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SUMMARY

This report provides a summary of consultation undertaken by South Oxfordshire District Council between June and July 2016 on our draft Design Guide. The draft Design Guide was proposed as guidance that sets out principles that should guide the design of future developments within the district. The consultation sought the views of statutory planning consultees as well as members of the public. Copies of the draft Design Guide were made available electronically on the council’s website and in hard copy from our offices and main libraries. We encouraged statutory consultees and members of the public to provide feedback on the guide by completing a survey which could be completed online or sent to us by email or post. A total of 51 organisations and individuals responded to the consultation. A range of ideas, views and concerns were identified from the consultation responses received. These included, in order of prevalence, the following comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Comments Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Format, structure and presentation of the guide | • Very accessible, exciting and easy to read.  
• Like that it is concise and uses illustrations.  
• The large file size means it takes a long time to download.  
• Some of the formatting doesn’t work when viewing the PDF version of the guide online.  
• More relevant photograph examples are required.  
• It is not clear who the audience of the guide is. |
| Relevance to small scale development | • The guide focuses on major schemes and not enough on small scale developments or non-domestic buildings. |
| Too much of an urban emphasis | • The guide relates more to urban areas and less with the rural and suburban character of parts of the district.  
• It requires a further section directed specifically at the rural environment. |
| Public consultation | • This should be proportionate to the scale of the development.  
• Additional consultees suggested. |
| There should be more reference to the Chilterns AONB | • The guide does not refer to the Chilterns AONB.  
• The guide will be a useful tool alongside the Chilterns Design Guide. |
| Internal space standards | • There is no reference to this.  
• The size of houses built today are not big enough. |
| New development should respect | • Development must relate to its context.  
• Must avoid ‘anywhere development’. |
the character within the district

- New development should respect the existing character or have its own complementary character.

The historic environment

- Should be more reference and weight given to this.

Amenity

- The 25 metre back to back distances are more generous than the commonly used 21 metres and no justification or caveats are given for this.

Benefits for the existing community

- This aspect is not covered sufficiently.

The council has used information gained from the consultation to make amendments to the guide where appropriate. These include:

- An example of how the principles of the guide apply to small-scale developments has been provided at the end of the document
- Clarification about how this guide relates to all contexts
- Two new Technical Documents covering non-domestic buildings and flats/apartments
- Updated section on the value of good design
- Updated section on public consultation
- More recent, meaningful photographic examples used which reflect the rural, suburban and urban character of parts of the district
- Updating and improving the clarity and structure of all Technical Documents
- Clarification of wording, correction of typos.

Council Officers have reviewed feedback from the consultation and made responses throughout this report. We expect the design guide to be adopted in November 2016.
THE DESIGN GUIDE AND WHY WE CONSULTED ON IT

The design guide was published in draft by South Oxfordshire District Council in June 2016 for comment.

South Oxfordshire District Council want to replace the existing design guide (2008) with an up to date, innovative and exemplar design guide. The new design guide will be a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and together with the design policies in the Council’s emerging Local Plan 2031, will be the key mechanism for delivering high quality design in the district.

The ultimate objective for the design guide is to raise the quality of design in new development in the district. The guide seeks to do this by setting out the aspirational standard that we expect new developments to meet. This is done by structuring the main guide into 9 sections with each one demonstrating a core design principle and explaining why this is important. Clear visuals, best practice examples and links to further information are set out in each section. Alongside this, plans showing the design development of a residential scheme are included and related to the principles of each section. This is to clearly show how each principle relates to a plan and to illustrate the ideal design process. A checklist is then presented at the end of each section for designers and decision makers to use as a tool to work through the design and assess the quality of the development being proposed. The main guide is supported by a series of ten technical documents known as the suite of documents. These cover different areas and disciplines which need to be considered at the outset of the design process. The suite of documents include: Building Conversions, Householder Extensions, Landscape, Public Art, Shopfronts and Signage, Biodiversity, Sustainable Energy and Trees.

We consulted on the draft guide to allow statutory stakeholders and interested members of the public, the opportunity to comment and make suggestions for improvement before it is formally adopted as council policy. This was in line with the council’s policy commitment to involve stakeholders in the development of planning policies as set out in our Statement of Community Involvement.

This consultation summary provides an account of the feedback we received, as well as our responses to the main comments, issues and suggestions raised.
CONSULTATION METHODOLOGY

The council published the draft design guide on its website on 17th June 2016. We sought to draw this to the attention of residents using press releases, social media and dedicated correspondence sent to people who had previously registered an interest in council consultations.

These included:

- A press release on the council’s website and advertisements in local papers (Appendix B - Publicity)
- A series of tweets on Twitter
- Letters sent to everyone on the register of consultee (Appendix A – Consultation Letter)
- Printed copies of the design guide sent to the libraries in Didcot, Wallingford, Henley and Thame and the Council’s Office at Milton Park

To prompt structured feedback on the guide, we asked people to consider the following questions:

1. How far do you agree with the relevant section, eg. part 1?
2. Do you have any comments for the relevant section, eg. part 1?
3. Do you have any comments on the format and layout of the guide?
4. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make on the design guide?
5. What makes a high quality development?
6. Give us an example of what you think is a high quality development in South Oxfordshire.

Responses to these questions could be sent to us via our online consultation portal, by email and by post. We allowed 6 weeks for responses to the consultation which lasted from 17 June to 29 July 2016. A copy of the question wording used is shown in Appendix D.

To make sense of the feedback received, we employed two types of analysis. In the first instance we looked at the headline quantitative measures of agreement with each section of the main guide and technical documents. This was followed by coding of the free text comments to help understand the sentiment behind respondents’ agreement or disagreement. The codes we generated identified frequently mentioned ideas, suggestions and issues. The findings of the consultation are set out in the next section of this report.

The consultation was conducted in full compliance with the council’s Customer Engagement Charter1 which sets out our commitments for work of this nature.

---

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

51 people and organisations responded to the consultation.

Responses shown in this section are presented anonymously except where they were made on behalf of a group or organisation. We have responded to all comments and these are shown in the text boxes.

Overall agreement with proposals

To provide a top line indication of support for the draft guide, we asked respondents to tell us the extent to which they supported each section and technical documents of the main guide. It should be noted that out of 51 respondents, in some cases, only 5 people responded to the structured questions. This may be because some respondents wrote letters or emails rather than using our online consultation system.

We found that out of the limited number of people who responded, most either strongly agreed or agreed with all sections made in the main design guide (Figure 1).
How far do you agree with the checklists in the guide?

We found that most respondents agreed with the checklists in the main design guide (Figure 2).

![Checklist Agreement Chart]

Detailed comments

Respondents were also asked if they had any comments to make for each section. The information provided below picks up on the key themes that ran throughout these free text comments. We have reported on the most common themes which are shaded in grey and provided an officer response where appropriate.

GENERAL REMARKS ABOUT THE DESIGN GUIDE

We asked people if they had any general comments to make about the main design guide. The most frequently made were concerns that the guide had too much of an urban emphasis and did not relate to the rural character of the district, questions and concerns about the relevance of the guide to small scale development, strong views that the character of the district is very important, compliments and some concerns about the format, structure and presentation of the guide and requests that there are stronger references made to the Chilterns AONB, historic environment and internal space standards, amenity and the benefits for the existing community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The format, structure and presentation of the guide</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to small scale development</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much of an urban emphasis</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The format, structure and presentation of the guide:

Compliments:

17 people commented on the format, structure and presentation of the document. 11 people were positive about this:

*I like the format and the reduced length.* 4

*I like the format and the reduced length. 4*

*I like the format and the reduced length.* 4

*The graphics are good and the document is not too wordy.* Amanda Walker, DP Architects.

*The graphics are good and the document is not too wordy.* Amanda Walker, DP Architects.

*The new Part 1 and Part 2 are very clear and attractively presented.* 15

*The new Part 1 and Part 2 are very clear and attractively presented.* 15

*The structure is very clear and the balance between text and graphics is also really good and provides a good way to understand the 'message' either by reading or by looking at the 'how to' process that the graphics show.* Dr. Laura Novo de Azevedo, Oxford Brookes University.

*The structure is very clear and the balance between text and graphics is also really good and provides a good way to understand the 'message' either by reading or by looking at the 'how to' process that the graphics show.* Dr. Laura Novo de Azevedo, Oxford Brookes University.

