etc.	Noted, although comment is a little unclear. Hand drawn illustrations are bespoke to show positive examples of scenarios that support the associated text. Any negative examples, such as Settlements Edges (p. 55) and Cul-de-sacs (p. 59) are shown alongside a positive solution to provide a comparison. Insufficient resources to provide detailed drawings of the type suggested.	No change.

SPD-028 Chesterfield & District Civic Society	78	Photos: <i>Must</i> be better and where possible ought to include people and activity. A larger range will support analysis (which is done well) and lead the reader through the good examples to the desired conclusion, offering inspiration and a desire to use the guide again out of choice.	Noted. Some photos could potentially be substituted, subject to access and availability to alternatives. Inclusion of additional photos is not possible due to space/format limitations. Circa. 190 photos are used (not inc. maps, plans and drawings) which is considered sufficient to achieve the balance between text / photos / length and making the document highly visual.	No change.
	79	Specifically - Photos of houses opposite Chapter 1 Heading appear to have turned their back on the street (unlike neighbouring property). The very opposite of what the guide is stating - the public realm always matters.	Noted. Photo illustrates a modern mews street of studio rooms and roof terraces above garaging (host houses are out of shot). Due to the close nature of the image it does not illustrate the context houses opposite and is also a dull sky. While criticisms are acknowledged this is considered to be a good example of a contemporary mews frontage, understood in context.	Source alternative cover image for Section 1.
	80	Cover illustration is not showing a building in context, is out of scale and challenging in appearance.	Noted. Diagram, expresses aspirations / blueprint of what the guide is seeking to deliver; not only architecture. Building is shown within a context, but is larger as it is focus of the subject. Architecture is also likely to evolve as a result of changing pressures e.g. environmental performance and be forward looking. It was considered inappropriate to show a historic vernacular style. Contemporary and traditional can co-exist when designed with care and sensitivity. Some modification possible.	Review 21st Century House illustration. Where possible amend to a less challenging, more contextual form and scale, but retaining a contemporary flavour.

n/b rows shaded grey indicate a change to in response the comment received

SPD-028 Chesterfield & District Civic Society	81	Section 2 is well written and presented. Chapter heading photo offers mixed messages. Buildings and trees offer a pleasant sense of place, but nostalgic style is compromised by: Poor retrofit, aluminium frame PV panels; public realm dominated by tarmac surfaces; houses with notional defensible space; prominent white meter boxes; interlocking concrete tiles.	Noted. Valid points identified, but overall this is a reasonably well composed street scene, expressing local materiality, incorporation of renewable energy, integration of parking etc. Few schemes demonstrate excellence across all design considerations.	No change.
	82	21C house illustration. Although there is a place for contemporary design, this one has not analysed context, does not fit into its surrounds and is contrary to the message in the guide. The structuralist style dates quickly, possibly because it is transitional and because it relies too heavily on good bespoke details.	Noted. It is important to allow for and support both contemporary design and traditional design. Given the concept is for a 21C house, a purely historic style building would be inappropriate. However, some modification possible.	Review 21st Century House illustration. Where possible amend to a less challenging, more contextual form and scale, but retaining a contemporary flavour.
	83	In 'Healthy' bubble suggest daylight is altered to 'daylight with some direct sunlight' .	Noted. Healthy bubble reads 'Natural light and ventilation', rather than 'Daylight'. Language is appropriate and encompasses daylight and direct sunlight.	No change.
	84	Cont./ Also add 'Outdoor amenity space'.	Agree.	Include 'Outdoor amenity space'.
	85	In Adaptable house bubble, include home working' (but this can cause parking issues if a job includes a car or van).	Agree. Inclusion of home working is a valid adaptation/accommodation. In addition, adaptation to potential other uses can be appropriate in some circumstances.	Amend 'Adaptable' bubble to include 'Home working' and 'Uses'.

