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1. Introduction

This Statement of Consultation Addendum has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Regulations require that as part of the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD’s) a Statement of Consultation should be prepared.

The addendum sets out what was done to consult with the district and other stakeholders detailing the methods used and the people involved to meet the requirements of Regulation 12 for the Consultation on the Wakefield Residential Design Guide (RDG) Part 1 (Guidance for Housebuilders) SPD Revised Consultation Draft document (September 2017).

The consultation took place in September / October 2017, asking people for their thoughts on the amended document. The RDG Implementation Plan accompanied the RDG Part 1 Revised Consultation Draft for comment. It sets out the actions the Council proposes to ensure its successful introduction in the district and this Statement of Consultation addendum considers the responses received.

In addition to the Regulations, the Council has a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which explains how the community and organisations and stakeholders can take part in the process of developing the SPD. The SCI was adopted by the Council on 22nd November 2017. It sets out how and which persons and bodies the Council will engage with, when preparing SPD’s.

1.1 Who was consulted?

The Councils’ SCI sets out how the community and organisations can take part in the planning process. The list of organisations and people to be consulted in relation to SPD documents are:

- Specific organisations
- General organisations
- Government departments and additional organisations
- Interested parties
- Residents and residents groups

Appendix B lists the organisations, persons and bodies notified of the consultation and invited to make representations, based on the SCI. Those who have asked to be kept informed of the progress of planning documents are also detailed.

Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended by section 11 of the Localism Act, introduced a duty to cooperate in relation to the planning of sustainable development. Regulation 4 of the 2012 Town and Country Planning (England) Regulations lays out the bodies that must be consulted under the provisions of the Act. These bodies were all informed of the consultation and invited to make representations.
1.2 Engagement Methods / Activities

The Revised Consultation Draft consultation (September 2017) for Part 1: Guidance for Householders followed the Draft Consultation which took place earlier in 2017. Part 2 of the RDG Supplementary Planning Document (Guidance for Householders) did not require any further consultation; however changes made to Part 1 (Guidance for Housebuilders) required a further opportunity for comments.

The majority of comments received were in reference to small amendments or additions to the text, most of which have been incorporated. A summary of the responses received at the Revised Consultation Draft stage and how they informed the revisions to draft document are located in Section 2.2 of this document.

The RDG Consultation stages included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Stage</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Documents available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Consultation</td>
<td>January/ February 2016</td>
<td>RDG Initial Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Consultation Draft</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>RDG Part 1: Guidance for Housebuilders, RDG Implementation Plan, Draft Consultation Statement of Consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Residential Design Guide (RDG) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) comprises of two volumes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG Volume</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 - Guidance for Housebuilders</td>
<td>Designed to support developers, their design professionals and agents in preparing proposals for residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 - Guidance for Householders</td>
<td>Provides advice for people who wish to extend or alter a property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The key consultation activities for the **Revised Consultation Draft of RDG Part 1** were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal notification of where the documents may be inspected and how representations may be made.</td>
<td>Over 1000 bodies and persons notified in writing (email or letter) of the consultation and invited to make representations – using the Councils consultation software - Objective.</td>
<td>List of consultees attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal notification of where the documents may be inspected and how representations may be made.</td>
<td>Information posters were displayed throughout the consultation period at community centres, libraries across the district and at district housing offices.</td>
<td>Copy of the poster is attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where documents were available for inspection.</td>
<td>Council’s website at: <a href="http://www.wakefield.gov.uk/spds">www.wakefield.gov.uk/spds</a></td>
<td>Website updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective - Council’s online consultation portal at:</td>
<td><a href="http://consult.wakefield.gov.uk/portal">http://consult.wakefield.gov.uk/portal</a></td>
<td>Details can be viewed online (including when event is closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In electronic and hardcopy format at: Wakefield One Customer Access Point and libraries across the district.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of the letter sent is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>Council's Corporate Facebook: <a href="https://www.facebook.com/mywakefield">https://www.facebook.com/mywakefield</a></td>
<td>Screen shots attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of community representatives and contacts.</td>
<td>All 63 local councillors representing the 21 wards in the district were notified of the consultation by email on 14.09.17</td>
<td>Email sent is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings - Workshop</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide Developer Briefing 28.07.17</td>
<td>Copy of agenda. Notes from the event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 Representation Summary

In all, there were 42 representations received to the Revised Consultation Draft of the RDG Part 1: Guidance for Housebuilders.

There were 5 representations made to the Wakefield District RDG Implementation Plan.

The comments were made in the following ways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>RDG Part 1 Revised Consultation Draft</th>
<th>RDG Implementation Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web (Consultation Portal)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.1 Comments and Responses to the Revised Draft Consultation (RDG Part 1)

The comments received to Part 1 of the Revised Consultation Draft RDG are detailed below along with the responses from Integreat Plus and the Council. Section 2.2 reports on the Implementation Plan and 2.3 provides a summary of the responses to both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Reference</th>
<th>Organisation / Individual</th>
<th>Relevant section or theme</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Integreat Plus / Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd1</td>
<td>Cllr. David Dews</td>
<td>45/On-plot parking and Garages/2.16</td>
<td>Do not include the garage as an on-site parking space, as these are often used for storage.</td>
<td>New build homes are encouraged to include more storage space around the home, and the RDG endorses National Space Standards Best Practice minimums for storage requirements (pg 79) Parking standards are set out in the adopted Street Design Guide (2012) – garages can be used for parking if they are the required size, which includes storage space for cycles etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd2</td>
<td>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</td>
<td>4/Site appraisal Important questions/1.0 1.10</td>
<td>This should include a preliminary ecological assessment to identify biodiversity constraints early in the process.</td>
<td>Ecology is covered under the ‘important questions’ bullet 1.01.14. The need for an ecological assessment is also outlined in section 2.21.03.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd3</td>
<td>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</td>
<td>4/Site appraisal Important questions/1.0 1.14</td>
<td>Replace &quot;preserved&quot; with &quot;conserved&quot;. Preserved implies something unchanging. Biodiversity is alive and inevitably changes. Need to use the correct terminology.</td>
<td>Text in 1.01.14 has been amended to read ‘How can the proposed layout, orientation and design incorporate ecological features to ensure they are conserved and enhanced?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd4</td>
<td>Cllr Graham Isherwood, Featherstone Ward</td>
<td>13/Sustainable Drainage systems (SuDS) and Blue Infrastructure/1.08.07</td>
<td>A few years ago, members attended several seminars and indeed considered by scrutiny whereby the implementation of the SUDS scheme would be adopted when housing estate schemes were being planned, it was thought that this would help with flooding in local areas, as I recall this was welcomed by all. However it appears that this scheme was not or is acted upon and we are now left with huge ponds instead that are to my mind are storing problems for the future for both the authority in maintenance and more importantly the safety of our younger residents, water is a natural attraction for our children and I believe that man made ponds/ lakes have no place among residential developments which I fear could be a safety cause of concern, I further feel that these ponds could be the cause of injury or god forbid worse, I have a feeling these things are being made for economic reasons and I would appeal that during the planning stage the SUDs is made part of the application that must be adhered to.</td>
<td>The use of SuDS is endorsed by the RDG. The text has been amended to remove the word 'playful' and to make it clear that the location of SuDS should be carefully considered during the application process. The RDG sets out where further guidance on SuDS is available. SuDS are a requirement of local planning policy. It is agreed they need to be carefully designed and located within a development. The RDG sets out the requirement for maintenance /management plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd5</td>
<td>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</td>
<td>13/ Sustainable Drainage Systems/1.08.07</td>
<td>Please continue to support SUDs surface water attenuation basins.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RDG1revcd6 | Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service | 14/ Biodiversity/1.09.03 | Recommend separate paragraphs for tree survey and biodiversity. The biodiversity should say: 1.09.04 A Preliminary Ecological Assessment of habitats and protected/notable species should be submitted with the planning application together with any additional protected species surveys and | This section has been amended to include separate paragraphs for Tree Surveys and Ecological Assessments. “1.09.03 An appropriate tree survey must be...
assessments recommended within the document. submitted with the planning application should the proposed development affect trees or woodland.