*It is clear, concise, comprehensive and will be a most useful supplement to the NPPF and the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide.* Swyncombe Parish Council

*It is clear, concise, comprehensive and will be a most useful supplement to the NPPF and the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide.* Swyncombe Parish Council

Criticism:

5 people however, commented that the format of the guide made it difficult to read online, the large size of the file made it difficult to download and it was not clear who the intended audience was.

*The structure of the document works very well, however, when reading it on-line it is not as easy to grasp how the document is structured.* Rachel Aldred, Architect.

*The structure of the document works very well, however, when reading it on-line it is not as easy to grasp how the document is structured.* Rachel Aldred, Architect.

*Page 16/17: the table does not work on pages which are aligned vertically. Like they are when viewing this on the web- which I presume you think will be most people. As page 17 table is not in line with other table it is utterly baffling viewed as a single page.* JPPC Chartered Town Planners.

*Page 16/17: the table does not work on pages which are aligned vertically. Like they are when viewing this on the web- which I presume you think will be most people. As page 17 table is not in line with other table it is utterly baffling viewed as a single page.* JPPC Chartered Town Planners.

*I found the document difficult to read on screen, perhaps a website presentation would be better. The green print used for headings did not stand out and was difficult to read. The illustrations are reminiscent of a book for children - I presume that this is a reference for professionals? 28* 28

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public consultation</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There should be more reference to the Chilterns AONB</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal space standards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development should respect the character and context in the district</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not enough emphasis on the historic environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits for the existing community</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevance to small scale development:

8 people commented that the guidance did not relate to small scale development such as 0-10 dwellings, small infill development etc.

*Could do with more guidance for small infill sites (1-5 units) where a small developer may need to be convinced to improve the environment and setting through good design.* Amanda Walker, DP Architects.

*I think that part 1 + 2 should have an explanation about application to smaller sites for the benefit of the public. Many sites are of up to 10 dwellings.*

The draft design guide states that all proposals should be tested against the Guide. However, it is clearly intended for larger developments and will be of very little use for smaller scale developments. Smaller scale developments are the vast majority of planning applications. JPPC Chartered Town Planners.

Whilst we accept that many design principles are applicable at any scale, we feel that for more complicated and large scale applications the guide provides a comprehensive approach but for single dwellings, extensions and other householder applications it may be an intimidating and lengthy document. Historic England

We similarly approve of the goals stated in chapter 8 (pages 44 & 45), both in the setting of design codes and choice of materials, but which should apply equally to single dwellings and minor developments (up to 4/5 dwellings). Swyncombe Parish Council.

Whilst the guide has been written for and tested against a range of scales of development, we appreciate that this may not be that clear as the example shown throughout the guide is of a large residential development. We have therefore included a section on how the guide relates to smaller scale development, providing an example of a smaller site.

Urban emphasis

6 people made comments which raised concern that the guide was written for an urban context and that the guidance would relate more to urban areas rather than rural areas.

*The guide appears in essence to be a manual for urban design with a loosely-connected section on the character of South Oxfordshire. Whilst we have no quarrel with the urban design principles, we are concerned that the main emphasis appears to be on a generic urban context and gives little weight or space to the largely rural*
nature of the District or the character of its village communities. Benson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee.

Although the intro talks a lot about countryside and villages, most of the detail is about urban or suburban development. Maybe a few of your drawings or comments could be changed so that they portray villages rather than suburbia?

Our major concern is that the guide is written almost entirely from the standpoint of good urban design. We argue strongly that the Guide requires a further section directed specifically at the rural environment. One of the disappointments of the last fifty years has been the tendency for urban design principles to be translated into villages and so to introduce an urban feel which is frequently inappropriate… The heading Urban Design Principles rather makes our point for us. Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Council.

A number of people were generally complimentary about the guide however and recognised its position as one document to be supported by other, more detailed studies:

It is clear, concise, comprehensive and will be a most useful supplement to the NPPF and the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide. Swyncombe Parish Council

The guide is intended to be applicable to all scales of development and the design principles set out would serve as a guide to best practice even though there is still the flexibility for justification to be provided where they cannot be achieved. The guide places great emphasis on the importance of designing in context and has a dedicated section titled ‘This is South Oxfordshire which provides a brief summary of the character of the district. A comprehensive list of links to additional resources containing detailed information about the district and its character is provided.

The use of the term ‘Urban Design’ does not refer only to urban areas but to any built development which could also be in rural or suburban areas. The guide has been updated to set clearer definitions of what we mean by ‘urban design’ and how the criteria relates to a mix of urban, suburban and rural areas of the district. We have also included more examples of developments in a rural context.

Public Consultation:

6 respondents made reference to public consultation. 4 respondents asked for additional groups to be added to the list of who to consult in the guide:

Could Public Health be added to the list of example areas covered by OCC for consultation? Oxfordshire County Council.

It is surprising that, in the list of organisations that should be consulted by developers, town and parish councils are at the bottom of the list - they should be much higher up. Also the list should local civic societies such as the Henley Society. Henley Society.

One respondent commented that our recommended approach of two stages of public consultation was not relevant to minor proposals:
Two-stage consultation process not relevant to minor proposals. JPPC Chartered Town Planners.

We have added Public Health to the list of consultees. Town and Parish Council’s are now higher up in the list. We consider the two stage approach for public consultation to be best practice, whatever scale of development. We cannot insist this approach is taken but we can encourage it.

There should be more reference to the Chilterns AONB

5 people raised concern that the guide did not refer to the Chilterns AONB or Chilterns Conservation Board.

There is no reference to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide which has been adopted by SODC as SPG (see South Oxfordshire Core Strategy para 15.27), or its supplementary technical notes on Chilterns Brick, Chilterns Flint and Roofing Materials. Please add reference to these documents within the new Design Guide to signpost where to find detailed advice on designing in the Chilterns AONB.

The guidance in the Design Guide could be applicable anywhere in the UK, it makes no reference to the character of the district and fails to mention Chilterns AONB.

Goring Heath Parish Council.

One respondent felt that the design guide would be complementary to the Chilterns AONB Management Plan however:

We are very glad that the Chilterns AONB Management Plan, Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and Shopfront Design Guide remain part of the foundation blocks of the new SODC Supplementary Guide. Henley Archaeological and Historical Group.

We have referred to the Chilterns Conservation Board, Chilterns Building Design Guide and the Chilterns AONB. The section on ‘This is South Oxfordshire’ refers to the Chilterns AONB.

Internal space standards:

3 respondents mentioned that there was no reference to internal space standards.

There is no reference to the design of internal space standards. 19

I feel some aspiration ought to be included in Part 2 or at the least some reference to storage requirements. Rachel Aldred, Architect.

One respondent made reference to minimum room sizes and stated that the UK has the smallest sqm spaces for dwellings in the EU.

There is no mention anywhere of minimum room sizes. UK has the smallest sqm spaces in the EU for dwelling of all types. We do not want to live in tiny boxes. There is plenty of land. Something like the Parker Morris standard. 39

We have referred to the Government’s Planning Practice Guidance for space standards.
New development should respect the character within the district:

4 people made comments which related to the character of existing settlements and the design of new development within them, commenting that new developments should respect the existing character of the area. References were also made to the relationship between local building materials and character and the importance of providing consistent guidance about this in the main guide. One person commented that the guide lacked local examples of good and locally distinctive design.

Recently in the rush to build, much characterful detail has been lost and suburban houses are creeping into the villages. This must be curtailed in a big way if South Oxon is to keep its charm. 7

In defining distinctive character, it would be helpful if the list of building materials on page 17 could be more readily associated with the character areas identified on pages 15-16, and if more detail could be given about the distinctive use of the materials. Benson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee.

You refer to ‘anywhere’ design yet the good examples given are not local and are just the same anywhere design – just a newer version of it. JPPC Chartered Town Planners.

The local materials table gives a very variable level of detail. The lack of consistency risks losing some key local characteristics. Watlington Parish Council

Two people mentioned the need to support contemporary development and the potential for creating new, distinctive character.

The emphasis of the document should be reviewed to consider new settlements and the potential to create a new character that is not related to an existing area. Persimmon Homes.

We agree that new development should be respectful of the local character of an area which is why the guide highlights the importance of contextual analysis.