SPD-028 Chesterfield & District Civic Society	86	Very good. In the site appraisal, it would be helpful to ask whether the older areas are degraded but reversible to pleasant streets. For example, many suburban estates once echoed garden city ideals and would have avenues of trees, uniform boundaries. Terraced houses would have had sash windows, front railings etc. Perhaps a point to be made later in Chapter 4.	Noted. A relevant issue in respect of a character appraisal, although the relevance of the reversibility of degraded areas to proposed new development sites is questionable in this context.	No change.
	87	Strongly support the need to show how the DAS has been undertaken to help reduce sophistry.	Noted.	No change.
	88	Local review arrangements ought to include RSL's, Community Interest Groups and relevant agencies such as utilities and police.	Noted. External groups could potentially be included such as through a workshop format, although LPA's will also require a separate mechanism that assists with consistency of approach and critical reflection. At this stage, the key objective is to establish the principle of review. How this will work in practice will require further consideration.	No change.
	89	Congratulations on tackling a difficult area well. Chapter heading photo is positive and well placed.	Noted.	No change.
	90	P. 37 Good photos. Due to architectural connotations, it may be better to label them as recent contemporary, as they show vernacular/nostalgic styles.	Agree.	Amend text.
91	P. 42. 3.3 Successful Places - suggest you add 'throughout the seasons, day and night'. It is easy to forget places with good lighting schemes are a delight in the evening. Similarly, a well designed place should cope well in adverse weather.	Noted. Although, there is a limit as to how far advice can be extended within the scope of this guidance. Good landscape design in respect of the forth dimension (time) and other issues must be taken as a given. This section aims to address the strategic provision of G.I. rather than detailed landscaped design.	No change.	

n/b rows shaded grey indicate a change to in response the comment received

SPD-028	Chesterfield & District Civic Society	92	Routes ought to direct people past/through community infrastructure even when slightly inconvenient. Main routes ought to be sited to deal well with adverse weather e.g. sunny side of street to minimise ice, space for grit bins (typical of most upland villages) offer some shelter from prevailing weather and summer sun, with gentle slopes and designed to discharge water.	These issues are addressed within section 3.12 Place Hierarchy re. positioning important buildings to reinforce important locations. Agree that streets should create a comfortable environment, but this will be dictated by the circumstances of each site.	No change.
		93	Pools and swales are perhaps best overlooked for child safety.	These are a necessary feature of many SUDs systems and are generally accepted component of green water management. With SUDs management falling to local authorities through the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, such features are likely to become increasingly important and safety would need to be considered as part of the SUDS adoption process.	No change.
		94	P.44 Pity the street light if out of scale. The one in the sketch (p. 45 is right.	Noted. Although the scale of the lamp is correct, just positioned in the foreground.	No change.
		95	P.45. Photo needs to be better as shadows obscure soft landscaping.	Noted. Although overall composition is appropriate to support the principal of 'Townscape'.	No change.
		96	Gathering areas are a feature. Best overlooked especially youth shelters.	Noted. Assume this is a reference to third drawing inc. focal point tree. Gathering areas are not expressly promoted in this section. However, sense of place is supported.	No change.