1.09.04 A Preliminary Ecological Assessment of habitats and protected/notable species should be submitted with the planning application together with any additional relevant protected species surveys and assessments."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd7</td>
<td>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</td>
<td>18/Sustainable Design/2.21</td>
<td>Change wording to: &quot;Maintain and enhance biodiversity by avoiding existing high value habitats, designing new habitats and wildlife corridors using locally native species.&quot; This better follows the guidance in BS42020 Biodiversity - Code of practice for planning and development. Text has been amended to &quot;Existing wildlife habitats should be maintained and enhanced by the proposal. New habitats and wildlife corridors should be designed using locally native species.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd8</td>
<td>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</td>
<td>18/Sustainable Design/2.21</td>
<td>Reword to &quot;Avoid existing high quality habitat, design networks of structurally diverse new habitats.&quot; Response as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd9</td>
<td>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</td>
<td>18/Additional planning consideration/2.28</td>
<td>&quot;Provide a minimum development stand-off of 8m from the top of the bank from all watercourses to enhance the wildlife habitat network. Ensure disturbance from light spillage and recreational activities are minimised.&quot; The stand-off from the top of the bank to a water course will be addressed taking into account the relevant stand-off requirements by statutory consultees at the time and the site particulars. 8m is the distance used for flood risk mitigation access along critical ordinary water courses. Water courses should provide very important back bones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for a network of wildlife corridors valuable for bats, water voles, otters, birds (kingfisher, dipper, waterfowl), invertebrates and plants. Without clear policy guidance developers will continue to squeeze these corridors beyond their breaking point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG1revcd10</th>
<th>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</th>
<th>19/ Identifying Natural Features/2.04</th>
<th>Reword to: &quot;Existing natural features such as watercourses, wetlands, grasslands, woodlands and hedgerows should inform the layout of the development. Identify areas at risk from heavy rainfall and watercourses and, where possible, remove from development area and retain for public open space and biodiversity enhancement. If this is not possible ensure that flood storage capacity is not reduced by the development and other property within the flood plain is not compromised.&quot;</th>
<th>Summary text on page 19 (2.04) has been slightly amended to reference watercourses, wetlands and hedges. Text on page pg 24 has been amended to include “Identify flood risk areas, and design the site layout to minimise risk of damage in event of flooding. Where possible, remove these areas from the development and retain for public open space and biodiversity enhancement.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd11</td>
<td>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</td>
<td>24/Image 04 Pleinen in Hoofddorp</td>
<td>This picture seems to have little relevance to Wakefield except as an example of excess use of hard surfaces likely to lead to lower biodiversity and high levels of surface water run-off/flash flooding. Can an alternative be found such as green roof technology which can greatly reduce surface water run off, provide additional private recreational space and add to biodiversity.</td>
<td>Imaged reviewed and replaced with a more local example of architectural responses to context. The section is response to local context, and so green roof technology is not relevant here (they are referred to in 2.19, pg 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd12</td>
<td>Mr Robert</td>
<td>28/ Public open</td>
<td>Retain and work with mature trees and hedgerows.</td>
<td>Text has been amended to include hedgerows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landscape architects are not the best for advising on biodiversity enhancement. Use the ecologist!

"Left over grassed areas" can be very good for biodiversity. Rank grassland provides good quality habitat for a range of butterflies and moths as well as small mammals such as field voles. If grassland species diversity is low some perennials such as oxeye daisy, black knapweed and field scabious could be added to provide a splash of colour and additional nectar sources. Some cutting will be required say every three years, unless it is accepted that it will succeed to scrub and woodland, again interesting for biodiversity."

Design for inclusion of typical, locally native species mixes and plants which provide good sources of nectar and berries. Such places can provide a wealth of wildlife for all to enjoy which benefits biodiversity and human health.

Text has been amended to recommend consulting an ecologist for advice on enhancing biodiversity.

Text has been amended to .."We advise that you avoid: Informal or left over areas offering no public or private use or value and do little or nothing to support biodiversity (BfL).". This avoids the unintended allusion that rank grassland areas are not good for biodiversity.

Please add an extra bullet point for green infrastructure and biodiversity.

"Provide cycleway with local wildlife habitat corridors to further green infrastructure objectives "

See NPPF para 114 and definition of green infrastructure PDF (page 52)

Text amended to read: ‘Ensure cycling and walking are incorporated into the wider street design and whole road network wherever possible. These could act as local wildlife habitat corridors to further green infrastructure objectives’.

Please add:
Include features to encourage biodiversity particularly hedgerows along at least one boundary and trees. Recent surveys undertaken for Bradford City Centre

The RDG encourages the inclusion of features that encourages biodiversity (see paragraphs 2.22.4, 2.04, 1.04.14, 2.21).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ecology Service</th>
<th>AAP showed that the number of typical birds was significantly increase by hedgerows and shrubs.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd15</td>
<td>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</td>
<td>All new homes should include hook-up points for secure electric car charging” This is particularly important with recent Government announcements about phasing out diesel and petrol cars by 2040, <a href="http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-40723581">http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-40723581</a>.</td>
<td>The advice to include electric car charging points is included in 2.18.12 (pg 48).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd16</td>
<td>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</td>
<td>Add &quot;Consult West Yorkshire Ecology Service, the Local Ecological Records Centre early in the design process for information on protected sites and notable species.&quot;</td>
<td>2.21.04 Amended to read “It is advisable to review the relevant development policies as well as national planning policy regarding ecology to ensure compliance. Consult the West Yorkshire Ecology Service, the Local Ecological Records Centre early in the design process for information on protected sites and notable species.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd17</td>
<td>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</td>
<td>Para 2.22.6 Remove &quot; or Ancient Woodland&quot; you are already keeping away from ALL woodland. Add Para 2.22.13 Include a range of species which are rich in nectar from spring to autumn. Look for berry and fruit bearing shrubs and trees to provide food for garden birds.</td>
<td>Text amended to remove reference to Ancient Woodland, as all woodland is already specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service</td>
<td>68/ Waterfront design/2.28</td>
<td>Planning applications are assessed on their own merits against relevant planning policy and guidance at that time and statutory consultee requirements. For Waterfront development it is necessary to achieve a balance in terms of ecology, amenity and environmental issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section contains mixed messages which we consider are often incompatible with each other.

Riparian biodiversity will on the whole be adversely impacted by increased levels of disturbance caused by waterfront development. The main rivers and many of their tributaries form part of the Wildlife Habitat Network, with species such as bats, otters and birds. Light spillage, noise, dogs and cats and human disturbance all add pressure to the habitat.

Waterfront design needs to minimise such negative impacts by including the following:

1. Provide sufficient stand-off from the water course, usually at least 30m for the large rivers to allow space for people and wildlife.

2. Plant some trees which can screen or partially screen waterfront properties from the river to reduce light spillage from windows onto the water and provide feeding corridors for bats.

3. Ensure that footpaths leave plenty of refuge areas along the waters edge which are fenced and screened by native scrub from humans and dogs.

4. Ensure that outdoor lighting is directed away from the watercourses and associated woodland.

5. Avoid balconies and private outdoor space which directly face the watercourse as this will increase disturbance from noisy activities.

6. Be prepared to implement control measures for invasive plant species such as Japanese
knotweed, Himalayan balsam and giant hogweed which have become a significant problem along some sections of the rivers.

7 Ensure the height and massing of buildings does not result in dense shading of the watercourse, a particular problem for land on the south bank.

| RDG1revcd19 | Mr Robert Masheder, West Yorkshire Ecology Service | 88/References/4.04 | Please could you add the following


| RDG1revcd20* | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| RDG1revcd21 | Mrs Vicky Symons, Featherstone Council | 13/Suitable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and Blue Infrastructure/1.08.07 | Featherstone Town Council would like to comment on the Suitable Drainage Systems.

The houses that are built in and around Featherstone have been left with large ponds that could cause storing problems for the future, for both the authority in maintenance and more importantly the safety of younger residents. Water is a natural attraction for Children especially during the Summer months and the Town Council believe that these man-made ponds/lakes have no place among residential developments, for the fear of safety. | The use of SuDS is endorsed by the RDG.

The text has been amended to remove the word ‘playful’ and to make it clear that the location of SuDS should be carefully considered during the application process.

SuDS are a requirement of local planning policy depending on the type and scale of development which includes major residential developments. The design of SuDS should be safe in accordance with the relevant SuDS design |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Margaret Isherwood, Wakefield North Ward</td>
<td>The Town Council would like to appeal that during the planning stage the SUDs are made part of the application that must be adhered to. Guidance and maintenance / management plans are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Simon Tucker, Canal &amp; River Trust</td>
<td>A few years ago the subject of SUDS (sustainable drainage system) for residential developments was discussed at length at the Communities OSC. The scheme would ensure a sustainable drainage system with the water retained in an enclosed tank buried in the ground. Unfortunately, in my view, the decision was later made to abandon this scheme and we are now left with the situation where all the new developments across the district have settling ponds situated on them. These drainage ponds are left open with, in most cases, just a flimsy fence around them and I have serious concerns about the water safety connected to these ponds. There are many families with young children moving on to these estates and children are attracted to ponds such as these. Incidents have occurred in the past resulting in loss of lives in open water and I believe that in order to avoid any such incidents in the future the opportunity should now be taken to look again at introducing SuDS on all new developments. Comment as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Trust welcome section 2.28, but would recommend that the guideline also advises developers that they should consider the setting of the canal or river within their development design. Comment reviewed. We feel that this point is covered in 2.28.02 “The Council encourages development contributing to the strengthening of the character of waterfronts by organically integrating the development site, adjoining public areas and water courses.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd25</td>
<td>Cllr Maureen Tennant-King, Featherstone Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd26</td>
<td>Mr Ian Sanderson, West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accompany the planning application to establish whether, and the extent to which, significant archaeological remains are affected by development proposals."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Section/Comment</th>
<th>Suggestion/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd27</td>
<td>Mr Ian Sanderson, West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service</td>
<td>27/ Creating An Identity/2.05.02</td>
<td>It would be help for this section to include: &quot;Consultation of the West Yorkshire Historic Landscape Character data held by the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service will help establish the historic character of any part of Wakefield District.&quot; Advice to consult the West Yorkshire Historic Environment Landscape Character data is contained in Section 2.03.02 – Local Context (pg 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd28</td>
<td>Mr Ian Sanderson, West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service</td>
<td>87/ References and Bibliography/4.04</td>
<td>It would be v helpful to the reader to include contact details for the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service (WYAAS), holders of the West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record WYAAS Nepshaw Lane South, Morley, Leeds, LS27 7JQ Tel. 0113 393 9959 email: <a href="mailto:wyher@wyjs.org.uk">wyher@wyjs.org.uk</a> Contact details for WYAAS are available online and from the council if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd29</td>
<td>Craven District Council</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No comment to make Response noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd30</td>
<td>Cllr Janet Holmes, Horbury and South Ossett Ward</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>I have read this document and support all the comments made. I do not have anything further to add. Response noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd31</td>
<td>Jacqui Salt, Natural England</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>While we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic this Supplementary Planning Document covers is unlikely to have major effects on the natural Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
environment, but may nonetheless have some effects. We therefore do not wish to provide specific comments, but advise you to consider the following issues (below):

**Green Infrastructure**

This SPD could consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should plan ‘positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure’. The Planning Practice Guidance on Green Infrastructure provides more detail on this.