We also support the potential for creating new developments with their own character and seek to encourage this throughout the guide.

The historic environment:

3 respondents raised concern that there was not enough regard for the historic environment in this guide and the role in could play in helping to deliver sustainable development.

The section on Historic Features and Heritage on page 18 mentions only designated heritage assets and does not refer to the local value of non-designated assets. We are concerned that this does not tally with the NPPF, and could result in lack of regard for the historic but unlisted buildings that contribute to the character of Benson. Benson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee.
The guide underplays the importance of the historic environment in successful, sustainable design which the NPPF includes. Historic England.

The guide refers to the historic environment in ‘This is South Oxfordshire’ and refers to relevant publications which provide further, detailed information, including those specifically related to the historic environment of South Oxfordshire.

Amenity:

3 respondents made reference to neighbour amenity. 2 challenged the proposed 25 metre back to back distances between dwellings stating that they couldn’t see the justification for this distance as opposed to the commonly used standard of 21 metres.

I would suggest that 21m back-to-back distance (common planning practice in relation to the consideration of mutual overlooking of dwellings) rather than the suggested minimum of 25m is progressed as I can’t see a justification for a minimum distance of 25m in all circumstances. I note that, unlike the existing 2008 Design Guide, there are no caveats to either the 21/25m minimum back-to-back distance, or the amenity space, or the back-to-side and front-to-front and back-to-boundary distances. Paul Butt on behalf of Croudace Homes and the University of Reading.

The minimum distances set out are overly prescriptive and are not based on any urban design best practice. Persimmon Homes.

We have updated the document to clarify that the back to back distance is 25 metres. We have also made it clearer that where these distances are not met the plans must be able to demonstrate how the design proposals can still ensure that privacy is maintained.

Benefits for the existing community:

3 respondents mentioned the importance of considering how new development could benefit the existing community.

We feel that in this and other respects the draft guidance should perhaps consider the well-being of the community as well as the well-being of the development that will hopefully be part of it. Benson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee.

Some consideration of how the new development will benefit the existing community. What is there to draw in neighbours and knit this new development into its surroundings? Rachel Aldred, Architect.

We have added a reference to high quality development benefiting the existing community under ‘The Value of Good Design’.
Sustainable development:

3 respondents specifically mentioned the term ‘sustainable development’. All 3 were concerned that the reference to it in the design guide and the definition used was vague, incorrect and different from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

P7 – Sustainable Development: Differs from the definition provided within the NPPF. It is important that the whole document is NPPF compliant. No mention made of the environmental role of sustainable development. SODC Planning Policy.

The term “sustainable” was too vague and not clearly defined what it would require from developments to be considered to be sustainable. Tetsworth Parish Council.

We have clarified this definition and referred to the one used within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

DESIGN GUIDE TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS

The main guide is supported by a suite of technical documents which cover more detailed aspects relevant to development. These documents were subjected to the same public consultation and we asked for views on each one of them.

How far do you agree with the content in the technical documents?

How far do you agree with the content of the technical documents?

How far do you agree with the content in the technical documents?

We found that most people agreed with the content of each technical document. The documents which received the most disagreement were Building Conversions,
Householder Extensions, Trees and Sustainable Energy. The qualitative analysis below explores the reasons for this disagreement.

Trees:

4 respondents commented on this technical document.

One matter of concern is the lack of emphasis on the problem of air quality in built-up areas. Should this not be dealt with in Technical Document No 4 under ‘Trees-Retaining and Planting?’ All one can see is a squiggly sketch in a drawing of a street scene, saying ‘air quality’ or so it seems unless there is more in another part of the document which we have overlooked. Henley Archaeological and Historical Group.

The document requires the use of larger tree species. This appears to be a false economy and should consider earlier planting of smaller trees to allow these to naturally grow. Matters such as management should be capable of being dealt with by condition and should not prevent commencement of development. Persimmon Homes.

Existing mature trees should be protected, on new estate sites, and further saplings planted. The latter should be adequately stated/protected and watered. Residents can be requested to adopt your trees near their properties. 10

| We agree and have updated this technical document to relate it to air quality. We think that smaller tree planting could be a successful approach if the planting is delivered early but in some situations, larger and more mature trees will be required – to deliver instant maturity for example and so it depends on the context. We have updated the text to reflect both options. |
| We agree with the comments on tree protection and this is reflected in the main guide and this technical document. |

Landscaping

3 respondents commented on this technical document.

Open space should be accessible for all users including people with disabilities, parents/carers and older people. SODC Equality Officer.

Insufficient weight has been given to the accepted methodology for Landscape Character Assessment. SODC Planning Policy.

This SPD could consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. Natural England.
Biodiversity:

4 respondents commented on this technical document.

The key elements of the document appears to be the ‘Planning positively for biodiversity’. The document references that the Council applies a form of Biodiversity Accounting, but the details of this scheme are thin on the ground. As set out previously, where a large scale development comes forward on a green field site, the high quantity of low scoring habitats (such as arable fields) start to negatively impact upon developments. The Council needs to use a common sense approach to see mitigation and creation of habitats; but not to the level where strategic developments are required to deliver a net increase. Persimmon Homes.

Householder extensions:

5 respondents made specific reference to this technical document. 2 respondents asked for clarification of the 45 degree test.

Technical Document 5 twice refers to the 45 degree rule without ever explaining it. This is not a problem for design professionals who one hopes would know about it, but as the document is entitled “Householder Extensions” the rule should be explained for the benefit of lay users of the guide. Watlington Parish Council

3 respondents asked for further information about the link with sustainable energy, accessibility and outbuildings.

There should be more encouragement of contemporary design in house design and environmental energy efficient elements on existing and new buildings rather than designating them as unsightly add ons. 15

The document is are largely silent on accessibility features and there appears to be no stated requirement to conduct or apply the findings of an accessibility audit nor to consider the accessibility needs of visitors, as distinct from the owner/occupier. Mobility Issues Group for Goring and Streatley.

What is missing is the detail for extensions and outbuildings, which was very helpful in the old guide. Kidmore End Parish Council
Building Conversions:

2 respondents questioned the purpose and need for this document, citing that many conversions are now permitted development.

*Need an explanation of the purpose of the document. Many changes of use are now permitted development. SODC Planning Policy.*

The Building Conversion technical note is very restrictive and appears inflexible. 15

We have edited the text to make it less prescriptive but as this is a guidance document, we seek to encourage best practice even when it is permitted development.

Sustainable Energy:

5 respondents commented on this technical document. Each comment related to the lack of further information and the need for some clarification.

*I am very disappointed that I cannot find any reference to choosing an aspect for the new dwellings which will give south facing roofs, and that these south facing roofs should have solar panels. Nor can I find any other references to utilising energy sources where possible.* 42

The document does not appear to have regard to all other documents prepared. Persimmon Homes supports the creation of homes which operate on a fabric first basis. There is no point in creating energy to be wasted within the home, and the energy in the home should be used efficiently. Building orientation should not focus solely on the potential for solar gain. Firstly solar gain is not necessarily a positive feature as this can lead to over heating of a property; secondly it disregards the contextual assessment of a site. Persimmon Homes.

*The technical guide on Sustainable energy is encouraging but not encouraging enough of retrofit power generation and heat source pumps etc. there should be clear link between householder extensions and this technical note. The Building Conversion technical note is v restrictive and appears inflexible importance of sustainable energy should be included. Commercial buildings should all be required to include power generation of some sort. Particularly buildings with large low pitched roofs should be required to have photovoltaic panels.* 15

We will be explaining the 45 degree test by including a sketch to show how it is carried out. We have tried to use contemporary examples throughout the document. We will reference all relevant guidance and other technical documents under ‘Additional information’. We have included the guidance on outbuildings.

We have tried to include more examples showing different types of sustainable energy systems. We have sought to cross reference the technical documents.
Public Art:

2 respondents commented on this technical document. 1 stated that public art was welcomed but its delivery should not impact on the viability of the development.

*The creation of art for arts sake is not something that is supported. Integration of artistic features within a development is welcomed, but if the art has an impact upon the best use of the land it should not become an over riding factor. The delivery of such initiatives should also be subject to viability assessments, the Council already seek significant contributions through CIL and affordable housing; the creation of additional costs relating to public art further dilute the ability to deliver viable schemes.* Persimmon Homes.