SPD-028 Chesterfield & District Civic Society	97	P. 53 Sunlight is very important to residential amenity and well-being. It seems needlessly mean to compromise on separation distances. It is a reasonable expectation that occupiers of homes receive direct sunlight to a habitable room throughout the year, especially for mobility impaired/elderly. N/B London design guide (2010) seeks direct sunlight to a habitable room for part of the day.	Agree. Text and illustrations support and endorse this view. Cross section illustrates spacing required to achieve 3 hours daylight over both 12 months and 11 months of the year on a level site at this latitude. However, other design considerations must also be balanced in the overall design. Further clarification of front to front relationships would be beneficial.	No change to 3.6. Include additional guidance in Amenity section (3.11) in respect of front to front separation distances.
	98	P. 53 Photo shows a poor arrangement and type of solar panels retrofitted to a roof. The illustration is inelegant and better examples exist.	Noted. Image conveys a typical example of available products and control over such features is limited, unless in sensitive locations. The purpose of the image is to convey the principle of utilising renewable energy.	Source alternative image, where possible.
	99	P. 54 Agree, but rural outlook is not a right to a view and houses still need good sized gardens so that occupiers are not dependent on an altruistic adjacent landowner.	Noted. Text possibly misinterpreted. This section seeks to achieve a positive interface between development and the adjoining landscape where a new long term edge is being created. There is no suggestion of a right to a view, or compromising on garden spaces etc.	No change.
	100	P.59 Culs-de-sac. Agree in principle but there is a distinction between culs-de-sac for vehicles and those for vehicles with connecting paths which address permeability issues. Many historic towns have cul-de-sacs that work well because ped/cycle routes link to other streets is legible as a connecting route. There is anecdotal evidence that developments without cul-de-sacs are more socially successful for teenagers.	Noted. Although para. 3.7.10 acknowledges that they may be necessary in some circumstances.	No change.

n/b rows shaded grey indicate a change to in response the comment received

SPD-028	Chesterfield & District Civic Society	101	P. 60 You might mention that parking is policed to protect the pedestrian environment and local amenity.	Noted. Although, Policing policy is outside the scope of the guidance.	No change.
		102	P. 61 Levels of Parking. Need to allow reasonable visitor parking, recognising some may have mobility problems. Unless parking is well managed under provision normally results in undesirable, hazardous parking and is a source of neighbour problems.	Visitor parking normally a consideration. Problems associated with under provision are identified within the draft document.	No change.
		103	Pavement/verge parking is an issue on existing estates (pavement parking outside London is normally an offence). New housing layouts need to be realistic to the needs of homes serviced by motor vehicles, not just bin lorries.	Noted. Agree. Parking on pavements is an offence under the Road Traffic Act. Draft SPD outlines how a range of factors should influence the level of parking provision. Wider street design considerations are dealt with under 3.9 Street Design. Bin lorry access is only one factor and is addressed under Section 3.19.17.	No change.
		104	Designs should try and ensure parking is contained in areas of landscape features, levels, higher kerbs, and front gardens that cannot accommodate a vehicle. Front Gardens shown on page 61 could easily become parking bays.	Noted. Agree, that containing frontage parking would benefit from additional guidance. Where deep front gardens are provided, installation of hard standing normally requires planning permission, subject to area and drainage. Where appropriate planning authorities can remove permitted development rights.	Draft additional guidance points on how to accommodate on-plot parking. Reformat section to accommodate changes.

	105	P.62 On-street spaces need to allow for growing size of vehicles. Suggest 2.5m wide spaces that bring benefits to pedestrians and cyclists too. Ideally they ought to be delineated through surface treatment to help reduce visual impact of streets.	Noted. Although, efficient compact cars are also increasingly in demand. While larger spaces should not be ruled out, they should not be mandatory given the many conflicting demands for space. Agree that materials should be used to delineate on-street parking.	Include additional criterion in box 3.8.10 re. using materials to define on-street parking.
	106	Strongly endorse larger garage size. Given population trends, it may be wise to seek 2.8m wide garage doors. They also help pedestrian safety through increased visibility when sited close to the footway.	Noted. Stated dimensions are in-line with 6C's guidance used by County Highway Engineers. 2.3m garage door width is a minimum and could be increased at discretion of designer. Garages need to be sited a minimum 5m from footway (depending door type). Wider doors would be unlikely to influence pedestrian safety at this distance.	No change.
	107	Need to mention micro-climate. Successful places also respond to micro-climate and in the SPD area it ranges from wet uplands with harsh winters to drier/sunnier lowlands. Vernacular upland buildings tend to be sited away from hilltops out of the prevailing wind. Within the SPD area they tend to face south and turn their back to the north.	Noted. Although, this would form part of the contextual assessment where relevant, e.g. frost pockets, exposed hilltops etc.	No change.
SPD-028 Chesterfield & District Civic Society	108	67. Support the aims but sketch shows 2.5 storey inelegant houses with a poor outlook.	Noted. Although architecture is considered an appropriate contemporary treatment to a traditional building form. However, sketch conveys some important messages about parking court design which is the prime consideration.	No change.