Urban green space provides multi-functional benefits. It contributes to coherent and resilient ecological networks, allowing species to move around within, and between, towns and the countryside with even small patches of habitat benefitting movement. Urban GI is also recognised as one of the most effective tools available to us in managing environmental risks such as flooding and heat waves. Greener neighbourhoods and improved access to nature can also improve public health and quality of life and reduce environmental inequalities.

There may be significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments. These can be realised through: green roof systems and roof gardens; green walls to provide insulation or shading and cooling; new tree planting or altering the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG1revcd31</th>
<th>Jacqui Salt, Natural England</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>This SPD could consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area.</td>
<td>The Council’s adopted Leisure, Recreation and Open Space (LROS) Local Plan (2017) sets out the Council’s approach to Green Infrastructure. This is not within the scope of a SPD. Policy LROS 2 Green and Blue Infrastructure is applicable. The LROS Local Plan was informed by the Greenspace Audit. A new Greenspace Strategy is currently been prepared and the review of the Local Plan is underway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council’s adopted Leisure, Recreation and Open Space (LROS) Local Plan (2017) sets out the Council’s approach to Green Infrastructure. This is not within the scope of a SPD. Policy LROS 2 Green and Blue Infrastructure is applicable. The LROS Local Plan was informed by the Greenspace Audit. A new Greenspace Strategy is currently been prepared and the review of the Local Plan is underway.
management of land (e.g. management of verges to enhance biodiversity). You could also consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans. Further information on GI is include within The Town and Country Planning Association’s "Design Guide for Sustainable Communities" and their more recent "Good Practice Guidance for Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity".

| RDG1revcd31 | Jacqui Salt, Natural England | General | **Biodiversity enhancement**  
This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit.  

The incorporation of features that are beneficial to wildlife (such as bat or bird boxes, swift bricks and fences with pre-cut holes for hedgehogs) within development is included within paragraph 2.21.02 (pg 54). |

| RDG1revcd31 | Jacqui Salt, Natural England | General | **Landscape enhancement**  
The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature.  
Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity Planning applications are submitted with landscape assessments and surveys where relevant and are assessed against relevant planning policy and guidance with relevant statutory consultee advice. |
assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might make a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.

For example, it may be appropriate to seek that, where viable, trees should be of a species capable of growth to exceed building height and managed so to do, and where mature trees are retained on site, provision is made for succession planting so that new trees will be well established by the time mature trees die.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Other design considerations</th>
<th>Policy requirements are also set out in local adopted policies Core Strategy policy CS10 (Design, Safety and Environmental Quality), and Development Plan Policies Policy D20 (Pollution Control),</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd31, Jacqui Salt, Natural England</td>
<td><strong>Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment</strong></td>
<td>The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity (para 125).</td>
<td>The Supplementary Planning Document does not require a SEA as set out in the RDG Initial Consultation. The SPD builds on policies in adopted documents which area part of the statutory development plan. All these policies have been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal, as part of preparing these plans and which was subject to detailed scrutiny at examination. Further when considering the criteria set out in Schedule 1 to the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programme Regulations 2004, it was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd31, Jacqui Salt, Natural England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RDG1revcd32| Miss Emma Ridley, Pegasus   | 07/Space Outside the Home/1.03         | ...we are broadly supportive of this document, we wish to object to Section 1.03  
‘Space Outside the Home’ and recommend a less restrictive approach if a house has an integral garage.  
Section 1.03: ‘Space Outside the Home’  
Paragraphs 1.03.01 and 1.03.02 outline the proposed ‘Basic Standards’ which should be applied to normal two storey homes where details of elevations, room layout and screening are not known. These standards are designed to mitigate the negative impact of poorly considered development. Where these standards are not met the Council will expect to see a thorough justification as part of the application.  
If a distance of 3 metres is required to be maintained between houses, this will cause detriment to the character of the development, especially in the case where there is an integral garage.  
**Section 1.03 is not justified based on the street scene. Due to this, the document has therefore** considered that none were triggered to an extent to require a SEA.  
Question 6 of the Initial Consultation asked Consultation Bodies their view on whether a SEA was required. None of the statutory environmental consultation bodies indicated they considered a SEA was required.  
The 3m side to side distance has been reduced to 2m to reflect the reduction in the side to boundary distance.  
The Residential Design Guide is a SPD and as such is not examined and so the tests of soundness are not relevant. The RDG hangs on existing policies in the Local Plan which have been examined and found sound. It also relates to national policy where relevant. |

*Planning Practice Guidance.*

None of the statutory environmental consultation bodies indicated they considered a SEA was required.
Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that “the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.”

Proposed Section 1.03: ‘Basic Standards’ does not accord with the NPPF tests of soundness in terms of character of an area, and a varied street scene.

<p>| RDG1revcd33 | Ms Michelle Saunders, North Yorkshire County Council | General | Thank you for consulting North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) on the Wakefield District Residential Design Guide Part 1: Guidance for Housebuilders and the Wakefield District Residential Design Guide Implementation Plan. Good urban design is an important component of Place Making. It can support the delivery of successful communities, add value to development and encourage investment and growth. The SPDs do not appear to raise any strategic cross boundary issues for the County Council. As such, from an officer perspective, we have no comments at this stage. | Response noted. |
| RDG1revcd34 | Rachel Clarke-Wood, Environment | 87/References/4.04 | Thank you for consulting us on the above guidance document. We welcome the inclusion of referral to flood risk matters and the reference for the need for | The link has been added to the references and bibliography section under Environment Agency section. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RDG1revcd35</strong> Alison Gillespie, West Yorkshire Combined Authority</td>
<td>I am just looking at the SuDS section of the Residential Design Guide, it doesn't reference the WY SuDS guidance (attached), could you confirm what Wakefield's intentions are in regards to the WY guidance document?</td>
<td>A link to The West Yorkshire Combined Authority SuDS guidance is contained within the Appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RDG1revcd36</strong> Mrs Elizabeth Jackson</td>
<td>Very pleased to see the adoption of the requirement for:- &quot;Developments are encouraged to provide net gains for biodiversity, which could include but is not limited to habitat creation schemes (such as wildflower meadows or wetlands), favourable conservation management for onsite habitats or structural enhancements for protected species (bat or bird boxes, swift bricks and fences with pre-cut holes for hedgehogs). Look forward to seeing evidence that these positive measures have been implemented.</td>
<td>Comment welcomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RDG1revcd38</strong> Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>It is really positive that WMDC are undertaking this work to refresh the design guide</td>
<td>Comment Welcomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RDG1revcd38</strong> Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>Adding the relevant policy reference to each page will make the document really easy for companies which are not planning literate. However, this does risk the document being made out of date sooner. This is of</td>
<td>The document is based on existing policy and the policy references will help the user. The document will be reviewed in context when a new local plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
particular relevance as WMDC are soon to begin their Local Plan Review.

| RDG1revcd38 | Mr David Kemp, Spawforths | General | It would be helpful if the document clearly identified the issues WMDC are trying to address e.g. parking, sense of place, aesthetics, materials, urban design. This would be helpful to clarify the purpose of the document and what it is trying to do that the earlier guide is not currently achieving.

This could draw out the positives and negatives of the majority of current housing design within the district. |

| | | | The Wakefield District RDG (Part 1 and 2) will replace the existing adopted RDG. The replacement RDG aims to enhance quality and value through positive placemaking processes that will lead to the shaping of strong communities in Wakefield. The document is set out in two sections - policy and planning requirements, and design guidance. It is considered that other matters will be addressed in the Local Plan review. |

| RDG1revcd38 | Mr David Kemp, Spawforths | General | The Comply or Justify element of the document may be prejudicial on SME local builders who do not have resources to justify and convince council officers

The RDG Implementation Plan will assist with this. The need to justify would be proportionate to the scale of development. SME local builders often already have more in built flexibility. |

| RDG1revcd38 | Mr David Kemp, Spawforths | General | Care needs to be taken within the document so that each element that is discussed builds upon previous elements and does not contradict or make achieving other elements difficult. Proposals will be assessed against the guidance as a whole - planning judgements will apply. |

| RDG1revcd38 | Mr David Kemp, Spawforths | General | Care needs to be taken to ensure that illustrations represent best practice principals fully, for example ensuring that buildings face onto primary streets not secondary at junctions when discussing other topics so the strength of argument is not lost. The diagrams (such as on the basic standards on page 7, and Inviting Neighbourhoods on page 26) are for illustrative purposes, and designed to show as much of the information relevant to the section as possible. The document as a whole needs considering, such as design fronting the highway. |
The Appendix “Guide to identifying and Using Local Vernacular” is helpful but care should be taken not to identify unique elements as typical of each area (eg. In Ossett the Porch shown on p82 is unique not typical of the area).

In terms of research work for local distinctiveness, The Yorkshire Pattern Book (Wakefield Edition – Sept 2003) has been used as a background source for local vernacular. A series of site visits across the district were undertaken to understand the varying quality of design and character of areas. Further professional knowledge of architects has been employed in producing this material. Examples have been included as an aid in showing distinctive qualities.

In the Appendix summarising the character of each town in a few paragraphs and pictures appears to be naïve and does not fully illustrate the place or what is positive and negative. The illustrative sections through two local areas provide an indication of the type but this is not comprehensive enough to make it of great use. The illustration of St John’s has limited use – see Page Specific Comment 10.

