

HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL
Report to Economy and Growth Select Committee
8th February 2018

TITLE:	High Peak Design Guide – Supplementary Planning Document
PORTFOLIO HOLDER:	Councillor Tony Kemp – Executive Councillor for Tourism, Regeneration and Licensing
CONTACT OFFICER:	Joanne Brooks – Regeneration Officer
WARDS INVOLVED:	Non-Specific

[Appendix 1 – High Peak Design Guide](#)

Appendix 2 – Public consultation feedback

1. Reason for the Report

- 1.1 A draft design guide has been completed for High Peak. This has now been subject to public consultation with the public and a regional organisation that promotes good architectural design. This report sets out the results of the consultation exercise and recommends that the amended design guide is adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 Members are recommended to :

- (a) note the consultation comments and officer's responses to them;
- (b) request that the Executive recommends that the Council adopts the Design Guide;
- (c) delegate approval to officers to make any technical updates to the design guide, including the detailed appendices, as required.

3. Executive Summary

- 3.1 The draft High Peak Design Guide aims to promote new and sustainable high quality design which respects the distinctiveness of the area. The general principles of design are set out within the text of the guide itself. This will then be supplemented by a series of technical appendices to the guide that will set out how the principles are to be applied.
- 3.2 Members approved the draft document for the purposes of wider consultation in 2016. Public consultation was carried out for a 4-week period between Monday 29th February and Tuesday 29th March 2016. Prior to the public consultation, all members were invited to a presentation of the draft document

on 25 February 2016.

- 3.3 The consultation responses showed a general support for the production of the design guide but with a number of observation and detailed comments.
- 3.4 The consultation feedback is summarised in Section 5 and reproduced in more detail, including officer's responses in Appendix 2.
- 3.5 We have also consulted with the Architecture and Design Centre for the East Midlands (OPUN) which offers an independent and impartial review service to local authorities on all building design related matters. The advice received from OPUN has been taken into account within the draft High Peak Design Guide and is included in Appendix 2.
- 3.6 It is the intention to adopt the design guide as a Supplementary Planning Document which will form part of the suite of documents aligned with the Adopted Local Plan.
- 3.7 The design guide will be a useful guidance document for applicants and agents when preparing planning applications. It will be used by case officers and Councillors in the determination of planning applications. It is intended to be an overarching 'live' document that will be continually supplemented by a series of technical appendices on a range of design issues. Whilst hosted by the Council's web site it can be downloaded for print.

4. **How this report links to Corporate Priorities**

- 4.1 This report promotes the need for good design and secures high quality new developments within High Peak. This in turn, is related to the Council's corporate aim 3: To support economic development and regeneration measured through sustainable towns and rural communities and increased economic growth.

5. **Options**

- 5.1 There are two principal options:

Option 1 - Do Nothing

Without the design guide there will be a general lack of design guidance that is specific to High Peak. There will be no mechanism by which the Council can raise the quality of design and determine applications for development within the area. **Not recommended**

Option 2 – Adopt the High Peak Design Guide

The adoption of the High Peak Design Guide will offer additional supplementary design advice for developers, architects and agents when submitting proposals for development in High Peak. The guide identifies the local building traditions and characteristics of the area and offers advice to ensure that any new development enhances and responds to the local

context. The guide and the corresponding technical appendices will improve and raise the standard of design across the area and can be used in the determination of planning applications and appeals.

Recommended

6. Results of the public consultation exercise

6.1 In accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, the following groups were consulted;

- Local architects and planning agents
- Local amenity groups, Parish Councils and special interest groups
- Ward Councillors
- Key council officers
- Members of the public

6.2 A copy of the document was also available to view on the Council's web site and a hard copy of the design guide was available to view at local Council offices and libraries.

6.3 The Council received a number of comments regarding the content of the design guide and these are summarised briefly as follows.

- The tone of the document is too entrenched in the past and more emphasis should be given to the positive role that modern architecture can bring.
- There should be more flexibility on using modern materials.
- The guide is too prescriptive in places e.g. new development, use of materials and detailing does not reflect paragraphs 59 and 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the government's policy guidance on planning issues).
- The document is lacking in any real detailed guidance on accommodating new development within High Peak such as layout, scale, density, car parking standards etc.
- There is a lack of good examples illustrating the content of the document.
- Additional comments required promoting inclusive access.