n/b rows shaded grey indicate a change to in response the comment received

	109	There appear to be too few parking spaces to serve the development.	Noted, although comment makes assumptions regarding parking ratios, context etc. Spaces beneath FOG unit are not visible in this perspective.	No change.
	110	Mews courts are a feature of some large towns and cities and tend to be bounded by modest 2-storey houses with the larger properties set back.	Noted, although sketch depicts a parking court arrangement rather than a mews court.	No change.
	111	P.68. No mention of statutory undertakers who tend to put operational convenience over townscape.	Utilities are an essential component, although one over which Planning has little influence at the planning design stage.	No change.
	112	P. 68. Footway widths. Unless there is spatial segregation 2m is unpleasant on busier roads. 2.5-3m is better where pedestrian traffic is higher.	Agree. Para. 3.9.15 addresses this issue.	No change.
	113	Agree with junction radii, but in the UK kerb protection at crossing points may be required	Noted, although this represents a very specific scenario in respect of the historic environment as opposed to new build.	No change.
	114	P.70-73 is good but as stated later, there ought to be better guidance on planting species.	Agree. Although this is an extensive subject area. Guidance on species planting is available within the relevant sections of the Landscape Character Assessments for Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire.	Include useful references in margin to point towards where advice on species selection can be obtained.
SPD-028 Chesterfield & District Civic Society	115	P. 74 is fine, but minimum separation distances shown in Table 3 should only apply to 2-storey housing. Some LPA's offer advice on 2.5 - 3 storey's and this ought to be included here as 21m between 2 and 3 storey developments can be overbearing, even on a sunny day.	Agree. Highlighted box indicates the application of standards with flexibility according to the circumstances of a particular situation, including the influences of topography, such as sloping sites. Further clarification of front-to-front relationships would be beneficial.	No change to table. Include additional guidance in respect of front-to-front separation distances.

	116	P. 77 Extensions and Impact on Daylight drawing. Agree with drawing, but would it not have been better to be positive and have the deemed to satisfy extensions shown as larger than the example that fails.	Noted. However, the purpose of the illustrations is to explain how the rule works, rather than how to achieve a larger extension per se. The range of potential scenarios is great.	No change.	
	117	P.78 Private Amenity Space. Agree. Worth noting that dwellings can be positioned to give the illusion of longer gardens to the mutual benefit of everyone.	Noted. Although it is unclear how this is intended to be achieved.	No change.	
	118	P.80. Might add provision for youth shelters. Also children's and communal spaces ought to have a sunny aspect, but opportunities for summer shade. Larger spaces ought to be seen as an opportunity for planting larger trees as these will have larger townscape benefits.	Partial agree. Bullet Point 5 addresses the light and shade issue. Using larger spaces to plant larger trees is a positive suggestion.	Include ref to inclusion of larger trees where space allows/reformat page to accommodate change.	
	119	P.82-85. Place Hierarchy. This is really good.	Noted.	No change.	
	120	P.86. Nice photo of a contemporary corner.	Noted.	No change.	
	121	P.88. Right advice and supports the case to use something different on P.10.	Noted.	No change.	
SPD-028	Chesterfield & District Civic Society	122	Permanent boundary [side/rear] walling helps to secure privacy and is a feature of many historic settlements and older terraces. It is shown in the drawing on P.74 and ought to be mentioned, possibly there or on P. 89 as a possible requirement for privacy and amenity. If not there, then here. P. 93 the gritstone wall is well built but atypical as it is normally coursed.	Noted.. Although, guidance does not seek to address separation between rear gardens, only that on public frontages. Para 3.15.9 -10 (p. 93) address boundaries that relate to their context, supporting privacy, amenity, character. Stone wall is from outside the area. Photo intended to illustrate the quality of materials rather than construction detail.	Include of ref to vertical boundaries in Para 3.15.8 re. supporting privacy and definition of public/private spaces. No change to gritstone wall image.