The other sought clarification on the definition of public art.

*Public art is art for the public specifically designed by artists for the purpose of public display (i.e. it is beyond the artist’s work merely shown in public spaces). Is this the definition of public art? SODC Planning Policy.*

**We have updated the definition of public art to link it with the reference in the NPPF.**

Shopfronts and Signage:

4 respondents commented on this technical document. 3 comments related to the design of shopfronts and signage:

*The Shop front guide needs to be clear what is meant by natural materials. Stand alone stainless steel or powder coated letters on traditional shop fronts can be acceptable. 15* we would suggest that the text should read "illuminaton of fascias and hanging signs is discouraged" rather than "....is not encouraged". Henley Society.

1 related to the accessibility of businesses units:

Consideration should be given to people with visual and mobility impairments in the design. *Doors should be easily distinguishable from their surrounds. Door opening furniture that is easily reached, and which provides a secure grip, is of critical importance to disabled people, including disabled children. It should be possible to operate all door opening furniture one-handed, without the need to grasp or twist.*

*Wheelchair users can also find it difficult to open and close doors when door operation is not power-assisted.* SODC Equality Officer.

**We have sought to include inclusive design throughout the document and have made reference to the relevant building regulations. We have sought to achieve greater clarity within the text.**

Other Comments:

We have updated the defini...
Other less frequently made comments related to:

- Bin storage
- Parking
- Connectivity
- Transport
- Size of the document
- Health and safety
- Protecting farmland
- Water/flooding
- Pedestrianisation
- Ageing population
- Validation requirements/information supporting an application
- Taller buildings
- Density
- Hierarchy of streets
- Daylight/sunlight
- Environmental enhancement
- Commercial development
- Contemporary design
- Environmental efficiency
- Future maintenance
- Light pollution
- Design codes
- Design review
- Shared space
- Footpaths
- Health
- Co-located services
- Cycling
- Air quality
- Privacy
- Cellars/basements
- Equestrian/Public rights of way
- Views
- Archaeology
- Enclosure
- Building control
- Adaptability
- Gardens
- Infilling
- Guidance is too prescriptive
- Guidance is not clear
HOW WE HAVE USED RESULTS OF THE CONSULTATION

The council would like to thank everyone who took part in this consultation. The council has used information gained from the consultation to make amendments to the guide where appropriate. These include:

- An example of how the guide relates to small-scale development has been provided at the end of the document
- A new technical document for non-domestic buildings has been created
- A new technical document for flats and apartments has been created
- Updated section on the Value of Good Design
- Updated section on public consultation
- More recent, meaningful photographic examples used which reflect the rural, suburban and urban character of parts of the district
- Updating and improving the clarity and structure of all technical documents
FURTHER INFORMATION

If you wish to discuss the findings of this consultation or learn more about our work on the design guide, please view our website www.southoxon/designguide or contact:

Planning Policy Email: Planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk
APPENDIX A – CONSULTATION WORDING

Planning

HEAD OF SERVICE: Adrian Duffield

Address 1
Address 2
Town
City
Postcode

CONTACT OFFICER: Clare Golden & Marta Bou Fernandez
planning.policy@southandvale.gov.uk
Tel: 01235 540546
135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton
OX14 4SB

17 June 2016
Dear

Notice of consultation for new South Oxfordshire Draft Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

South Oxfordshire District Council is consulting on the new South Oxfordshire Design Guide Document (SPD). The document provides guidance to decision makers and those wishing to design new developments on best practice and the criteria that we will use to assess the quality of developments. This document is an SPD.

This consultation lasts a period of six weeks running from Friday 17th June to Friday 29th July 2016 closing by 4.30pm precisely. Representations must be received in this time period. You can view an electronic copy of the Design Guide by visiting www.southoxon.gov.uk/designguide.

Hard copies of the document will also be available to view at the District Council’s Offices at 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, OX14 4SB during normal office opening hours. It will also be available to view at the libraries in Didcot, Henley, Thame and Wallingford.

You can comment using our online consultation system, accessible via the web address above. If you have not already done so, you will need to register to use our system.

You can send your comments through to: planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk
Or by post to: New South Oxfordshire Design Guide, C/O Urban Design Officer, Planning Services, South Oxfordshire District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, OX14 4SB.

Comments received will be used to inform the development of the document. Please be advised that all consultation responses will be available to the public to view and may be included on our website. Following the consultation, we will be producing a consultation report which will be made available on our website in due course.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely

For and on behalf of Adrian Duffield

Head of Planning
APPENDIX B: Publicity

PUBLIC NOTICE

NOTICE OF CONSULTATION FOR NEW SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE DESIGN GUIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)


Purpose of this SPD:
The South Oxfordshire District Council is consulting on the new South Oxfordshire Design Guide Document (SPD). The document provides guidance to decision makers and those wishing to design new developments on best practice and the criteria that we will use to assess the quality of developments. This document is an SPD.

Consultation time frame and viewing documents:
This consultation lasts a period of six weeks running from Friday 17th June to Friday 29th July 2016 closing by 4:30pm precisely. Representations must be received in this time period. You can view an electronic copy of the Design Guide by visiting www.southoxon.gov.uk/designguide

Hard copies of the document will also be available to view at the District Council’s Offices at 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, OX14 4SB during normal office opening hours. It will also be available to view at the libraries in Didcot, Henley, Thame and Wallingford.

You can comment using our online consultation system, accessible via the web address above. If you have not already done so, you will need to register to use our system.

You can send your comments through to: planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk

Or by post to: New South Oxfordshire Design Guide, C/O Urban Design Officer, Planning Services, South Oxfordshire District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, OX14 4SB.

Comments received will be used to inform the development of the document. Please be advised that all consultation responses will be available to the public to view and may be included on our website.

Following the consultation, we will be producing a consultation report which will be made available on our website in due course.
APPENDIX C: Most common remarks
Presentation, structure and style:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council’s response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The graphics are good and the document is not too wordy.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I liked the format and found it to be a very accessible document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Vale Building Control</td>
<td>Really easy to read, very concise (always welcomed) and exciting document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>First impression is promising, relatively jargon-free and user-friendly!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>Historic England welcomes the Council’s initiative in the production of this generally excellent, comprehensive and attractively presented Design Guide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPPC</td>
<td>Some of the images are meaningless/valueless. The table on page 17 cannot be read as a PDF version. The very high file size of the document (80mb!!) will have put many off using it and is not at all user friendly. Pdfs are great as they allow a search facility, but taking 5 minutes to download is far too high.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The new Part 1 and Part 2 are very clear and attractively presented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Moreton</td>
<td>50 pages and 80MB!!! Can I suggest you rethink the format of this document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I found the document difficult to read on screen, perhaps a website presentation would be better. The green print used for headings did not stand out and was difficult to read. The illustrations are reminiscent of a book for children - I presume that this is a reference for professionals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Brookes University</td>
<td>I think it is great that you have mixed graphics so that the first impression is of a friendly and engaging document. The structure is very clear and the balance between text and graphics is also really good and provide a good way to understand the 'message' either by reading or by looking at the 'how to' process that the graphics show. The hand drawings give an impression of openness and friendliness which is great. The fact that it is condensed and mostly focused on design principles rather than on very detailed mandatory codes is a fantastic feature. The guide feels exciting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>Document does not include a numbering system. Size: It is ridiculous that a 50 page document is over 80mb, surely a low resolution online version can be made available. This makes the document inaccessible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Council</strong></td>
<td>The Council have made the document inaccessible through the very size; and should ensure the final version is available in a low resolution format.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td>It would help if the design guide was easier to download.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rachel Aldred</strong></td>
<td>The structure of the document works very well, however, when reading it on-line it is not as easy to grasp how the document is structured. I therefore think it would be useful to have a graphic at the start that more clearly explains the structure that I am able to refer back too. Could pages of the pdf be bookmarked to facilitate this?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SODC Planning Policy** | The text is quite small.  
P32 & 33 – Figures need references and also details of where these places are. |
| **Swyncombe Parish Council** | Compliments to the author(s) of this document. It is clear, concise, comprehensive and will be a most useful supplement to the NPPF and the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide. |
| **Watlington Parish Council** | The appearance of the document is appealing and invites closer examination, but it is not clear who the intended audience is.  
It seems too elementary to be aimed at professional developers / designers, but they are the people who will be doing the real design work and so are the people that the Guide should be trying to influence.  
On the other hand it is pitched at about the right level for parish council planning committees or groups preparing |
Neighbourhood Plans. As far as Neighbourhood Plans go it provides ideas that could be incorporated as policies, but is not going to be that easy to reference because of its relaxed structure and style.