Response as above.

It would be helpful if the whole document could be made distinctive for Wakefield. This could include helping housebuilders to understand the history and differences between the three distinct areas of the District, which appear to be identified on page IV. It is Spawforths understanding that the district can be divided into three broad areas: former Woollen industry in West to merchants housing in the city and mining communities to east. Character and materials and quality varies significantly across the district.

Response as above.

It would also be helpful if the document analysed the dominant housing typologies within the district to draw out the elements which create the distinctive

The Local Plan review will consider the points raised here in more depth than a supplementary planning document is able to consider, including
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>It may be helpful for the document to look at where the majority of allocations are being planned for within the district and to focus on how to improve the quality within these areas. It is Spawforths understanding that the majority of housing will be close to post-war suburbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The document would also benefit from the creation of a vision for new housing. For example what is WMDCs aspirations for the suburbs. Increase urban character and density? Build around public transport hubs? What is the aspirational design aesthetic for the district (or areas of)? Is the aim for new housing in the district to be more contemporary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Many of the good practice examples could be described as too aspirational for many housebuilders. It may serve the document better if the document presented examples of what can be achieved even with standard house types. This takes the approach that smaller little steps forward will bring achievable improvement by encourage the industry to make improvement and then further improvements can be made at a later date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Many of the Good Practice Example images do not show the information that the title or text describes. The image showing this will be very important in helping Housebuilders and their design teams to understand how the desired outcome can be achieved. We agree that a small number of the best practice images could be improved. These have been reviewed, and where the image did not best represent what the title or text was describing, an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name, Organisation</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The document does not appear to discuss viability of schemes and many of the items within the document may cause concern to housebuilders, for example: Many of the Exemplars are from much higher value areas than can be achieved within the district and therefore may not be realistic and may discourage housebuilders from engaging with the document. There are also implications of reducing the front to front distances as this will reduce the square foot delivered by a plot of land as cars will have to be relocated into parking courts or to the side of properties to reduce the front to front distance. Reducing the amount of development being delivered may reduce commerciality and viability of schemes. Section 3.07 covers adding value through good design and who benefits. Good design does not cost more when measured across the lifetime of a building or place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>69/Design for the 21st Century/3.0</td>
<td>We are unsure why the Custom and Self-Build, Housing for the 3rd and 4th age, Modern Methods of Construction and Flood Resilient Housing elements are included within the Housebuilders section. This appears to be teaching the industry what it is already aware of unless the document is requiring that these are considered in all development sites. The RDG is a wide document and information is included that is considered relevant and helpful to the different audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>77/Appendix /4.0</td>
<td>The inclusion of the appendix appears to be unnecessary and risks that the information is incomplete as it only reflects part of the Standards. We feel that although the standards within the appendix are not exhaustive, they are important to include the benefit of the wide document audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>IV/Wakefield District Map</td>
<td>Page IV – Red lines on plan but it is not stated what they are/their significance. They are also not identified in key. Train Lines not visible in key. The red lines are main sub areas of the District (Wakefield, 5 Towns and South East). This has now been added to the key. The train lines have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>Page 4 – “It is important to avoid north facing rooms especially in living and dining rooms” – this seems to be unrealistic and could have a negative impact on the creation of active frontages to the street if the building faces north.</td>
<td>We have removed the suggestion that dining rooms are not north facing, but still believe it is important to design out north facing living rooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>Page 7 – “Diagram to demonstrate Basic Standards” is missing the 21m front to front standard and “Back to Side” distance.</td>
<td>Distance for the Back to Side has been added. Front to Front distance is the same as the Front to Back or Back to Back distance (as the table states). Front to Back is on the diagram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>Storage of Waste – Consideration needs to be given to the implications of the bin store solutions shown on the front to front distances.</td>
<td>Diagram of bin storage at the front of the property has been amended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>Page 23 – Why to housebuilders need to consult the West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record. What will it give them? Should this information be included within the document?</td>
<td>The information is included in the guidance section as it is useful information and may be very relevant and helpful for applications in sensitive historic areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>Page 24 – Are there more local examples which show housebuilders response to local context. Brearley Forge, Sheffield? St Swithan’s Wakefield? Shirecliffe/Ellesmere New Council Housing, Sheffield?</td>
<td>Image has been reviewed and replaced with an example from a more local context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>Page 26 – The diagram is useful but appears to have a confusing street hierarchy with buildings fronting towards secondary streets rather than primary.</td>
<td>The diagrams are for illustrative purposes, and designed to show as much of the information relevant to the section as possible. The document as a whole needs considering, such as design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>29/Home Zones/2.07</td>
<td>Page 29 – The Example does not show the Home zone being introduced. Housebuilders may which to understand how parking was addressed to achieve this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>30/Location and Connections /2.08</td>
<td>Page 30 – The Example may prevent housebuilders from engaging as the scheme shown is so dissimilar to the products they build.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>31/Enclosure, Place Heirarchy &amp; Wayfinding /2.09</td>
<td>Page 31 – “Enclosure” - this would benefit from analysis of the dominant street types within the district and determining which are good practice. St John’s Square is a unique example within the district, the benefits of showing this are therefore limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>35/Prioritising People through Street Design/2.11</td>
<td>Page 35 – “Optional Angle Principle”. Is there consideration of what varying the angle of housing will have on the frontage to the street and the development coverage (sqft/acre)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>39/Off Plot Parking for Visitors/2.13</td>
<td>Page 39 – The Example does not clearly show how off-plot parking has been tackled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>42/Design of the Home and Garden/Diagram</td>
<td>Page 42 – This is a very clear drawing highlighting how the finishing of buildings can affect character. In addition to the items already shown the location of alarm boxes and gas/electric meters should also be included. The rear garden is currently not shown as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Correspondent</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>46/Accessible Housing and Lifetime Homes/2.17</td>
<td>Page 46 – Is it not better for the requirements for Accessible and Lifetime Homes to be left to their own documents to prevent this Document becoming outdated? Is what is included within this document a comprehensive and accurate reflection of the requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>50/Sustainable Design/Diagram</td>
<td>Page 50 – The illustration appears to oversimplify the issues in managing placemaking with achieving sustainable design for example the orientation of many properties shown in the diagram does not support the road hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>56/Successful Soft Landscapes/2.22</td>
<td>Page 56 – Is it necessary to include the guidance on planting? The Example image does not show “Successful Soft Landscaping”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd38</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>68/Waterfront Design/2.28</td>
<td>Page 68 – The Example does not illustrate how the development relates to the water as the image does not show the water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd39</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd40</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon</td>
<td>4/Site and Context Appraisal/1.01.12 (Geography &amp; Orientation)</td>
<td>Whilst we consider orientation on all dwellings during layout design, many sites have constraints, such as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>1.01.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>Homes and Mr Mark Davis,</td>
<td>RDG1revcd41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/Space</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>RDG1revcd40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd40</td>
<td>RDG1revcd41</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>8/Space Outside the Home /1.03.05-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd40</td>
<td>RDG1revcd41</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>8/Space Outside the Home /1.03.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd40</td>
<td>RDG1revcd41</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>9/Public Open Spaces/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd40</td>
<td>RDG1revcd41</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>10/Street Design &amp; Parking /1.05.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
particularly an issue for 3 bedroom dwellings.

| RDG1revcd40 | Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint) | 10/Street Design & Parking /1.05.03 | 1.5.3 (Surface Water Drainage) – Rather than individual plots having porous materials and/or the site having overall measures to deal with surface water drainage, we believe that individual sites and open space solutions should work collaboratively in order to deal with drainage on the site. This will be in line with requirements of sewers for adoption, Yorkshire Water adoption principles and Wakefield MDC

Furthermore, the control of surface water through SuDS techniques are dependant upon many mitigating factors including topography, contamination and infiltration suitability of the site geology. This element of a site is already controlled through alternative legislation and is beyond the scope of this document. Information has been included as good practice, drainage and design should be consistent with permitted development rights.

| RDG1revcd40 | Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint) | 11/Development Affecting Historic the Environment /1.06.10 | 1.06.10 (Historic Environment) – The insistence that ‘traditional materials’ be used within Conservation Areas will introduce a level of cost restriction that may affect deliverability of developments within Conservation Areas. The use of high quality alternative materials should be allowed to be considered where appropriate.