6.4 Following the general consultation exercise the Council consulted with OPUN on the Design Guide. In summary they commented as follows:

- The document is overly wordy and should be a leaner document.
- Good examples should be more practical and guidance should be more precise.
- The document should be more user friendly.

6.5 By taking on board the comments from OPUN the document has been edited to offer a slimmer and more precise document with less section headings. It has been repackaged into a web based format that can be continually added to and updated. Each section heading and topic area will have a

series of technical appendices that offer more detailed and practical advice and good examples - some of which are already complete. As a result many of the general responses have been addressed within these changes.

7. **Implications**

7.1 Community Safety - (Crime and Disorder Act 1998)

No implications

7.2 Workforce

No implications

7.3 Equality and Diversity/Equality Impact Assessment

This report has been prepared in accordance with the Council's Diversity and Equality Policies.

7.4 Financial Considerations

There are no financial considerations for the Council relating to the recommendations of this report.

7.5 Legal

No implications

7.6 Sustainability

Sustainability is at the heart of the Council's design policies. The Council supports the use of sustainable design and construction methods and is committed to delivering new homes with environmentally sustainable design that helps to save the environment, energy, water and money.

7.7 Internal and External Consultation

Both an internal and external consultation process was completed, the results of which are included in Appendix 2.

7.8 Risk Assessment

No significant issues have been identified.

8. **Background and Detail**

8.1 The importance of good design is recognised by the Government in its National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2012):

Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people” (NPPF, paragraph 56)

- 8.2 The need for high quality development is also emphasised in the adopted High Peak Local Plan. This document and other relevant supplementary planning documents set out what the Council would expect to see in terms of securing good design within High Peak.
- 8.3 This design guide will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and sets out the overarching principles in securing good design. Once adopted, the design guide will be continually updated and supplemented by detailed technical appendices on a wide range of design issues. Being primarily a web based document it can be continually updated and kept abreast of current policies and practice.
- 8.4 The design guide will be a material consideration in all planning decisions which involve development in High Peak. It will carry considerable weight in decision making, having been subject to scrutiny and amendment through wide public consultation.

Dai Larner
Executive Director Place

Web links and background papers - Draft High Peak Design Guide

Location - Files held electronically

Contact details - Joanne Brooks ext 365

Appendix 2 – Draft High Peak Design Guide – Public Consultation responses

Respondent	Comment	Officer response	Officer recommendation
OPUN	<p>1.Good overview of area but overly wordy. It needs to be more practical and lean. Review the style so that it is more crisp and to the point.</p> <p>2.Document needs to be repackaged with end user in mind.</p> <p>3. Lacks guidance on what to do and is quite generic. Not precise enough to give clear direction and needs to be more specific.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>The design guide has been amended so that it has become a leaner and simpler document with less topic headings. A list of important bullet points has been inserted at the end of each section to give a quick summary.</p> <p>The document has been repackaged so that it is primarily a web based document that the user can move through and reference quickly.</p> <p>Each section will be accompanied by a list of further information (some already published) and additional technical guidance notes on relevant topic areas. Most of these have been prepared in draft form but need supplementing with actual on the ground examples. Given the design guide will be web based it can be continually added to.</p>
A Leclercq	Support for document	Support noted	No further action required
Buxton Civic Ass	BCA support Design Guide	Support noted	No further action required

Respondent	Comment	Officer response	Officer recommendation
High Peak Access Group	<p>General comments on highlighting the need for inclusive, adaptable and accessible space and buildings with particular reference to sections 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9.</p> <p>Identified some incorrect annotation of photographs</p> <p>Additional hyperlinks required to document published by Historic England: <i>Easy Access to Historic Buildings</i></p> <p>Section 2 - should also reference visitors to High Peak</p>	Comments noted	These are minor changes of a technical nature - agree to amend text where required.
HPBC Officer	Reference should be made to Landscape Character SPD in Section 11 and HPBC Tree Policy in appendix 1	Comments noted	These are minor changes of a technical nature- agree to amend text where required
HPBC Officer	Section 12 - Reference to statutory protection for wildlife and link to Derbyshire Wildlife Trust in Appendices.	Comments noted	These are minor changes of a technical nature- agree to amend text where required