The checklist approach in both the Guide and the Technical Documents is good, but there is not always enough supporting text to make the checklist clear. It would also be useful to have more explicit references to these Technical Documents in the Design Guide – some references are included, but others are not. Only four out of eight of them are referenced in the body of the Guide although a further one is referenced in the introductory text.

The use of illustrations is not as clear as it might be with a tendency to borrow illustrations from the old Design Guide without making it clear what the relationship to the text on the page is.

| Chilterns Conservation Board | The Board supports making the document more user friendly and interactive. |

Relevance to small-scale development:

<p>| Respondent ID/Organisation | Comments | Council's response: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1</strong></th>
<th>Could do with more guidance for small infill sites (1-5 units) where a small developer may need to be convinced to improve the environment and setting through good design.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chilterns Conservation Board</strong></td>
<td>The new Design Guide itself appears to be a generic and basic introduction to Urban Design for major developments, rather than containing advice on architectural design appropriate to the South Oxfordshire area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goring Heath Parish Council</strong></td>
<td>It is completely silent on the reality of nearly all planning applications that are actually submitted. It is noted that all principles and criteria are relevant for all scales of development. We believe that this is over-prescriptive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>I think that part 1 + 2 should have an explanation about application to smaller sites for the benefit of the public. Many sites are of up to 10 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic England</strong></td>
<td>The intended wide applicability to audience and scale is ambitious and, we feel, not entirely successful. Whilst we accept that many design principles are applicable at any scale, we feel that for more complicated and large scale applications the guide provides a comprehensive approach but for single dwellings, extensions and other householder applications it may be an intimidating and lengthy document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principles outlined in the design guide are applicable to all scales of development. We have emphasised this message throughout the document as a result of the consultation. An example of how to apply these principles to small scale development has been added at the end of the guide.
Suggest providing individual documents including only those sections of the design guidance that are relevant to make use the document more helpful in guiding applicants through the assessment and design process and/or examples of how to apply the principles in the Guide at a smaller scale of development.

**JPPC**

The draft design guide states that all proposals should be tested against the Guide. However, it is clearly intended for larger developments and will be of very little use for smaller scale developments.

Smaller scale developments are the vast majority of planning applications. If this is intended to replace the previous guide in total, then it will be little used which will undermine its purpose and it might as well say ‘all proposals must respond to their surroundings and will be scrutinised by professionals’.

Design review not appropriate for smaller schemes.

**SODC Planning Policy**

P22 – We should explain that this applies from both strategic sites, to small infill developments and an extensions to dwellings.

Overall – the design guide is good for large scale residential schemes however, it seems to be based largely on residential development rather than commercial or other uses and doesn’t provide much information on how it would be used by a layperson or;
how a small scale scheme should consider good design.

Swyncombe Parish Council

We similarly approve of the goals stated in chapter 8 (pages 44 & 45), both in the setting of design codes and choice of materials, but which should apply equally to single dwellings and minor developments (up to 4/5 dwellings).

There is too much of an urban emphasis to the guide:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee</td>
<td>The guide appears in essence to be a manual for urban design with a loosely-connected section on the character of South Oxfordshire. The main emphasis appears to be on a generic urban context and gives little weight or space to the largely rural nature of the District or the character of its village communities.</td>
<td>Part 1 of the guide refers to the rural character of South Oxfordshire. We are aware of the predominant rural nature of the district and have reviewed all the principles in the guide to make sure that these are applicable to all scales and context of development. A section on how the principles of the guide can be applied to a small scale development has been added at the end of the guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Council</td>
<td>The guide is written almost entirely from the standpoint of good urban design. It requires a further section directed specifically at the rural environment. The Guide recognises the importance of context, but its more detailed guidance will often conflict with it in a rural environment.</td>
<td>Urban design is a discipline that relates to the design of our cities, towns and villages. It is a collaborative and multi-disciplinary process of shaping the physical setting of where we live, work and socialise. It is the art of making places no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Although the intro talks a lot about countryside and villages, most of the detail is about urban or suburban development. Maybe a few of your drawings or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring Heath Parish Council</td>
<td>Appears to wholly address issues of design in an urban setting, despite South Oxfordshire being a predominantly rural area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidmore End Parish Council</td>
<td>The guide is biased towards urban and suburbs rather than rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swyncombe Parish Council</td>
<td>It is almost exclusively relevant for urban developments and does not take adequately into account the need for 'high quality rural developments'. This is particularly important for South Oxfordshire, which is predominantly rural and will, therefore, present specific infrastructure, building design, housing development and connectivity challenges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henley Society</td>
<td>On p.13, it is surprising that, in the list of organisations that should be consulted by developers, town and parish councils are at the bottom of the list - they should be much higher up. Also the list should local civic societies such as the Henley Society.</td>
<td>Town and Parish Councils have been elevated in the list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPPC</td>
<td>Two-stage consultation process not relevant to minor proposals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

comments could be changed so that they portray villages rather than suburbia? matter the context. Therefore the word ‘urban’ is not be taken literally but rather as a way of describing a discipline.
| Mobility Issues for Goring and Streatley | Under “who to consult”, should the list also include someone with expertise on needs of disabled and/or elderly?  
Should the list of statutory authorities and organisations also include “equality“, “equal opportunity“ and/or “diversity“ officers of local authorities? | We cannot insist on this approach but recommend it as best practice.  
We have added this to the list. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Oxfordshire County Council | Could Public Health be added to the list of example areas covered by OCC for consultation? | Added.  
We agree and recommend it as best practice. |
| Persimmon Homes | Design Review: The document sets out a statement in relation to Design Review process. It is unclear how the Council expects this to be utilised. The Council should also be aware that Design Review is a process that can take place at any stage and should ensure that site allocations in their own Local Plan are considered through a Design Review process. |  |
| Swyncombe Parish Council | Who to consult’ (page 13): we note that no mention is made of the Chiltern Society, nor the CPRE. |  |

There should be more reference to the Chilterns AONB:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council's response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>You need to add Chilterns AONB to the list of relevant bodies near the beginning (not just North Wessex). All relevant bodies should be consulted, eg CPRE. AONB must be sacrosanct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilterns Conservation Board</td>
<td>There is no reference to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide which has been adopted by SODC as SPG (see South Oxfordshire Core Strategy para 15.27), or its supplementary technical notes on Chilterns Brick, Chilterns Flint and Roofing Materials. Please add reference to these documents within the new Design Guide to signpost where to find detailed advice on designing in the Chilterns AONB.</td>
<td>We have added the Chilterns Conservation Board to the list of consultees and we make reference to the Chilterns Design Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring Heath Parish Council</td>
<td>The guidance in the Design Guide could be applicable anywhere in the UK, it makes no reference to the character of the district and fails to mention Chilterns AONB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henley Archaeological and Historical Group</td>
<td>We are very glad that the Chilterns AONB Management Plan, Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and Shopfront Design Guide remain part of the foundation blocks of the new SODC Supplementary Guide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Include reference to the prevention of light pollution in the Chilterns AONB if nothing else.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internal space standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council's response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>There is no reference to the design of internal space standards</td>
<td>We have made reference to the Government’s guidance on space standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Aldred</td>
<td>Space standards- I feel some aspiration ought to be included in Part 2: 7, or at least some reference to storage requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no mention anywhere of minimum room sizes. UK has the smallest sqm spaces in the EU for dwelling of all types. We do not want to live in tiny boxes. There is plenty of land. Something like the Parker Morris standard SHOULD BE INCLUDED.

Respecting the existing context and character of the district:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council’s response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee</td>
<td>In defining distinctive character, it would be helpful if the list of building materials on page 17 could be more readily associated with the character areas identified on pages 15-16, and if more detail could be given about the distinctive use of the materials and e.g. the poor quality of the clunch. We suggest that it would be helpful to give more visual emphasis to the prime need to identify what is locally distinct before arriving at the design.</td>
<td>We have defined what we consider to be high quality development and high quality materials. We have emphasised the importance of context and respecting existing character and promoting design that complements and adds positively to existing character throughout the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>Expensive materials do not equate to a high quality finish and the thrust of the statement should be revised. High quality development is more than the materials used, but the cost is not a factor that should be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The emphasis of the document should be reviewed to consider new settlements and the potential to create a new character that is not related to an existing area.