The cost of high quality concrete is often comparable with cheaper natural materials – maintenance costs are often lower, and laying costs equal. As this is a guidance document we have however changed must to should.

| RDG1revcd40 | Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes | 12/Storage of Waste/1.07.04 | 1.07.04 (Placement) – Whilst most developers strive to locate waste storage to the side or rear of properties this requirement may be hindered by Paragraph 1.07.05 (Terrace Housing) and shared paths to mid terraces should be allowed where security measures, such as lockable gates, have Text has been altered to read 'Designate an enclosed section of a porch or boundary structure for bins. Shared rear access paths to mid terraces are discouraged unless access meets secure by design standards and is for bin storage'.
<p>| RDG1revcd40 | RDG1revcd41 | Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint) | 13-14/Drainage, Flood-Risk and Biodiversity/1.08.01-1.09.03 | 1.08.01 – 1.09.03 (Drainage, Flood-Risk and Biodiversity) – The requirements outlined within these paragraphs generally repeats national legislation and local guidance. We therefore ask whether this section is necessary within this document. | These requirements are included to help a wider audience, and refers to national and local policy. |
| RDG1revcd40 | RDG1revcd41 | Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint) | 23/Local Context/2.03.01 and 2.03.03 | 2.03.01 and 2.03.03 (Local Context) – Whilst this principle is recognised as a basic urban design principle, the delivery of housing should not be constrained by rigid interpretation of a local vernacular. Many areas actually have a mixed grain, of both details and materials, and it may be more appropriate to create a place with its own unique identity (BfL) rather than imitate a poor surrounding streetscape. | Sentence at the start of 2.03.01 has been altered to read: ‘Reference to local vernacular provides a way of interpreting local distinctiveness in a way that is creative and appropriate to the development’. |
| RDG1revcd40 | RDG1revcd41 | Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint) | 27/Creating an Identity/2.05.02 | 2.05.02 (Creating an Identity) - The commercial requirements of a development must be considered as an integral part of the design. Grouping of a particular form of dwelling generally within ‘character areas’ will inadvertently affect the viability and deliverability of developments. There may be opportunities for smaller character areas within very large developments but the meaning of ‘larger developments’ should be defined. | We believe that what constitutes a ‘large development’ is dependent on the context of the development. What is large is a village setting would be small in a city, and therefore it may be misleading to quantify this. |
| RDG1revcd40 | RDG1revcd41 | Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon | 28/Public Open Space/2.06.01 | 2.06.01 – 2.06.03 (Public Open Space) – Due to the modern nature of the development process it is not always possible to hold design charrettes with local | 2.06.01 – 2.06.03 does not refer to design charrettes. Community involvement is recommended in the adopted Statement of |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2.06.03</td>
<td>Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>communities to discuss aspects. Therefore, we as developers, must rely on information and advice from Officers at the Council. Community Involvement (SCI) and Design and Access Statement requirements should be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.09.01</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>31/Enclosure, Place Hierarchy &amp; Wayfinding</td>
<td>2.09.01 (Enclosure) – This requirement is somewhat restricted by the separation distances imposed in Section 1.03.04 (Distances) and 2.13.01/2.16.01 (Parking) and these requirements should be allowed to be integrated in a variety of ways. There is sufficient flexibility in the RDG document to accommodate enclosure requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.01</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>32/Housing Mix/2.10.01</td>
<td>2.10.01 (Housing Mix) – A definition of the term ‘Larger Developments’ should be included within the guidance. We believe that what constitutes a ‘large development’ is dependent on the context of the development. What is large is a village setting would be small in a city, and therefore it may be misleading to quantify this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.01</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>37/Street Materials 2.12.01 – 09.</td>
<td>2.12.01 – 2.12.09 (Street Materials) – This requirement is controlled by alternative guidance (WMDC’s Street Design Guide) and as such its inclusion within this guide should be re-considered. Information cross referenced from the Street Design Guide is to aid understanding. The RDG has a wide audience with varying knowledge of adopted documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.01 &amp; 2.16.01</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis,</td>
<td>39/Off Plot Parking for Visitors 2.13.01</td>
<td>2.13.01 and 2.16.01 (Off and On-Plot Parking for Visitors) – The requirements set out within the Street Design Guide makes it difficult for schemes to be compliant with this document. For example, the requirement for a 4 bedroom property to have 3 There is no change to the Street Design Guide and parking levels, The documents should be considered together. The RDG recommends where possible a combination of parking solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph Number</td>
<td>Text Content</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.01</td>
<td>Parking spaces inevitably means that parking will form a part of the frontage and may not be directly in front of the property they serve, as specified in paragraph 2.16.01. We would ask whether the Council proposes to make alterations to the Street Design Guide so that it is line with this document.</td>
<td>Should be used together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.01</td>
<td>The size, and design, of private amenity space is actually controlled elsewhere within this document. The repetition of this guidance should be avoided.</td>
<td>The supplementary information is not repeated and is relevant to this section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.01</td>
<td>Note that the paragraph number in the document is incorrectly listed as ‘1.17.01’. Persimmon and Strata, as well as other housebuilders, will generally look to comply with Building Regulations. Any target over and above Building Regulations can only be aspirational since it may affect the number of houses achievable on site and inadvertently, the viability of a scheme.</td>
<td>The paragraph numbers in this section have been corrected, and the numbering throughout the document checked.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.07 – 2.18.09</td>
<td>This requirement is controlled through the Building Regulations and we suggest that unless other factors, such as noise, are a consideration, developers will comply with the legislation. The relevance of this detail within this guidance should therefore be re-considered.</td>
<td>Mechanical Ventilation will be covered in section 9, pg 6 (1.02 Health and Housing), given that it is a requirement and not guidance. Text amended in 2.18.08 to read ‘may’ and not ‘will’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)

47/Ventilation/ Air Quality & Noise/ 2.18.13 – 15

2.18.13 – 2.18.15 (Noise) – Whilst we agree with the principles set out within this section, we would urge the Council to consider dwellings that front on to noise sources, thereby having quieter garden areas. All our homes are fitted with glazing/ventilation to meet nationally required standards. This requirement is again controlled by alternative legislation and its relevance within this ‘guidance’ should be re-considered.

The guidance refers to the orientation of buildings to protect habitable rooms and gardens from noise sources. The information is included to aid understanding.

Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)

51/Future Proof Design and Renewable Technologies/ 2.19.01 – 2.19.19 (Renewable Technologies) – We are of the view that this section is not relevant to the Residential Design Guide. The requirement for Renewable Energy Technologies is already outlined within the Core Strategy Document.

The RDG contains guidance on how to meet the policy requirements.

Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)

53/Active and Sustainable Travel /2.20.01-03

2.20.01 – 2.20.03 (Active or Sustainable Travel) – We have had many instances where we have had planning approval for cycle and walking facilities on our sites but have had issues agreeing these details with the Section 38 team post-planning. We would therefore encourage active involvement from the Section 38 team during the planning stages.

We agree that the active involvement from Section 28 in the planning stages is a requirement, and is part of the Implementation Plan.

Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)

55/Successful Soft Landscapes/ 2.22.01 – 2.22.12 (Soft Landscapes) – Whilst we acknowledge that the planting of trees enhances the visual amenities and character of residential developments, we are also mindful that the costs for adopted street trees often makes proposals unviable. We would therefore ask that the Council consider the costs of adopted street trees when assessing

More trees are required for the environment. Trees are an integral part of landscaping, and this guidance sets out principles for successful planting which can help avoid excess maintenance costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>landscaping proposals.</th>
<th>The provision of trees could be sought as a S106 contribution like public open space if it meets the relevant tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd40</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>70/Design for the 21st Century/Whole section</td>
<td>3.01.01 – 3.07.04 (Whole Section) – We acknowledge the principles outlined within this section and believe as two major housebuilders operating within the region our schemes and methods of construction currently meet these requirements. As technologies advance and the market evolves these methods change, but always align with these principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd40</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>77/Appendix/Whole Section</td>
<td>4.01.01 – 4.03.30 (Whole Section) – We support the space standards outlined within this section but would ask that the Council are flexible on the minimum standards when assessing developments on sites which have significant constraints, such as steep gradients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd40</td>
<td>Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes and Mr Mark Davis, Strata Homes (joint)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Whilst the principle of a document to improve design standards across Wakefield is to be applauded, there are many elements within this guidance that appear to fall beyond the purview of the planning system. Where there is alternative legislation to control these, e.g. Building Regulations, the relevance of these sections needs to be re-considered as a whole to improve the deliverability of Wakefield MDC’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The information in section 2 is guidance; the information is included to add understanding. Planning and Building regulations are not mutually exclusive as we move forward. Building Regulations covering water quality and space standards can only be introduced by policy in a Local Plan and these will be considered under the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd42</td>
<td>Mr Ian Smith, Historic England</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>At this stage, we have no comments to make on the contents of that document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd43</td>
<td>Miss Rachael Bust, Coal Authority</td>
<td>4/Site and Context Appraisal /1.01.10</td>
<td>1.01.10 Constraints - The Coal Authority supports the notification in this part of the document that ground stability issues which may pose a constraint to the development layout should be considered as part of the site appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd43</td>
<td>Miss Rachael Bust, Coal Authority</td>
<td>6/Health and Housing/1.02.</td>
<td>1.02 Health and Housing – The Design Guide sets out 9 key health and housing considerations, with number 9 of this list relating to Air Quality, Land Contamination &amp; Noise. The Coal Authority considers that these key considerations should identify land stability as an issue which requires to be addressed and an early stage, as required by the NPPF, and we therefore request that the following changes are made to this part of the text; 9. Air Quality, Land Contamination, Land Instability &amp; Noise Early in the design process an assessment should be undertaken of air pollution, land contamination, land instability issues and noise to identify the impact on or from the proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development and any mitigation needed. Where possible housing should be developed in an appropriate location away from existing sources of pollution. The incorporation of street trees, electric vehicle (EV) charging points and the use of travel plans to reduce vehicle emissions should all be considered to help reduce levels of NO2 and particulates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name and Affiliation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd44</td>
<td>Mr Ian Stokes, York City Council</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Thank you for issuing the Wakefield District Residential Design Guide Part 1: Guidance for Housebuilders for comment. I have examined the document and I believe it is a comprehensive and well-presented document. I am particularly pleased to see that Section 2.05 ‘Creating an Identity’ cites Derwenthorpe, York as a good practice example for creating identity. Given the geographical distance between Wakefield and the City of York it is likely that the design guide will have a negligible impact on the City of York. Therefore, in this regard a neutral response is offered.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG1revcd45</td>
<td>Selby Council</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>We have no specific officer comments to make on this document</td>
<td>Response noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Comment ID's rdg1cd20, rdg1cd24, rdg1revcd37 & rdgrevcd39 were inadmissible
### 2.2 Comments and Responses to Implementation Plan (September 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Reference</th>
<th>Organisation / Individual</th>
<th>Relevant section or theme</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Integreat Plus / Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Design Guide Implementation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG IP1</td>
<td>Mr John Orrell</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The implementation plan is an excellent proposal and I fully support the collaborative educational programme envisaged. My only proviso is to be careful about placing too much weight on precedent projects/images of what &quot;good design&quot; looks like. Good design is about process not product.</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG IP2</td>
<td>Councillor Graham Stokes</td>
<td>10/Creating Inviting Neighbourhoods/4.4</td>
<td>In creating inviting neighbourhoods it is essential to consider the housing needs of the local populace taking into account the age and work profile, in Knottingley WDH are reviewing the future of the independent living scheme at Beulah Court, should they decide to close the facility in 2019 it would mean that there are no independent living schemes within the area, despite local people wanting to remain local with family and friends. Knottingley would benefit from a small working group of people from WMDC, WDH and the CCG to consider the future housing needs of the town and how it is to be provided in a managed way, my belief is that there is a need for an</td>
<td>Comment noted. This is outside the scope of the RDG. The review of the Local Plan for the district will consider housing requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
independent living scheme and more elderly affordable and rented accommodation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG IP3</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG IP4</td>
<td>Mr P Cocker</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>Response noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG IP5</td>
<td>Rachel Clarke-Wood, Environment Agency</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Thank you for consulting us on the above consultation. We have no specific comments to make on the plan. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG IP6</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>8/Training Workshops /4.0</td>
<td>The document appears to focus on training in order to achieve change. This may not be the best approach to deliver the desired change and the resources may best be focused in other areas. For example, the aspiration within the document for innovative highway design may be complex to implement as the S38 team are currently under resourced. The need for adoption officers S38 to be bought into innovative solutions is therefore unlikely to be possible.</td>
<td>It is agreed that resources need to be addressed and this is in progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG IP6</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The delivery of significant change will require strong leadership and understanding of design principles within WMDC to give officers confidence to change their current practices.</td>
<td>It is understood that this is necessary and is the purpose of the Implementation Plan is to address this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG IP6</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>14/Design Review/5.0</td>
<td>If WMDC are using external consultants to assess schemes will there be an emphasis on achieving compliance?</td>
<td>Design review is an established process and used elsewhere locally and nationally. It is recommended in the NPPF. The document sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG IP6</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Is there an opportunity to think innovatively about how to deliver the items which are considered important to housing in the district. For example: In Bolsover they are looking to write the delivery of Street Trees into the S106 requirements</td>
<td>The provision of trees could be sought as a S106 contribution like public open space if it meets the relevant tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG IP6</td>
<td>Mr David Kemp, Spawforths</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The document could also clarify what is appropriate level of detail at Outline Planning Application stage to avoid submission of too much detail.</td>
<td>The level of detail provided for an outline application will depend on the number of matters being applied for. The level of information asked for is proportionate to the type of application been sought and scale of development. This should be set out in the design and access statement accompanying a planning application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Summary of Revised Draft Consultation Responses