<p>HPBC Officers</p>	<p>General comments on Sustainability Section 6 – Reference NPPF and HPBC adopted Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Insert a sub heading dealing with sustainable transport.</p> <p>Some concern expressed about use of natural materials and viability</p>	<p>Chapter 6 relating to sustainable design has been omitted and sustainability has now been threaded through the whole document</p>	<p>Text amendments made where appropriate.</p>
<p>J Davy</p>	<p>General comments on setting high standards for sustainable building and development.</p> <p>Support Section 12 – Wildlife</p> <p>Future development should fit into context and resist piecemeal development.</p>	<p>Sustainable design comments reflect standards responding to national and local planning policies.</p> <p>Wildlife section now incorporated in section 4</p> <p>The importance of designing in context is dealt with in Section 3.</p>	<p>No text amendments required.</p> <p>No text amendments required.</p> <p>No text amendments required.</p>
<p>J Poulter</p>	<p><i>This was the most detailed and comprehensive set of comments the extent of which cannot be reproduced in their entirety, but can be summarised as follows:</i></p> <p>Design Guide is not in accord with paras 59 and 60 of the NPPF</p>	<p>The Design Guide does respond to these paragraphs but officers recommend additional text in para 1.2 to be more</p>	<p>To amend para 1.2.</p>

	<p>The guide maybe used as a justification to prevent contemporary/modern architecture based on style and appearance.</p> <p>Section 1 A generalisation that every traditional building is good can prevent progress and improvement. No mention of the context buildings were constructed in.</p> <p>The Design Guide should incorporate more specific objectives and standards such as density, space standards, car parking, accessibility and sustainability.</p> <p>Section 2 Para 2.3 should be amended to respect today's lifestyles whilst responding to its</p>	<p>positive about new development of a contemporary design.</p> <p>Officers are keen to distinguish between the matters of style and appearance and professional judgements should be restricted to design rather than personal taste.</p> <p>Officers accept the point being made and agree to amend text to reflect the needs, resources and technologies of the time.</p> <p>The Design Guide is intended to set out high levels design principles and many of the more detailed principles will be covered in further technical appendices.</p> <p>Officer's accept redraft of para 2.3 by respondent</p>	<p>Guide has a more positive response to modern and contemporary design.</p> <p>To amend paragraph 1.6</p> <p>Para 1.2 amended to reference further detailed guidance.</p> <p>To amend para 2.3 (now para 2.2)</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>context.</p> <p>Identifying the characteristics of traditional buildings in High Peak is contained in section 2 but this does not place these in context with people needs, technology and resources available.</p> <p>The paragraphs dealing with modern architecture should be more positive about the role of new buildings.</p> <p>Section 3 New development with a strong vertical emphasis should be allowed if not causing harm.</p> <p>New roofs need not always respect or copy traditional characteristics.</p> <p>There should be 5 main factors and not 3 in considering new design. Form and scale need to be separated and proportion added and each factor expanded.</p>	<p>Officers agree with respondent and suggest an amendment to para 2.8 to reflect this point.</p> <p>Officers suggest an amendment to paragraphs 2.13 – 2.16 to be more positive on the integration of new buildings in a traditional context.</p> <p>This reference now omitted due to redraft suggested by OPUN.</p> <p>Officers accept this point and suggest an amendment to para 3.6 to reflect this comment.</p> <p>Officers don't disagree with this comment but are trying to keep the guide to a reasonably high level in terms of detail.</p>	<p>To amend para 2.8 (now 2.7)</p> <p>To amend paras 2.13 – 2.16 (now paras 2.8 – 2.11).</p> <p>No amendments necessary</p> <p>Para 3.6 (now para 3.4) amended to state that new roofs should 'normally' fit within the existing roofscapes.</p> <p>To redraft paragraphs 3.12 – 3.25 (now paras 3.7 – 3.17) to deal with scale, materials, proportions, detailing and form.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Section 4 Expecting all new buildings to be constructed in stone and slate is not realistic. There are issues around sourcing, cost implications and the sustainability of transporting these. More modern sustainable materials should be used.</p> <p>Through colour acrylic render systems, timber cladding and the use of brick should not be ruled out as appropriate materials. Use of new materials is too restrictive.</p> <p>Expecting a high level of detailing and craftsmanship on all buildings is an unrealistic expectation.</p> <p>Section 5 The section is too brief and should cover more guidance on density, frontages, external spaces, parking and boundary treatments.</p> <p>Section 6 Sustainable Design should not necessarily be seen as a stand-alone chapter but a thread</p>	<p>Agree to amend para 4.1 to state 'wherever possible' new buildings should be constructed from the same palette of materials.</p> <p>Agree to amend para 4.7 to allow modern renders in less sensitive locations. However the use of brick and timber boarding is not prevalent throughout High Peak.</p> <p>Officers do not agree with this point. The existing wording make an important point as often the use of stone is purely executed.</p> <p>Officer accept this point but the additional guidance requested will be covered by future technical guidance.</p> <p>Officers agree and this section has been removed.</p>	<p>To amend para 4.1(now para 7.14)</p> <p>To amend Section 4 (now section 7) regarding the use of modern renders.</p> <p>No amendments proposed.</p> <p>No amendments proposed to this section (now section 4).</p> <p>Where relevant sustainability issues are highlighted at the end of each section.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>throughout the whole document.</p> <p>Section 7 and 8 The guidance does not mention the acceptability of extending buildings by making a clear distinction between old and new. The guidance is too restrictive on conversions.</p> <p>Section 10 More flexibility is required in this section as guidance on detailing is too restrictive.</p> <p>Section 11 This section should be more realistic about external materials.</p>	<p>Officers agree and redrafted paras in section 7 and 8 (now section 5) to reflect the points made.</p> <p>Officers agree to make guidance less prescriptive by amending wording to allow more flexibility.</p> <p>The section (now section 4) is not unrealistic and advocates the use of top dressed tarmac.</p>	<p>Para 5.6 amended. Para 5.15 amended.</p> <p>Amend para 10.2 (now 7.3)</p> <p>No amendments required.</p>
R Hubble	<p>Support and concur with all comments made by J Poulter.</p> <p>Welcomes Design Guide but concerned about the amount referenced to the Peak Park.</p>	<p>See above responses</p> <p>High Peak contains landscape and settlement areas within the Peak Park and there are strong similarities within the built and natural environment. Given this the Peak Park Design Guide proved a useful reference point.</p>	<p>See above recommendations</p> <p>As per OPUN comments document redrafted and less emphasis is given to Peak park.</p>