	123	P. 97 This is fine but note stone slate roofs found in NE Derbyshire will normally have a fairly shallow pitch.	Noted. However, stone slate roofs unlikely to be common material for most new developments.	No change.
	124	P.99. Agree with statements but bottom left photo does not impress, a better example ought to be used.	Noted. Images demonstrate a range of modern contemporary infill developments in varied contexts and are considered appropriate in support of this design principle.	Substitute with image showing houses within the wider context of the street.
	125	P.114. Agree, especially with meter boxes (so why use photo on p. 18).	Noted. Image on P.18 is a considered street scene, while the shortcomings identified are noted, overall the photograph is a positive image and local example.	No change.
	126	Section 3.19 Servicing - You might refer to Architects Pocket Book for space requirements.	Noted. Although reference to Metric Handbook : Planning & Design Data is already included.	No change.
	127	Overall, advice is very good.	Noted	No change.
	128	P. 121. Ought to remind all about planning conditions as well as planning obligations which have management and maintenance requirements. E.g. retaining parking spaces, access to utility infrastructures outside the highway.	Noted, although this section is intended to address issues in relation to public space. Fulfillment of planning conditions should be taken as a given.	No change.
	129	P.120. Perhaps mention tree root barrier to ensure footways and surfaces remain even.	Agree.	Add reference to tree root protection.
SPD-028 Chesterfield & District Civic Society	130	Tree rightly feature a lot in the illustrations throughout the guide but advice on the species and where to gain technical advice is remarkably limited - p. 72-73 and 120. More information and links are needed, including the ecological value of trees.	Noted. Although this is an extensive subject area. Guidance on species planting is available within the relevant sections of the Landscape Character Assessments for Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire.	Include useful references in margin on pages 26, 42 and 72 to signpost existing Landscape Character Assessments where advice on species selection can be obtained.

131	I like the quotes in the margins and the use of symbols to indicate relevance. The guide should state what it does not do and what if necessary will be done to cover these areas.	Noted. However, Part 01 outlines what the guide does cover, Rather than what it does not. Currently no plans or capacity to undertake further SPDs at the present time.	No change.
132	It is an important tool. The LPA's need to ensure that it is openly supported and actively used by interested parties. Its use and effectiveness should be monitored.	Noted.	Monitor and review proposals are set out in Part 02. No change.
133	A good document but the test will be how much it will be used. Intended users must feel both an obligation and desire to apply the advice. Therefore compliance with its aims will need to be monitored.	Noted. See monitoring and review processes (Part 2 - Design Process).	No change.
134	Presentation: It would be more attractive to use if the presentation is improved through better photographs, more refined sketches and grey rather than black ink.	Noted. Some alternative images and drawing amendments will be sought, subject to accessibility and resources. Black text on a white background is generally accepted as providing a suitable contrast to allow most readers to clearly see the text.	Substitute certain images with suitable alternatives. Amendments to drawings where identified above. No change to text colour. Strengthen highlighted boxes to give greater emphasis to key points and differentiate differing elements on each page.
135	Covering such a large area it is not possible to cover local distinctiveness well and this is a weakness. There is a case for a supplement on materials and details. Similarly for trees and shrubs.	Noted. Further area by area character appraisals could be developed, subject to resources.	No change. Give consideration to future district wide character appraisals.