Summary of comments to the RDG Part 1 and Implementation Plan

RDG Part 1

There were a number of useful written comments, with the majority of minor comments being incorporated into the text as amendments or additions. There was some concern that a small number of the best practice images did not clearly demonstrate the principles in the heading or text, and so where this issue was raised, the images have been replaced with more illustrative alternatives. The point was also raised that some of the diagrams did not fully demonstrate the principles regarding street hierarchy and active frontages, however these were created for illustrative purposes only and used to demonstrate the principles within that section.

Some concerns were highlighted that some of the principles within the RDG may affect the density and viability of housing sites. The side to side distance has been reduced from 3m to 2m to align with the previous reduction in the side to boundary distance.

Some of the more substantive points raised, such as the inclusion for wider visions for housing in the district, will be considered in the Local Plan Review.

Implementation Plan

The principles and ambitions of the Implementation Plan were widely welcomed. The main concern was whether the council would have the resources and required knowledge to accomplish the aims of the plan. The council agree that resources are needed, and this is being addressed.
3.0 Appendix A - Methods of Engagement

This section illustrates the different methods of engagement undertaken for the Public Consultation of the Revised Residential Design Guide (Part 1) and Implementation Plan.

3.1 Developer Briefing - 28.07.17

Date: 28.07.2017
Time: 14.00 – 16:00
Location: Town Hall, Westgate, Wakefield, WF1 2HQ

This meeting was held as part of the Public Consultation on the new RDG. The purpose was to inform developers on the changes made since the first developer consultation event and to gain feedback on any outstanding developer concerns regarding the documents’ legibility and content before the next round of consultation.

Summary of meeting:

The changes that have already been made were widely welcomed by the developers. Concerns were raised about how adhering to the RDG may impact on the viability of development, such as the ability of the large housebuilders to vary their standard housing type. The aspiration of the document to raise the quality of the design across the Wakefield District was welcomed by all, and Wakefield Council would like this to include all scales of development.

The Implementation Plan was also welcomed, and developers were generally pleased that the Council were looking to increase resources and inhouse skills so that the RDG would be embraced and followed.
DENSITY AND VIABILITY

The basic standard of a 1.5m Side to Boundary dimension has been reduced to 1m.

The basic standard of a 2m Front or Back to Front or Back has been retained, but with an understanding shown that this standard may be reduced subject to site specifics.

POTENTIAL FOR CONFLICT

The current source of supplementary planning guidance on residential design is the current Residential Design Guide, which was adopted in 1996 and the Street Design Guide (adopted in 2012).

The new guidance has been checked against these guides to ensure that there are no areas of conflict.

It has also been produced in line with the Local Development Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Slides from presentation with Developers
## Agenda

**Date:** 28th July 2017

**Event:** ‘Residential Design Guide’ Developer Briefing

**Hosts:** Wakefield Council and Integreat Plus

**Location:** The Kingswood Suite, Wakefield Town Hall, Wood Street, WF1 2HQ

**Chair:** Neil Rodgers, Wakefield Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Presenter/Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td><strong>Tea and Coffee on Arrival</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td><strong>Introduction &amp; Welcome</strong></td>
<td>Neil Rodgers, Service Director for Planning, Transportation &amp; Highways, Wakefield Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15</td>
<td><strong>RDG Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Elizabeth Motley, Head of Architecture and Urbanism Integreat PLUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45</td>
<td><strong>Questions and Answers</strong></td>
<td>Led by Neil Rodgers, Wakefield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45</td>
<td><strong>Moving Forward</strong></td>
<td>Elizabeth Motley, Integreat Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td><strong>Finish</strong></td>
<td>Neil Rodgers, Wakefield Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developer Roundtable Meeting Notes

Project: Wakefield Design Guide
Date: 28/07/2017
Time: 14:00 – 16:00
Place: Wakefield Town Hall

Developer Attendees:
Neil Bowen (Neil Bowen Architects)
Matt Burrows (Persimmon Homes)
Jason Campbell (Bellway Homes)
Charlotte Copley (Redrow Homes)
Ian Corner (Strata Homes)
Mark Jones (Barratt Homes)
David Kemp (Spawforths)
John Orrell (OLA Design)
Christopher Peatland (Redrow Homes)
Marcus Walsh (Martin Walsh Architectural)
Robert Carter (Barratt Homes)
Clare Wilby (Strata Homes)
Lloyd Anglesea (Strata Homes)

WMDC Attendees:
Neil Rodgers – WMDC
Becky Eades – WMDC
Neville Ford – WMDC
Integrate Plus Attendees:
Elizabeth Motley – Integrate Plus
Richard Motley – Integrate Plus
Jonathan Morrison – Integrate Plus
Robbie Ormrod – Integrate Plus

Documents:
(RDG) Residential Design Guide
(IS) Implementation Strategy

Minute taker: JM / RO

Key Points:
Implementation

An Implementation Strategy document is being created to direct the Council and developers on how to use the RDG and to make sure its principles are understood and embedded. The IS will be released simultaneously with the RDG, and will be consulted on during the consultation period in Sept/Oct 2017. The two documents are intended to be published in early 2018.

It was noted that Wakefield Council do not currently have the capacity for the assessment of good design. A resource in this regard will be looked at in the near future to see if the Council can provide this service in-house, or whether it needs to work in collaboration with other organisations.

Other initiatives that the council are looking at, which will be set out in the IS, are: training workshops for elected members, officers and senior management on elements of good design; design enabling activities; access to a library of design reports and best practice precedents; design review; learning lunches and design masterclasses.

Comply or Justify

A point was raised that Comply or Justify should be Justify, if not, Comply. This was because they felt that justification of high quality innovative design should be welcomed and promoted above just complying with the rules. Integrate Plus and Wakefield Council agree that innovative and creative design should be promoted, but that the current phrasing allows this. The RDG needs to address a wide audience, from smaller developers to mass housebuilders, and each will approach the document differently.

Street Trees

Discussion was held over the adoption of schemes by highways in regard to street trees. Developers are not inclined to include street trees in schemes when the Section 38 team (highways) will not adopted them, which frustrates the planning process. It was agreed that developers would welcome a clear set of guidance on what would and would not be adopted/allowed at an early stage of the design process and an explanation as to why not. This would allow early viability studies to be more accurate. It was raised that trees are shown on plans which are passed by planners, yet not
adopted after construction. Wakefield Council confirmed that if a scheme received pre-application advice and the inclusion of street trees were agreed, then that would be followed through to the decision.

The Leeds City Region ‘Green Street’ initiative looks to encourage street trees but limitations such as root spread and lighting issues need to be addressed. There are solutions to prevent root spread used by other councils in similar situations, such as flexi-pave.