	<p>Draft guide ignores reference to NPPF paras 59 and 60 and guidance from Landmark Trust and Historic England (HE).</p> <p>The guide ignores modern materials and use of brick.</p> <p>General comment regarding the validity of the Design Review Panel (DRP) and lack of qualified architect retained by HPBC</p>	<p>The Design Guide references paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Paras 59 and 60 are dealt with in the body of the design document. Reference to guidance from HE</p> <p>See above responses under J Poulter</p> <p>Officer note this comment but the mechanism of the DRP and staffing resources do not form part of the Design Guide.</p>	<p>No amendments required</p> <p>See above recommendations.</p> <p>No amendments required</p>
A Hubble	<p>Support and concur with all comments made by J Poulter</p> <p>Main concern with overall tone that comes from a 'conservation' point of view and not 'regeneration'. Document is not progressive or forward thinking enough and lacks good contemporary examples within a conservation context.</p> <p>Importance of context is correct but document does not reflect the differing contexts within High Peak.</p>	<p>See above responses</p> <p>Officers agree with and suggest an amendment to be more positive on the integration of new buildings in a traditional context.</p> <p>Comment noted but feel that this point is reflected in Section 3.</p>	<p>See above recommendations</p> <p>Paras 2.8 – 2.11 and section 3 more positive take on new development.</p> <p>No amendments necessary.</p>