SPD-028	Chesterfield & District Civic Society	136	Experience shows that written elements can be neglected at the design stage, with designers looking for illustrations to guide them for this is the medium they prefer, whilst there advocates dwell on the written word to demonstrate that the designer has got it right. In that respect it might be better to give greater emphasis to checklists by creating master checklist for all elements in the appendix for use with the DAS. The London Housing Design Guide interim Edition (2010) offers a comprehensive example.	Noted. Although, the guide makes extensive use of illustrations and photographic examples for this reason and strikes a balance between written and illustrative content. Experience suggests that checklists can provide a helpful overview, but are also inflexible and not always suited to creative processes.	No change.
		137	The SPD is only one method of getting a good message over. Should there be an annual or biannual design and craft awards to celebrate excellence and reinforce the purpose of the guide?	Design awards are a good way of promoting good practice and rewarding quality, but are resource intensive. The guidance cross references to Building for Life 12, which has an associated awards scheme that rewards schemes that achieve a good standard of design.	No change.
SPD-029	Cllr A. Syrett	138	Include clearer references to public art.	Noted, agree. Public art is referenced in 3.2.11 Legibility and Place Hierarchy on pages 81 and 82. More explicit references/imagery could be, incorporated under 3.2.8 Legibility (p. 39), 3.5.12 Character Areas (p. 49) and 3.11.23 Public Spaces and Play Areas (p. 80).	Include additional references to the role and benefits of public art within the guidance.
SPD-030	Nottinghamshire Building Preservation Trust	139	The objectives appear to be covered in a suitably general way.	Noted.	No changes
SPD-031	Cllr G King	140	There have been many fatal accidents involving reversing refuse lorries and pedestrians in recent years in the UK. So I am very pleased that paragraph 3.19.20 of the draft layout and design planning guide advises the avoidance of turning areas in favour of	Agree. Clarification of this reason would be helpful.	Amend text to expand safety reason for designing out culs-de-sac, subject to space limitations/formatting. Suggested wording: This obviates the need for heavy

n/b rows shaded grey indicate a change to in response the comment received

	<p>through routes. Anything we can do to avoid the need for heavy vehicles to reverse where there may be pedestrians present will contribute to reducing the risks and help to save lives.</p> <p>To help make the reasons for the first sentence of 3.19.20 more transparent e.g. by adding the words:</p> <p><i>"in order to obviate the need for heavy vehicles to reverse. Heavy vehicles reversing entail a significant risk of death or serious injury to any pedestrians who may be in a blind spot behind the vehicle"</i></p> <p>Or words to that effect. Advice is easier to understand when the reasons for it are included.</p>		<p>vehicles to reverse, as reversing is a serious hazard to pedestrians and other road users.</p>
--	---	--	---

Appendix 4: Questionnaire



Joint Residential Design Guide Interim SPD – Questionnaire
--

Reg. 12 & 13 Public Consultation 15th October – 26th November 2012

RESPONSE FORM

Please respond to this consultation by completing this questionnaire and returning it by: email to: forward.planning@chesterfield.gov.uk

Or by posting it to:

Forward Planning, Chesterfield Borough Council, Town Hall, Rose Hill, Chesterfield, S40 1LP

Please respond by **26th November 2012** – comments received after this date may not be able to be taken into account. If you would like to be kept informed about next steps following this consultation please include your personal details below:

NAME:	
ORGANISATION:	
ADDRESS:	
POSTCODE:	
EMAIL:	

Please answer as many or as few questions as you wish. If you need extra space, please continue on a separate sheet of paper as necessary. You do not need to answer all the questions.

To answer these questions you will need to look at the draft document:

Successful Places: A Guide to Sustainable Housing Layout and Design (Draft Supplementary Planning Document)

It can be viewed on the internet at:

<http://www.chesterfield.gov.uk/ResidentialDesignSPD>

Office use only:		Respondent No.	
------------------	--	----------------	--

--- For each statement below please circle the comment that best describes your view or answer yes or no where applicable ---

PART 01 – Introduction: Challenge and Purpose

Q1. The information in Part 01 is clear and easy to understand. Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

Q2. There is enough information to explain the purpose, status and use of the guide. Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

PART 02 – Delivering Quality: The Design Process

Q3. The guidance in Part 02 clear and understandable. Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

Q4. The design process outlined in Part 02 (sections 2.3 – 2.7) sets out the necessary steps to help developments take account of their site and location and support the delivery of more locally relevant designs? Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

PART 03 – Place Making Principles: Good Urban Design Practice

Q5. Part 03 includes 19 good practice design principles that can help achieve well-designed places (sections 3.1-3.19). These are the main design principles that should help shape new residential development. Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

Q6. The format for each principle appropriate and easy to understand? Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

Q7. Are there any other design principles which should be included?