Wakefield’s ‘Emerald Ring’ is nearly complete so there is already a precedent for dealing with street trees in the city.

**Viability**

Changes to the specified side to boundary distance of 1.5m to 1m were welcomed. It was noted that the 1.5m distance came from existing guidance (the 1996 Residential Design Guide) but that the existing RDG was not followed by developers.

Developers raised the point that changing housing types to reflect the local vernacular would be unviable. Housing types from mass developers are used across the country and take years to developed. It was felt that the use of Revit or other BIM software would not assist in this due to knock on effect to all elements of the scheme. Wakefield Council noted that they hoped to influence the development of new house types by developers in the future.

Response to vernacular and the local context can be referred in material choice, building form, landscaping and site arrangement. These need not require the design of a whole new housing type. The creation of ‘place’ is the main requirement.

The issue was raised that responses to context/vernacular often result in small changes and additions which result in pastiche. The RDG does not promote pastiche architecture. It was felt more discussion on this was needed.

The point was raised that the RDG should not require applicants to submit excessive justification documents with an application (if they choose to justify and not comply), which could slow and frustrate the process. Early engagement with the council in the design would streamline the process.

**Streets**

In relation to street materials (and street trees) the council recognises that there are limitations due to budget constraints and ongoing maintenance. However there are still options available, other than tarmac, which would be viable. There are also requirements for access for a number of services that limited design options (refuse and emergency services).

**General Points**

The aspiration for high quality design and place making was welcomed by all.

**Integreat Plus contact details:**

0114 275 26 20

Elizabeth Motley: Elizabeth.Motley@integreatplus.com
3.2 Online Consultation Portal (RDG)

Screenshot of Wakefield Council’s Consultation Portal
Online Consultation Portal (Implementation Plan)

Screenshot of Wakefield Council’s Consultation Portal
3.4 Comment Form

Comments forms were available at libraries across the district.

LDF REVISED CONSULTATION DRAFT COMMENT FORM
WAKEFIELD DISTRICT RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDE (RDG) PART 1 AND RDG IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Notes for making comments about LDF documents

1. The preferred way for making comments is online at: http://consult.wakefield.gov.uk. Please see the section “Information and How to Get Involved”.

2. You can also make comments by using this form.

3. Please use a separate comment form for each comment you make.

4. Please use capital letters and black ink when completing paper copies of the form.

5. Further copies of this form can be downloaded from the Council’s website at www.wakefield.gov.uk/epds

6. You may be contacted at a later date to discuss your comments in more detail.

7. Completed forms should be returned either by:
   - email to ldf@wakefield.gov.uk
   - post to:
     Wakefield Metropolitan District Council
     Spatial Policy
     Planning, Transportation and Highways
     Wakefield One
     PO BOX 700
     Burton Street
     Wakefield
     WF1 2EB

Comments must be submitted by 5pm on Wednesday 11 October 2017. Late comments will not be considered.

Copies of the comments will be made available for public inspection and cannot be treated as confidential.

Data Protection Statement: The City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council processes personal data under the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998 in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The information you supply will only be used and retained for the purpose of preparing the Local Development Framework. It will be saved on the Local Development Framework database and made available to view on the Council’s website.
3.5 LDF Advertisements

Poster distributed to libraries across the district and displayed in Council offices advertising Consultation by WMDC
Screenshot of a post promoting the consultation on Wakefield Council corporate Facebook page
Screenshots of a post promoting the consultation Facebook - South East and Normanton and Featherstone Where I Live (examples)
3.6 Press Adverts
4. Appendix B

Appendix B lists the Organisations, persons and bodies notified of the consultation and invited to make representations, based on the SCI including those who have requested to be kept informed on such work. The list of consultees is recorded from the Draft Consultation stage, which this document is an addendum to.

4.1 Specific Consultation Bodies as Listed in Regulation 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

(a) Coal Authority
(b) Environment Agency
(c) Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage, now Historic England)
(d) Marine Management Organisation
(e) Natural England
(f) Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (company number 2904587),
(g) Highways Agency,
(h) a relevant authority any part of whose area is in or adjoins the local planning authority's area
(i) any person— (i) to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003, and (ii) who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the local planning authority's area.
(j) if it exercises functions in any part of the local planning authority's area— (i) a Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006(9) or continued in existence by virtue of that section; (ii) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) or (c) of the Electricity Act 1989(10); (iii) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986(11); (iv) a sewerage undertaker; and (v) a water undertaker;
(k) the Homes and Communities Agency(12); and
(l) where the local planning authority are a London borough council, the Mayor of London;

General consultation bodies as listed in regulation 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012:

a) voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the local planning authority's area,
(b) bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the local planning authority's area,
(c) bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the local planning authority’s area,

(d) bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the local planning authority’s area,

(e) bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the local planning authority’s area;
4.2 Consultee List

Specific Organisations (21)
(Sci Appendix 2.1)
British Telecom PLC
Canal and River Trust
historic England (formerly English Heritage)
Environment Agency
Highways Agency
Knottingley to Gowdall Drainage Board
Leeds City Region Secretariat
Local Government Yorkshire and Humber
Mid Yorkshire NHS Trust
Mobile Operators Association
National Grid
Natural England
Planning Inspectorate
Powergen
Historic Monuments of England
RWE – npower
Strategic Health Authority Estates Department
Yorkshire Cable
Yorkshire Electricity
Yorkshire Water Services

Specific Organisations (Adjoining Councils) (8)
(Sci Appendix 2.1)
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Bradford Metropolitan District Council
Calderdale Council
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
Kirklees Council
Leeds City Council
North Yorkshire County Council
Selby District Council

Specific Organisations (Town and Parish Councils within district) (25)
(Sci Appendix 2.1)
Ackworth Parish Council
Badsworth Parish Council
Crigglestone Parish Council
Crofton Parish Council
Darrington Parish Council
East Hardwick Parish Council
Featherstone Town Council
Havercroft-with-Cold Hiendley Parish Council
Hemsworth Town Council
Normanton Town Council
Nostell Parish Council
Notton Parish Council
Ryhill Parish Council
Sharlston Parish Council
Sitlington Parish Council
South Elmsall Town Council
South Hiendley Parish Council
South Kirkby and Moorthorpe Town Council
Thorpe Audlin Parish Council
Upton and North Elmsall Parish Council

Walton Parish Council
Warmfield-cum-Heath Parish Council
West Bretton Parish Council
Wintersett Parish Council
Woolley Parish Council

Specific Organisations (Town and Parish Councils adjoining district) (20)

Allerton Bywater Parish Council
Beal Parish Council
Brierley Town Council
Brotherton Parish Council
Byram-cum-Sutton Parish Council
Clayton-with-Frickley Parish Council
Cridling Stubbs Parish Council
Denby Dale Parish Council
Fairburn Parish Council
Great Houghton Parish Council
Hampole and Skelbrooke Parish Council
High Hoyland Parish Council
Hooton Pagnell Parish Council
Kirk Smeaton Parish Council
Kirkburton Parish Council
Ledsham Parish Council
Ledston Parish Council
Norton Parish Council
Shafton Parish Council
Stapleton Parish Council

**General Organisations (Community Groups) (81)**

(SCI Appendix 2.2)

A.I.R.E Environmental Group
Ackworth and District Riding Club
Ackworth Footpath Group
Agbrigg and Belle Vue Allotment Association
Age Concern Wakefield District
Asian Women's Association

Aysgarth Community Association
Brunswick Street Mosque
CIW
Castleford Heritage Group
Castleford Riverside Community Group
Castleford Town Centre Partnership
Central Jamia Mosque
Chevin Housing Association
Citizen Advice Bureau
Community Assembly
Crofton Community Centre
Cutsyke Community Group
Development Initiative for Voluntary Arts
DIAL Wakefield
Eastmoor Community Project
Featherstone Historical Society
Federation of Small Businesses (Wakefield Branch)
Ferrybridge Community Centre
Glasshoughton Community Forum
Grange Street Mosque
Groundwork Wakefield
Help the Aged
Hemsworth and District Partnership
Horbury and District Historical Society
Horbury Community Council
Horbury Village Partnership
Horbury, Ossett and Sitlington Regeneration Group
Kinsley and Fitzwilliam Community Resource Centre
Kirkhamgate Community Association
Knottingley Town Hall Community Centre
Lock Lane Community Centre
Lupset Community Centre Association Ltd
Lupset Community Partnership
Minsthorpe Community College
NACRO
Next Generation Community Trust
Normanton Environmental Society
North Wakefield Community Group
Ossett Historical Society
Pontefract and District Archaeological Society
Pontefract and Castleford Federation of Small Businesses
Pontefract and District Rail Action Group
Pontefract Heritage Group
Pontefract Local History Society
Pontefract Town Centre Partnership
Portobello Tenants and Residents Association
Residents Against Toxic Sites
Royal British Legion, Horbury, Sitlington and Ossett branch
SANS (Sharlston and Streethouse) Community Development
SESKU Community Advisory Forum
SESKU Environment Group
Showmen’s Guild
South Hiendley Community Association
South Pontefract Community Partnership
Special Abilities
St Catherine's Church Centre
St Marys Project
St Michael's Tenants and Residents Association
St Peter and St Pauls Community Association
Swaffia Mosque
Thorpe Audlin Community Association
Upton and North Elmsall Community Forum
Voluntary Action Wakefield District
Wakefield and District Environmental Action Forum
Wakefield and District Environmental Action Forum South Kirkby
Wakefield and District Sight Aid
Wakefield Asian Welfare Association
Wakefield College
Wakefield District Sports Association
Wakefield Local Access Forum
Wakefield Mosque, Pinderco Ltd/WACF
Wrenthorpe Community Association