	<p>Character assessments by developers should demonstrate understanding of individual sites and guide appropriate development.</p> <p>Developments should take into account position and aspect.</p> <p>Document does not reflect aspirations and requirements of today's society and how this impacts on design. Lack of opportunity to produce anything different.</p> <p>High Peak has evolved over a long period of time and is a product of different eras which gives visual interest and should continue to do so.</p> <p>More modern materials such as render and timber are dismissed in document.</p> <p>The document does not deal with how modern developments and amenity requirements can</p>	<p>Character assessments are welcomed to guide appropriate development</p> <p>Comment noted but this point is already referenced in Section 6 on Sustainability.</p> <p>Comment noted and para 2.3 amended to reflect demands of today's lifestyles.</p> <p>Comment noted and para 2.8 amended to reflect this point.</p> <p>Officers note this comment and agree to amend section 4 (now section7) to be flexible over the use of modern materials where appropriate including render. Timber however is not a traditional material in High Peak.</p> <p>Officers note this comment but feel that this is an issue</p>	<p>Para 3.11(now 3.7) amended to reflect this point.</p> <p>Section 6 now omitted but comment incorporated into para 3.17.</p> <p>Para 2.3 (now 2.2) amended.</p> <p>To amend Para 2.8 (now 2.7).</p> <p>Amend wording of Section 4 (now section 7).</p> <p>No amendments required.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>be balanced with a more traditional village layout.</p> <p>Concern over restrictions regarding conversion and extension to converted buildings.</p> <p>Design Guide would benefit from photographs to inspire new development.</p> <p>Design Review board needs to be independent with members qualified in building design and architecture.</p>	<p>and topic area that would be presented as one of the future technical guidance notes.</p> <p>Officers note these comments and agree to amend para 8.4 to allow extensions and alterations where necessary and where approached carefully.</p> <p>Officer agree with this point and the final document will require some additional photographs especially in Section 6.</p> <p>See response to R Hubble above</p>	<p>Amend para 8.4 (now 5.15)</p> <p>Section 6 has now been omitted. Photographs have been added to final document and good examples can continually be uploaded.</p> <p>See recommendation to R Hubble above.</p>
J Hubble	<p>The concept of the document is to be applauded but there are omissions and generalisations that do not encourage good design.</p> <p>Difficult to find any real guidance.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>The Design Guide is intended to set out high level design principles and</p>	<p>No amendments required</p> <p>No amendments required.</p>

	<p>The document gives the impression of not encouraging new building materials, technology or design.</p> <p>Very negative attitude to modern architecture in Section 2.</p> <p>No acknowledgement in the draft document of the 20th or 21st century influences in design.</p> <p>Much of the document is personal taste rather than design principles. The 3 main design criteria in section 3 result in a homogenous mass of pastiche buildings trying to imitate traditional buildings and no recognition of present day living.</p>	<p>many more of the detailed guidance will follow in technical appendices.</p> <p>See response to J Poulter above</p> <p>Officers suggest amendments to Sections 2 and 3 to be more positive on the role of new buildings in traditional context.</p> <p>One of the defining characteristics of High Peak is the prevalence of 19th century vernacular architecture. There are few examples of latter architectural styles that would warrant inclusion with the Design Guide.</p> <p>Comment noted and officers suggest a redraft of paras 3.12 – 3.25.</p>	<p>See recommendations to J Poulter above.</p> <p>Paras 2.8 – 2.11 and section 3 more positive take on new development.</p> <p>No amendments required.</p> <p>Paras 3.12 – 3.25 (now 3.8 – 3.17) amended to address scale, materials, proportions, detailing and form.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Contrasts in scale and use of sustainable materials would break the monotony of new buildings.</p> <p>The draft document should look at the guidance given by Historic England and their attitude to extending listed buildings using modern materials and designs.</p> <p>No comment has been made on housing size.</p> <p>The draft guidance focuses mainly on housing but no mention of larger buildings and how use will dictate form and appearance. The example of Buxton Water is welcome in the document.</p> <p>Several issues in the sustainability section that need addressing such as cars and how we plan for them; is stone sustainable? The use</p>	<p>Officers note these comments and propose to add an additional para 3.12 (now 3.8) regarding scale. The use of new and sustainable materials is referenced in section 4 (now 7)</p> <p>Comments noted and para 7.7 amended to reflect guidance in HE document.</p> <p>This level of guidance would fall in further technical appendices that would need to reflect policy H3 of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>There is a section on large buildings (para 3.9).</p> <p>Section 6 now omitted from document. There is already a sub-section on</p>	<p>Amendments to text already proposed to cover these points</p> <p>Amend para 7.7 (now para 5.6)</p> <p>No amendments required.</p> <p>Additional text to supplement para 3.9 (now 3.6) to respond to comment.</p> <p>No amendments required.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>and cost of modern materials.</p> <p>Planners need to consider the use of external advisors to advise and support design decisions.</p>	<p>sustainable materials. The successful integration of cars into new developments is likely to be a topic for future technical guidance.</p> <p>See response to R Hubble above</p>	<p>See recommendations to R Hubble above</p>
--	--	---	--