Bullet 8 requires development to reflect the surrounding area. This runs contrary to the principle of best use of land and SODCs desire to create new settlements. Such a strict objective should not be included. The objective would also rule out taller development in urban centres, such as Didcot, where higher density taller development around a transport hub would be considered highly appropriate.

Character Areas: The assessment of Character Areas does not represent a familiar picture of South Oxfordshire. Areas around Didcot are part of the historic county of Berkshire, where the vernacular is well described in Pevsner, which includes the traditional Berkshire style with hung tile and larger roof structures.

The Character Areas seem to be focused on landscape areas, which do not necessarily respond to architectural character. Character Areas need to be reviewed and should have regard to a recognised architectural source.

The document sets out the requirements to look beyond a site's red line. Whilst this approach is understood and supported; the Council often allocates sites within a red
line and this assessment beyond the red line should be completed by the Council in formulating a policy for the site.

Watlington Parish Council  The local materials table gives a very variable level of detail. The lack of consistency risks losing some key local characteristics.

---

**Sustainable development:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council’s response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>Para 2 sets out that well designed places are sustainable development. This statement is not correct and the Council should review this particularly given the weight the Council wishes to attach to this document. The document will be cited in appeal discussions with inspectors where the golden thread of the presumption in favour of sustainable development is key. This document will allow disconnected well designed development to be allowed at appeal.</td>
<td>We have now provided a definition in line with the NPPF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODC Planning Policy</td>
<td>P7 – Sustainable Development: Differs from the definition provided within the NPPF. It is important that the whole document is NPPF compliant. No mention made of the environmental role of sustainable development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetworth Parish Council</td>
<td>The term “sustainable” was too vague and not clearly defined what it would require from developments to be considered to be sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The historic environment: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council's response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee</td>
<td>The section on Historic Features and Heritage on page 18 mentions only designated heritage assets and does not refer to the local value of non-designated assets. We are concerned that this does not tally with the NPPF, and could result in lack of regard for the historic but unlisted buildings that contribute to the character of Benson.</td>
<td>We now refer to non-designated heritage assets and they can be found within Conservation Area Appraisals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>The guide underplays the importance of the historic environment in successful, sustainable design which the NPPF includes.</td>
<td>We have a section on the historic environment and make links to relevant publications throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watlington Parish Council</td>
<td>The section on archaeology only mentions ‘known’ archaeological remnants or deposits. Surely it is necessary to discover if there are any previously unknown archaeological remains prior to development of a site in those cases where development is taking place in areas where there is potential for prior use of the land to left valuable archaeological remains.</td>
<td>This would be established through the pre-application or planning application process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amenity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council's response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>I think it would be useful to include guidance regarding the placement of vents from kitchen extractor fans, i.e. that consideration is given to neighbours and that</td>
<td>Noted and updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
extractor fans do not blow directly into a neighbours garden (noise, smell and appearance).

| Paul Butt on behalf of Croudace Homes and the University of Reading | The purpose of the draft Design Guide, I note is to "improve the standard of design in developments" and "break the mould of the standard design guide", although the draft Design Guide maintains the minimum back-to-back to distance guide line of 25 metres (pages 42 and 43).

I would suggest that 21m back-to-back distance (common planning practice in relation to the consideration of mutual overlooking of dwellings) rather than the suggested minimum of 25m is progressed as I can't see a justification for a minimum distance of 25m in all circumstances.

The only other 'standards' approach I've picked up on that is contrary to the stated intention of breaking the mould are also on page 42 in relation to: (i) the provision of adequate amenity space for each residential unit, including apartments (1 bed = 35sqm, 2 bed + 50sqm, 3 bed+ = 100sqm); and (ii) back to side minimum distances of 12m, front-to-front 10m, and back-to-boundary 10m.

I note that, unlike the existing 2008 Design Guide, there are no caveats to either the 21/25m minimum back-to-back distance, or the amenity space, or the back-to-side and front-to-front and back-to-boundary distances. |

| Persimmon Homes | Amenity Space: The minimum distances set out are overly prescriptive and are not based on any urban design best practice. This is further reinforced by the stated distance on page 43 of 21m back to back |

Noted and the checklist provides the opportunity for justifying a shorter distance where it is not possible to achieve 25 metres.
(compared to the 25m proposed on page 42). This is repeated in criterion 7.14, which should be amended.

Benefits for the existing community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee</td>
<td>Step 4 specifies provision of shops and other facilities within a development. In Benson, however, there is considerable community support for avoiding this in the interests of maintaining or improving the viability of existing shops part of a more sustainable commercial centre at the heart of the village. We feel that in this and other respects the draft guidance should perhaps consider the well-being of the community as well as the well-being of the development that will hopefully be part of it.</td>
<td>We have updated the value of good design to reflect the broader benefits. The guide seeks to secure well designed schemes for existing and future residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Aldred</td>
<td>Some consideration of how the new development will benefit the existing community. What is there to draw in neighbours and knit this new development into its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suite of Technical Documents:
Sustainable energy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rural areas of South Oxfordshire are very attractive to developers to sell houses to commuters to Oxford, London and Reading, should the guidelines favour sites with good transport links such as nearby main roads or rail links? There is little point of having clear energy efficiency guidelines for new homes if their siting results in increased carbon emissions due to unnecessarily long commutes by car and increased road congestion.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The technical guide on Sustainable energy is encouraging but not encouraging enough of retrofit power generation and heat source pumps etc. There should be clear link between householder extensions and this technical note.</td>
<td>We have sought to provide cross links throughout the main guide and technical documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Building Conversion technical note is very restrictive and appears inflexible importance of sustainable energy should be included. Commercial buildings should all be required to include power generation of some sort. Particularly buildings with large low pitched roofs should be required to have photovoltaic panels.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial buildings should all be required to include power generation of some sort. Particularly buildings with large low pitched roofs should be required to have photovoltaic panels.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>The document does not appear to have regard to all other documents prepared. Persimmon Homes supports the creation of homes which operate on a fabric first basis.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no point in creating energy to be wasted within the home, and the energy in the home should be used efficiently. Building orientation should not focus solely on the potential for solar gain. Firstly solar gain is not necessarily a positive feature as this can lead to over heating of a property; secondly it disregards the contextual assessment of a site. The document appears to be trying to make energy requirements a planning consideration; however, the Government have clearly set out where a Local Authority can have control through the planning process in the PPG. These relate to accessibility; water efficiency and space standards. Energy efficiency is a requirement of the building regulations and should not be subject to planning requirements.

SODC Planning Policy

No comments to make other than the document is very short and doesn’t contain a great deal of additional information. It should be within the Design Guide to avoid duplication and integrate sustainability into the design from the start.
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I am very disappointed that I cannot find any reference to choosing an aspect for the new dwellings which will give south facing roofs, and that these south facing roofs should have solar panels. Nor can I find any other references to utilising energy sources where possible.

Noted.

