

**Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council  
and  
Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council**

**Local Development Framework**

**Initial Statement of Consultation  
for  
Draft Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning  
Document(s)**

**March 2007**



## **DRAFT DESIGN GUIDANCE PREPARED BY OLDHAM AND ROCHDALE COUNCILS AS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS**

### Explanatory Note:

The Government has reformed the system of development planning in England. Development Plans are used to control and guide the development and use of land. As part of the reformed system, Oldham and Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Councils must prepare a “Local Development Framework”.

The Local Development Framework will be a folder of different documents, including Development Plan Documents which set out the Council's approach to future development in the Borough.

This document is part of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It has been prepared jointly between Oldham and Rochdale Councils. Policies can be expanded on or supported by SPDs in order to provide more detail, interpretation of policies and to assist developers. These will be taken into account when planning applications are determined.

It is a government requirement that Supplementary Planning Documents must be prepared together with:

- a sustainability appraisal,
- a habitats regulations assessment, and
- an equalities impact assessment.

Members of the public may comment on the Supplementary Planning Document and any of the three supporting documents. A document outlining who has been consulted in the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document, and issues they raised, is also available alongside these documents. This is called a Consultation Statement.

Members of the public may comment on this document during the six-week public consultation period as indicated on the public notice and comments form.

Comments made on the document cannot be treated as confidential.

If you would like further help in interpreting this document please contact

- Oldham Council Strategic Planning and Information team on Telephone: 0161 770 4151 / 4139. E-mail [spi@oldham.gov.uk](mailto:spi@oldham.gov.uk).

or

- Rochdale Council Strategic Planning Team on Telephone: 01706 924369. E-mail: [strategic.planning@rochdale.gov.uk](mailto:strategic.planning@rochdale.gov.uk)

All documents connected with the Local Development Framework are available on the Council's web sites at [www.oldham.gov.uk](http://www.oldham.gov.uk) or [www.rochdale.gov.uk](http://www.rochdale.gov.uk).

## সাপ্লিমেন্টারী প্লানিং ডকুমেন্টস্ (প্লানিং সংক্রান্ত সম্পূরক দলিল) হিসেবে ওল্ডহাম এবং রচডেল কর্তৃক প্রস্তুতকৃত খসড়া নকশা (ডিজাইন) সম্পর্কিত দিকনির্দেশনা

### ব্যাখ্যামূলক টীকাঃ

ইংল্যান্ডে উন্নয়ন পরিকল্পনা তথা ডিভালপমেন্ট প্লানিংয়ের পদ্ধতি সরকার সংশোধন করেছে। জমিজমার উন্নয়ন এবং ব্যবহারের বিষয়টি নিয়ন্ত্রণ এবং এ ব্যাপারে দিকনির্দেশনা দেয়ার জন্যে উন্নয়ন পরিকল্পনাগুলো ব্যবহৃত হয়ে থাকে। সংশোধিত পদ্ধতির অংশ হিসেবে, ওল্ডহাম এবং রচডেল মেট্রোপলিটান বারা কাউন্সিল দ্বয়কে অবশ্যই একটি "স্থানীয় উন্নয়ন অবকাঠামো" তৈরি করতে হবে।

"স্থানীয় উন্নয়ন অবকাঠামো"টি হবে বিভিন্ন দলিলের একটি ফোল্ডার, যার একটি হবে "উন্নয়ন পরিকল্পনাসংক্রান্ত দলিল-দস্তাবেজ"। এই বারায় ভবিষ্যৎ উন্নয়নের প্রতি কাউন্সিলের দৃষ্টিভঙ্গিগুলো কিরূপ হবে তা উল্লিখিত দলিল-দস্তাবেজে তুলে ধরা হয়েছে।

এই দলিলটি হচ্ছে সাপ্লিমেন্টারী প্লানিং ডকুমেন্ট (এস.পি.ডি) তথা সম্পূরক উন্নয়ন দলিলের একটি অংশ; এটি ওল্ডহাম এবং রচডেল কাউন্সিল যৌথভাবে তৈরি করেছে। নীতিমালার বিশদ ব্যাখ্যা দেয়ার জন্যে এবং ডিভালপারদের (নির্মাণকারী) সহায়তা করার লক্ষ্যে সাপ্লিমেন্টারী প্লানিং ডকুমেন্ট (এস.পি.ডি) তথা সম্পূরক উন্নয়ন দলিলগুলো দ্বারা প্লানিং সংক্রান্ত পলিসি তথা নীতিমালা পরিবর্তন অথবা সমর্থন করা যেতে পারে। প্লানিংয়ের দরখাস্তগুলোর ব্যাপারে সিদ্ধান্ত নেয়ার ক্ষেত্রে এ জিনিসগুলো বিবেচিত হবে। এই খসড়া দলিলটি ওল্ডহাম এবং রচডেল কাউন্সিল যৌথভাবে প্রস্তুত করেছে এবং চূড়ান্তভাবে অনুমোদিত হবার পর এটি সাপ্লিমেন্টারী প্লানিং ডকুমেন্ট (এস.পি.ডি) তথা সম্পূরক উন্নয়ন দলিলের মর্যাদা লাভ করবে।