Wrenthorpe Environmental Society
Yorkshire Mesmac
Zakria Mosque

Government Departments (11)
(SCI Appendix 2.3)

Communities and Local Government
Crown Estates
Defence Estates
Equality and Human Rights Commission
Government Office for the English Regions
Health and Safety Executive
HM Prison Service Headquarters
Homes and Communities Agency
Housing Corporation
Office of Government Commerce
Yorkshire and the Humber Reg. Housing
**Additional Organisations (34)**

(Sci Appendix 2.3)

- Arriva Yorkshire
- British Geological Survey
- CABE
- Campaign for Better Transport - West Yorkshire Group
- Campaign to Protect Rural England
- Church Commissioners
- Coal Authority
- Diocese of Wakefield
- East Coast Main Line
- English Welsh and Scottish Railways
- Fields In Trust
- Forestry Commission
- Freight Transport Association
- Freightliner Ltd
- Friends of the Earth
- GB Railfreight Ltd
- Gypsy Council
- Gypsy Council for Education, Culture, Welfare and Civil Rights
- Home Builders Federation
- Home Office
- Midland Mainline
- National Trust
- Network Rail
- Road Haulage Association
- Royal Mail Property Holdings
- RSPB
- Sport England (Yorkshire Region)
- Sustrans
- Traveller Law Reform Project
- Virgin Trains
- Wakefield District Biodiversity Group
- Wakefield Naturalists' Society
West Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive
Woodland Trust

Additional Organisations (Joint Services) (5)
(>SCI Appendix 2.3<>

West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service
West Yorkshire Ecology
West Yorkshire Fire Service
West Yorkshire Metropolitan Ambulance Service
West Yorkshire Police

Additional Organisations (Civic Societies) (6)
(>SCI Appendix 2.3<>

Horbury Civic Society
Knottingley Civic Society

Normanton Civic Society
Ossett Civic Society
Pontefract Civic Society
Wakefield Civic Society

Additional Organisations (Chambers of Trade and Commerce) (5)
(>SCI Appendix 2.3<>

Featherstone Chamber of Trade
Horbury and District Chamber of Trade
Mid-Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry Ltd
Pontefract Chamber of Trade
Wakefield Area Chamber of Commerce Industry Ltd

Other Organisations (18)
(>SCI Appendix 2.4<>

British Wind Energy Association
Council for British Archaeology
WMDC Councillors (63)
(Sci Appendix 2.4)
63 Local councillors representing all 21 wards.

Members of Parliament and Members of the European Parliament (10)
(Sci Appendix 2.4)
4 Members of Parliament
6 Members of the European Parliament

Additional developers, businesses and organisations who have requested to be/have been consulted (246)
(Sci Appendix 2.4)

A and L Slater Ltd
ABLE Partnership Ltd
Acanthus W S M Architects

Director of Public Health
Friends, Families and Travellers
Greenpeace
Mid Yorkshire NHS Trust
National Farmers Union
National Fed. of Gypsy Liaison Groups
National Trust
Northern Gas Networks Ltd
Northern Rail
npower Renewable
Ramblers Association
Theatres Trust
Wakefield District Housing (WDH)
Wakefield Job Centre Plus
Welcome to Yorkshire
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
Agbrigg and Bell Vue Community Centre
Aged Welfare Assoc
Altofts Community Sports Club
Altofts Cricket Club
Altofts Football Club
Arriva Yorkshire
Azaad Cricket Club
Bad Brains MTB Club
Barnsley, Dearne and Dove Canals Trust
Barratt and David Wilson Homes
Barton Willmore LLP
BBM Revolution Cycling Club
Bernhards Landscapes (Wakefield) Ltd
British Sign and Graphics Association
BTCV
Calder Clarion Cycling Club
Carter Jonas
Castleford Cricket Club
Castleford Lock Lane ARLFC
Castleford Panthers ARLFC
Castleford RUFC
Castleford Tigers
Cathedral Church of All Saints, Wakefield
Castleford Town AFC
CDP Ltd
Central Jamia Masjid
City of Wakefield Golf Club
CLA Country Land and Business Association
Coal Authority
Coalfields Regeneration Trust
Colliers International
Community Awareness Programme (CAP)
Community Group for College Grove/Pinderfields
Confederation of UK Coal Producers
Crigglestone and Durkar Residents Association
Crigglestone ARLFC
Cromwell Wood Estate Co. Ltd
David Storrie Associates
Development Planning Partnership
Dewsbury Road Autos
Disabled Peoples Partnership (South East)
DPDS Consulting Group
Eastmoor Angling Club
F.M. Lister and Son
Featherstone Lions ARLFC
Featherstone Road Club
Featherstone Rovers
Friends of Bottom Boat Park
Friends of Carr Lodge Park
Friends of CHaT Parks
Friends of Flanshaw
Friends of Friarwood Valley Gardens
Friends of Frickley Country Park
Friends of Fryston Wood
Friends of Green Park Ossett
Friends of Hartleys Field
Friends of Haw Hill Park Normanton
Friends of Haw Park Wood
Friends of Heath Common
Friends of Horbury Lagoons
Friends of Illingworth Park
Friends of Kettlethorpe Lake and Woodland
Friends of Kettlethorpe Park
Friends of King George Field
Friends of Lakeside Meadows
Friends of Lock Lane Altofts
Friends of Manygates Park
Friends of Millpond Meadows
Friends of Newmillerdam Country Park
Friends of Newton Hill
Friends of Orchard Head
Friends of Ossett Church Street
Kayes Hotels Ltd
Knottingley Canoe Club
Lafarge Aggregates Ltd
Leeds City Council
Lothhouse Colliery Action Group
Lothhouse Colliery Park Residents Group
Lothhouse Hill Golf Club
Low Laithes Golf Club
Lupset Play Area's Association
Marine Management Organisation
Metro Locals Community Skate Park Group
Mid Yorkshire Golf Club
Middlestown Playground Group
Miller Homes Ltd
Mono Consultants
National Trust- Nostell Priory and Parkland
New Inn
Newmillerdam Community and Conservation Association
Nine Lakes Community Trust
Normanton Golf Club
Normanton Juniors AFC
Normanton Knights ARLFC
Northern Power Grid
Northern Trust
Nostell Estate
Notcutts Ltd
Old Quarry Adventure Playground, The
Old Thornesians AFC
Ossett Albion FC
Ossett Common Rovers FC
Ossett Cricket and Athletics Club
Ossett Town Centre Partnership
Ossett Town FC
Outwood Parks Action Group
Overtown Grange Farm
Pacy and Wheatley Ltd
Pacy and Wheatley/Mr Foster/SETC
Pennine Camphill Community
Pinderfields Paraplegic Archery Club
Pledwick Cricket Club
Pontefract and District Golf Club
Pontefract and District Walking Club
Pontefract Civic Society
Pontefract Cycle Club
Pontefract Squash Club
Pontefract Collieries FC
Railfuture Yorkshire
Rapleys LLP
Re-Connect
Residents For Newmarket
Resource Aid Centre
Rivers Community Action Group
Rose Farm
RSPB Fairburn Ings
RSPB Wakefield District Local Group
Rural Action Yorkshire
Sandal Community Association
Sandal Cricket Club
Sandal Lawn Tennis Club
Scala Land Ltd
Slazengers Hockey Club
Slazengers Sports and Social Club
Smiths Gore
South Elmsall Cycle Club
South Kirkby Angling Club
Spawforths
Sport England
Standing Conference of Asian People
Stanley Cricket Club
Stanley Rangers ARLFC
Stanley United FC
Stanley United Juniors FC
Stephenson and Son
Stockdale Stables
Sustainability Advisory Group
Tangent Properties
The Highwood Stud
Thomas Eggar LLP
Thornes Juniors FC
Thorntree Farm
Tireil Ltd
Townsend Planning Consultants
Turley Associates
UK Coal Mining Ltd
Upton Cycle Club
Upton United Junior FC
Upton Village Angling Club
Virgin Media
Wakefield and District Environmental Action Forum
Wakefield Angling Club
Wakefield Archers
Wakefield Badger Group
Wakefield Cycle Club
Wakefield Deaf Women's Group
Wakefield District Cycle Forum
Wakefield District Cycling Forum
Wakefield District Harriers and Athletics Club
Wakefield District Tree Wardens
Wakefield FC
Wakefield Golf Club
Wakefield High Flyers
Wakefield Hockey Club
Wakefield Learning Partnership
Wakefield Over 50's Action Group
Wakefield Phoenix Netball Club
Wakefield RSPB Local Group
Wakefield Shirt Co. Ltd
Wakefield St Michaels CC
Wakefield Sunday League
Wakefield Tennis Club
Wakefield Tree Warden Network
Wakefield Triathlon Club
Wakefield Walking Club
Wakefield Wildcats
Walton Allotments Society
Walton and Co
Walton Angling Club
Walton Common Farm
Walton Community Centre and Recreation Ground Ltd
Walton Golf Centre
Walton Guide and Scout Group
Walton Sports and Social Club
Walton Tennis Club
Waterton Park Golf Club Ltd
Waystone Ltd
Well Woman Centre

West Yorkshire Canoe Club
West Yorkshire Tennis Club
Wheels for Havercroft
White Rose Ladies FC
Whitwood Golf Club
Wintersett Wildlife Group
Wrenthorpe Community Association, Wrenthorpe Environmental Society and Ruskin/Barnes Avenue Action Group
Wrenthorpe Rangers FC
Yorkshire Sculpture Park

Additional individuals who have requested to be / have been consulted (188)

(SCRI Appendix 2.4)