Biodiversity:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council's response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brightwell cum Sotwell</td>
<td>P8. We support the first and third bullet points but the second bullet point is concerning because ‘no net loss of habitat’ might appear to condone removal and replacement, whereas continuity of the existing and natural evolution are more important in a rural context. This point is picked up again at p12 and we would argue that in the rural context the habitat should only be tampered with at all to the extent that is essential for a development, and only where it is then tampered with should the no net loss principle be relevant.</td>
<td>The guidance echoes the Governments guidance in paragraph 109 of the NPPF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>Key Design Objectives bullet 2 sets a requirement for no net loss of habitat. This statement needs to be clarified, particularly in light of larger sites. Some biodiversity metrics will give a low score to an agricultural field, but due to the size of the site will require a very high level of biodiversity offsetting. In situations such as this the creation of new habitats should be accepted as offsetting, although not creating an increase based on the metric.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key elements of the document appears to be the ‘Planning positively for biodiversity’. The document references that the Council applies a form of Biodiversity Accounting, but the details of this scheme are thin on the ground. As set out previously, where a large scale development comes forward on a green field site, the high quantity of low scoring habitats (such as arable fields) start to negatively impact upon developments. The Council needs to use a common sense approach to see
mitigation and creation of habitats; but not to the level where strategic developments are required to deliver a net increase. The document sets out where planning conditions should be used. Obviously the PPG provides clear guidance on Planning Conditions and the document makes no reference to these requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SODC Planning Policy</th>
<th>Good information. Is this the correct place for it within the Design Guide?</th>
<th>Noted and updated for all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire County Council</td>
<td>In the Protected Species section should there also be some reference to Priority species in Oxfordshire such as hedgehog, brown hare and harvest mouse?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 6 At this point, is it worth mentioning less frequently encountered protected species such as dormice, fish, aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 10 Should it also be noted that planning permission must first be secured and all conditions which are relevant and capable of being discharged, must be discharged?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 11 Is it worth noting that 'proposed development' not only covers planning applications but permitted developments too?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 12 Habitats: Is it worth mentioning Conservation Target Areas as some point? Other protected species associated with habitats could include fish and/or aquatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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and terrestrial invertebrates. Page 13 Not all hedgerows are a priority habitat. Page 14 Should arable field margins be included as a habitat type?

**Landscape:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council's response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Trust</td>
<td>We fully support initiatives that encourage people to live in balance with the environment around them and encourage local and sustainable food practices such as reducing food miles or local food production, particularly on a community scale. We would like to see this type of advice specified and encouraged in the main Design Guide (Part 2) to encourage early consideration of such initiatives in the creation of design concepts and designs. We think that additional guidance should be added to the Biodiversity annex to the Design Guide to provide developers with additional guidance on how to identify biodiversity offsetting need and opportunities and the types of local organisations, such as Earth Trust, who could help them to facilitate these requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>This SPD could consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. You could also consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans.</td>
<td>Noted and updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODC Planning Policy</td>
<td>What makes the landscape unique?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test your design: Seems to repeat the design guide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Infrastructure: Nothing contained in this section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play space: Mention passive surveillance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient weight has been given to the accepted methodology for Landscape Character Assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The description of items to be included in a landscape character assessment is confusing and limited in its scope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The document suggests that a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) has been carried out but it does not make it clear whether each planning application should be carrying out a full LCA or whether applicants should refer to existing LCAs that have been carried out in the district. It would be sensible to refer to existing national guidance such as that by Natural England.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the ‘further information’ section includes the National Landscape Character Area Profiles there is no discussion about different levels of assessment. Methodologies elsewhere in the country commonly increase the level of detail to Landscape Character Types within Landscape Character Areas within National Character Areas.

The further information section also refers to the emerging Oxfordshire County Council Historic Landscape Character but the technical document does not explain how this might fit in with contemporary landscape design.

The Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (and its predecessor the Institute of Environmental Assessment) since 1995 have published joint guidelines on good practice in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Their industry recognised standards for such assessment are set out in the 2013, Guidance for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3 (GVLIA3).

GVLIA3 clearly sets out two paths, one for formal landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) as a necessary part of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and a more informal landscape appraisal path where EIA is not required. The Design Guide technical
document should ask applicants to state clearly the path that they are on and therefore whether they are providing LVIA or informal appraisal.

Rather than selecting aspects such as topography and trees to appraise it would be better to direct applicants to the GVLIA3 guidance methodology, which has an in-depth approach to the landscape as a resource not just a collection of views.

The use of the term ‘landscape structure’ to over existing and proposed features in the landscape is over simplistic. Existing landscape features should be covered adequately in LVIA or appraisal so this section should be called something like ‘new landscapes’ or ‘design’.

There also seems to be a lack of clarity in the artificial separation in the text between 'landscape structure', 'green infrastructure', 'topography and strategic views', ‘health, well-being and recreation’ and ‘play space’. All of these factors overlap. The criteria selected therefore do not flow well and it is not at all clear whether the applicant should ‘test the design’ against all or some of the criteria. The use of ‘ensure your design…’ in some places gives confusing emphasis to only some criteria.

Major omissions include:
- lack of reference to the principles of water sensitive design or Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), which should be an essential part of any designed landscape for developments over a certain size
- a lack of explanation of the relationship between landscape designs and Design and Access Statement
- no reference to short or long-term landscape management plans and
- no reference to designing in protection of existing structures, such as trees, during the construction period.

### Shopfronts and Signage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equality Officer</td>
<td>Shopfronts: Consideration should be given to people with visual and mobility impairments in the design. Doors should be easily distinguishable from their surrounds. Door opening furniture that is easily reached, and which provides a secure grip, is of critical importance to disabled people, including disabled children. It should be possible to operate all door opening furniture one-handed, without the need to grasp or twist. Wheelchair users can also find it difficult to open and close doors when door operation is not power-assisted.</td>
<td>Inclusive design is a key principle within the design guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Shop front guide needs to be clear what is meant by natural materials. Stand alone stainless steel or powder coated letters on traditional shop fronts can be acceptable. The shop front technical note is much the same as the old policy and needs more revision.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henley Society</td>
<td>In the supplement on Shopfronts and Signage, p.3 of on-line copy, 10th bullet point, we would suggest that the text should read &quot;illumination of fascias and hanging signs is discouraged&quot; rather than &quot;....is not encouraged&quot;.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODC Planning Policy</td>
<td>SODC already has a &quot;Traditional Shopfront Design Guide&quot; 1995 SPG. Is this technical document only for traditional shopfronts as per the SPG or for all shopfronts? There are lots of examples of excellent modern shopfronts which have brought new life to town centres. Examples of very poor shopfronts that we fitted in the 60s being upgraded to modern, inspirational designs which enhance the public realm. This technical document could be an opportunity to guide the design of modern new shopfronts. We already have the SPG to protect the traditional shopfronts. Again, if it is important information, why is it not in the Design Guide itself?</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“A strikethrough version of the guide is appended.”
Why is a strikethrough version appended when the full version is still available on the SODC website?

“The design details of traditional shopfronts have their roots in the display of goods in medieval market stalls, although the shopfront as we now recognise it emerged only with the expansion of commercial activity in the 18th century.” I’m not sure that the above is entirely correct or adds any value to the document.

Traditional shopfronts in our district are increasingly threatened by the decline of the small individual retail outlet and the rise of larger stores with standard corporate images. Is this correct? Is the threat now increasing? Why? Larger stores are not new and there is not a rise in them.

However, it is possible to integrate the needs of retail units and pay regard to the character of the building or surrounding streetscape. Perhaps highlight the value that more traditional designs can add to the shops etc.

The existing shopfront guidance is an SPD so we are still referring to it.

Noted.
### Extensions and Alterations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council's response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The insistence on side extensions being subservient to the original dwelling in all cases is totally unnecessary on houses built after 1930. In the case of houses built after 1980 this is very difficult to achieve especially in small houses with low ceilings and small footprints. There should be more encouragement of contemporary design in house design and environmental energy efficient elements on existing houses.</td>
<td>It depends on the site context but generally, we believe that late extensions should appear visually subservient to the main dwelling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and new buildings rather than designating them as unsightly add ons.

I am very disappointed that Sections 5 and 6 guidance on buildings and extensions seem to be the same as the last very constricting and proscriptive design guide. Were these 2 sections re written? I could not see anything new in them not even the illustrations which show the same mainly dull designs as before.

We agree and have tried to use contemporary examples.

Were these 2 sections rewritten?

I could not see anything new in them not even the illustrations which show the same mainly dull designs as before.

We have sought to update this element of the guide, whilst still keeping existing relevant information.

Could you provide a reference of what the 45 rule is?

We will be explaining this.

For example Technical Document 5 twice refers to the 45 degree rule without ever explaining it. This is not a problem for design professionals who one hopes would know about it, but as the document is entitled “Householder Extensions” the rule should be explained for the benefit of lay users of the guide.

Similarly the “Roof lights should be included on rear elevations where they are less likely to be visible in the street scene” could be an instruction to use roof lights where possible, or it could be an instruction only to use roof lights where they will not be visible from the street.

Noted.