Place a X in a box as appropriate:

Yes

No

If yes, please can you explain what else you think should be included?

PART 04 – Management and Maintenance: Enduring Quality

Q8. The guidance in Part 04 is clear and easy to understand. Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

Q9. Part 04 identifies the main management and maintenance requirements in respect of the planning and design process? Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

Overall Format and Layout of the Guide

Q10. The overall format of the guide clear and easy to understand. Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

Q11. It is easy to find your way around the guide. Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

Q12. The SPD clearly sets out the processes and principles that we expect developers and designers to address? Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

Q13. The SPD will help improve the quality of place making and housing design? Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

Q14. This SPD will help create more sustainable housing schemes? Do you:

[strongly agree] [agree] [feel neutral] [disagree] [strongly disagree]

Please add any comments in the box and if you disagree, please explain why:

Q15. Do you wish to be notified at the adoption stage and issued with a copy of the adoption statement? If so, please ensure you have completed your details at the front of this form.

Place a X in a box as appropriate:

Yes

No

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Do you have any other comments or suggestions on any aspect of the draft guidance that you have not addressed above? If so, please use the additional comments sheet overleaf.

Additional Comments Sheet:

Please tell us what part of the guide your comment is about by filling in one or more of the boxes below. If you require additional space please copy and paste the boxes below onto additional pages in Word or photocopy the page to add comments by hand.

Part No. (e.g. 01, 02)		Subject title	
Page No.		Paragraph No.	
Map/drawing/photo			

Put a X in a box as appropriate:

Do you wish to Support Object Comment

Please summarise your comments in the box below:

Part No. (e.g. 01, 02)		Subject title	
Page No.		Paragraph No.	
Map/drawing/photo			

Put a X in a box as appropriate:

Do you wish to Support Object Comment

Please summarise your comments in the box below:


Thank you for taking part in our survey. Please return it to us by 26-11-2012

Appendix 5: Public Consultation Feedback Charts


Successful Places Draft SPD Public Consultation Feedback

Summary of Responses to Individual Questions


Q1. The information in Part 01 is clear and easy to understand.




Q2. There is enough information to explain the purpose, status and use of the guide.




Q3. The guidance in Part 02 clear and understandable.




Q4. The design process outlined in Part 02 (sections 2.3 – 2.7) sets out the necessary steps to help developments take account of their site and location and support the delivery of more locally relevant designs.



Q5. Part 03 includes 19 good practice design principles that can help achieve well-designed places (sections 3.1-3.19). These are the main design principles that should help shape new residential development.



Q6. The format for each principle appropriate and easy to understand.




Q7. Are there any other principles which should be included?

Note: No table has been prepared for responses to Q7. which required a Yes/No response.


Where the question was answered ‘Yes’ an explanation was requested, whereby the respondent was asked to explain what else they considered should be included.

As such, responses to Q7 are set out in the *Detailed Comments and Responses Table*, which includes all detailed comments received, the Local Authorities comment, together with a recommended response or change to the document where appropriate.


Q8. The guidance in Part 04 is clear and easy to understand.




Q9. Part 04 identifies the main management and maintenance requirements in respect of the planning and design process.




Q10. The overall format of the guide clear and easy to understand.




Q11. It is easy to find your way around the guide.



Q12. The SPD clearly sets out the processes and principles that we expect developers and designers to address.



Q13. The SPD will help improve the quality of place making and housing design.



Q14. This SPD will help create more sustainable housing schemes.