The document is are largely silent on accessibility features and there appears to be no stated requirement to conduct or apply the findings of an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility Issues Group for</th>
<th>SODC Planning Policy</th>
<th>Watlington Parish Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The document is largely silent on accessibility features and there appears to be no stated requirement to conduct or apply the findings of an</td>
<td>Could you provide a reference of what the 45 rule is?</td>
<td>For example Technical Document 5 twice refers to the 45 degree rule without ever explaining it. This is not a problem for design professionals who one hopes would know about it, but as the document is entitled “Householder Extensions” the rule should be explained for the benefit of lay users of the guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Similarly the “Roof lights should be included on rear elevations where they are less likely to be visible in the street scene” could be an instruction to use roof lights where possible, or it could be an instruction only to use roof lights where they will not be visible from the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent ID/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Council’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring and Streatley</td>
<td>accessibility audit nor to consider the accessibility needs of visitors, as distinct from the owner/occupier.</td>
<td>Noted. We have referred to the Building Regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidmore End Parish Council</td>
<td>What is missing is the detail for extensions and outbuildings, which was very helpful in the old guide.</td>
<td>This has now been included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Conversions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent ID/Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Council’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Building Conversion technical note is very restrictive and appears inflexible.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The importance of sustainable energy should be included.</td>
<td>There is a separate technical document for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODC Planning Policy</td>
<td>Need an explanation of the purpose of the document.</td>
<td>Noted to all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many changes of use are now permitted development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is too prescriptive and should not apply to “all types of conversion”.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether the building being converted is within the Green Belt, the AONB, a Conservation Area, is Listed etc are key factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain the character of the setting: This is contained within the design guide with greater detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption that the conversion is to residential? Retain characteristics is covered above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing internal features of interest should be integrated into the conversion where possible. Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No planning permission is required for refurbishment unless it is considered to be “development”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No structural survey is required – how will this be enforced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the legal definition of a “more historic building”? How does this differ from a “less historic building”?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Additional information required (where applicable):**
This list could be extended to include a transport assessment, noise assessment, cumulative impact assessment etc.

Better to just refer to the validation checklist.

### Trees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council's response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henley Archaeological and Historical Group</td>
<td>One matter of concern is the lack of emphasis on the problem of air quality in built-up areas. Should this not be dealt with in Technical Document No 4 under ‘Trees – Retaining and Planting’? All one can see is a squiggly sketch in a drawing of a street scene, saying ‘air quality’ or so it seems unless there is more in another part of the document which we have overlooked.</td>
<td>Noted and updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPPC</td>
<td>Size of tree pits should be ‘appropriate’ not necessarily agreed. A BS applies. It is not appropriate for every tree to be checked by a tree officer- it just cannot happen.</td>
<td>Noted and updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Persimmon Homes | Criterion 8.12: This is not appropriate as it provides no range for the negotiations with the Council’s Tree Officer;  

The document requires the use of larger tree species. This appears to be a false economy and should consider earlier planting of smaller trees to allow these to naturally grow. Matters such as management should be capable of being dealt with by condition and should not prevent commencement of development. | Noted and updated. |
| 10 | Existing mature trees should be protected, on new estate sites, and further saplings planted. The latter should be adequately stated/ protected and watered. Residents can be requested to adopt your trees near their properties | Noted. |

Public Art:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Council’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>The creation of art for arts sake is not something that is supported. Integration of artistic features within a development is welcomed, but if the art has an impact upon the best use of the land it should not become an over riding factor. The delivery of such initiatives should also be subject to viability assessments, the Council already seek significant contributions through CIL and affordable housing; the creation of additional costs relating to public art further dilute the ability to deliver viable schemes.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODC Planning Policy</td>
<td><em>Public art is art for the public specifically designed by artists for the purpose of public display (i.e. it is beyond the artist’s work merely shown in public spaces).</em> Is this the definition of public art? The images are local but a few national and international examples could also be added. <em>Further Information: South And Vale of White Horse District Council Public Art Policy (to link)</em> More information on how public art will be provided in relation to S106 and CIL is required. If this is to be our public art strategy then more information is needed.</td>
<td>Noted and updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: Questions asked to structure the consultation

**Questions for Design Guide**

South Oxfordshire District Council want to replace the existing Design Guide (2008) with an up to date, innovative and exemplar Design Guide. The new Design Guide will be a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and together with the design policies in the Council’s emerging Local Plan 2031, will be the key mechanism for delivering high quality design in the district.

**What the Design Guide seeks to achieve:**

The ultimate objective for the design guide is to raise the quality of design in new development in the district. The guide seeks to do this by setting out the standard we expect new developments meet through a series of checklists which each relate to a key design principle. Alongside the checklists, examples of best practice and solutions for common design problems will be provided. Clear links and references to further guidance and technical documents will supplement the content in the guide. The guide should also be used as a tool to design and assess development proposals by encouraging designers and decision makers to follow a process and checklist which will help secure and assess the quality of the development being proposed.

**How the new guide will be different to the existing guide:**

The new guide is much more concise than the existing guide, being 50 pages rather than 204. It is a much more visual document, relying on illustrations, plans and photos to convey important messages and provide explanations rather than detailed text which the previous guide had. The introduction of the checklists is also a new tool which sets the standard we expect new developments to meet and provides a basis for assessment and testing of the design of proposed developments.

**Name**

**Name of organisation representing (if applicable)**

**Please provide your e-mail address or contact address**

Part 1 of the Design Guide explains what the design guide is trying to achieve, why it is important and how to do it. It focuses on the purpose of the guide, its objectives, explains the design process to be followed for all applications and who to consult. Part 1 also gives a brief overview of the character of South Oxfordshire.

How far do you agree with this section?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below if you would like to

Section 1
Summary: One of the first things to consider before designing is to look beyond the red line of the application site. This is the site context. A contextual analysis identifies the context within which the application site is set. This section explains how the site features and the wider area beyond can help to shape your design. The outcome of this first step is the production of an opportunities and constraints plan. This will help inform your design rationale which is the explanation of the reasons behind the design decisions made.

How far do you agree with Section 1?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 1?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below

Section 2
Summary: This section explains how the physical features and natural resources from a site can be used to benefit the intended occupants of your development and ensure that it does not have a negative impact on neighbouring properties.

How far do you agree with Section 2?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 2?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below, if not please leave blank

Comments box

Section 3
Summary: This sections focuses on how to create a network of paths and roads which result in a place that is easy to get to and move through for all users.
How far do you agree with Section 3?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 3?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below
Comments box

Section 4
Summary: This section focuses on the building blocks of development, density and variety of uses

How far do you agree with Section 4?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 4?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below
Comments box

Section 5
Summary: This section explains how to achieve safe and attractive streets and spaces for all. It also covers how to integrate street furniture, lighting and public art and avoid street clutter.

How far do you agree with Section 5?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 5?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below
Comments box
Section 6
Summary: This section focuses on how to integrate parking to support attractive streets and spaces

How far do you agree with Section 6?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 6?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below, if not please leave blank
Comments box

Section 7
Summary: This section covers character, scale form and massing. It also covers amenity spaces.

How far do you agree with Section 7?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 7?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below
Comments box

Section 8
Summary: This section talks about the importance of securing design quality and create a place that works well for everyone and will continue to work well in the future

How far do you agree with Section 8?
Strongly agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly disagree
How far do you agree with the checklist on Section 8?
Strongly agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below
Comments box

Do you have any comments on the general format and layout of the Guide?
Comments box

Any other comments that you would like to make on the new Design Guide?
Comments box

What makes a high quality development?

Give us an example of what you think is a high quality development in South Oxfordshire

**Technical documents:**
A series of technical documents accompany the Design Guide. These cover different areas and disciplines which need to be considered at the outset of the design process.

**Trees**
How far do you agree with this Section?
Strongly agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below, if not please leave blank
Comments box

**Landscape**
How far do you agree with this Section?
Strongly agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly disagree
Please provide any comments about this section below
Comments box

**Biodiversity**
How far do you agree with this Section?
- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below
Comments box

**Householder Extension**
How far do you agree with this Section?
- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below
Comments box

**Building Conversion**
How far do you agree with this Section?
- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below
Comments box

**Sustainable Energy**
How far do you agree with this Section?
- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below
Comments box

**Public Art**
How far do you agree with this Section?
Strongly agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments about this section below
Comments box

Any other comments that you would like to make on the new Design Guide?
Comments box