নিম্নবর্ণিত বিষয়গুলোর পাশাপাশি সাপ্লিমেন্টারী প্লানিং ডকুমেন্ট তথা উন্নয়ন সংক্রান্ত সম্পূরক দলিলপত্রগুলো অবশ্যই প্রস্তুত হবার ব্যাপারটি হচ্ছে একটি সরকারি অত্যাবশ্যক কাজঃ

- টিকে থাকতে পারবে কিনা সে'সংক্রান্ত একটি মূল্যায়ন
- একটি হ্যাবিটেট রেগুলেশন্স এসেসম্যান্ট (প্রাণী ও গাছগাছালির স্বাভাবিক আবাস সম্পর্কিত বিধিমালা মূল্যায়ন), এবং
- সমতার প্রভাব বিষয়ক এসেসম্যান্ট

সাপ্লিমেন্টারী প্লানিং ডকুমেন্ট এবং সহায়ক দলিল তিনটির উপর জনসাধারণ ইচ্ছে করলে মন্তব্য করতে পারবেন। সাপ্লিমেন্টারী প্লানিং ডকুমেন্টটির প্রস্তুত প্রক্রিয়ায় কার কার সাথে সলা-পরামর্শ করা হয়েছে এবং তারা কোন্ কোন্ উদ্বেগ/সমস্যাগুলো তুলে ধরেছেন সে বিষয়ক একটি দলিলও এ দলিলপত্রের পাশাপাশি পাওয়া যাবে। এটি কনসালটেশন স্টেটম্যান্ট হিসেবে পরিচিত।

এ দলিলের ব্যাপারে, পাবলিক নোটিশ এবং মন্তব্যের ফর্মে উল্লেখ মোতাবেক, জনসাধারণ ইচ্ছে করলে মতামত প্রদান ও সলা-পরামর্শের জন্যে নির্ধারিত ছয়-সপ্তাহ সময়ের মধ্যে মন্তব্য করতে পারেন।

এ দলিলের উপর যে মন্তব্যগুলো করা হবে সে'গুলো গোপনীয় হিসেবে বিবেচিত হবে না।

এ দলিলটি বুঝার ব্যাপারে যদি আপনার আর কোন সাহায্যের প্রয়োজন পড়ে তবে অনুগ্রহ করে যোগাযোগ করুনঃ

- ওল্ডহাম কাউন্সিলের স্ট্র্যাটেজিক প্লানিং এবং ইনফরমেশন টিম, টেলিফোনঃ 0161 770 4151 / 4139;  
ই-মেইলঃ spi@oldham.gov.uk

অথবা

- রচডেল কাউন্সিলের স্ট্র্যাটেজিক প্লানিং টিম, টেলিফোনঃ 01706 924369;  
ই-মেইলঃ strategic.planning@rochdale.gov.uk

স্থানীয় উন্নয়ন অবকাঠামোর সাথে সংশ্লিষ্ট সকল দলিলপত্র কাউন্সিল দ্বয়ের [www.oldham.gov.uk](http://www.oldham.gov.uk) এবং [www.rochdale.gov.uk](http://www.rochdale.gov.uk) ওয়েব সাইটগুলোতে রয়েছে।

ઓલ્ડહામ અને રોચડેલ કાઉન્સિલો મારફત પ્લાનિંગ(યોજના બનાવવા)ના પૂરક દસ્તાવેજો તરીકે તૈયાર કરવામાં આવેલ રૂપરેખાને લગતુ કાયુ માર્ગદર્શન

#### સમજણ આપતી નોંધ :

સરકારે ઈંગ્લેંડમાં વિકાસની યોજનાને લગતી પધ્ધતિનીનવરચના કરી છે. જમીનના વિકાસ તથા ઉપયોગની ઉપર કાબુ રાખવા તથા તેને લગતુ માર્ગદર્શન પૂરૂ પાડવા માટે વિકાસની યોજનાઓનો ઉપયોગ થઈ રહ્યો છે. નવરચના કરાયેલ પધ્ધતિના ભાગરૂપે, ઓલ્ડહામ મેટ્રોપોલીટન બરો કાઉન્સિલે હવે સ્થાનિક વિકાસનું માળખુ તૈયાર કરવુ પડે છે.

સ્થાનિક વિકાસનું માળખુ એ વિવિધ દસ્તાવેજોનું એક ફોલ્ડર હશે કે જેમાં વિકાસની યોજનાને લગતા દસ્તાવેજો હશે, જે બરોમાં ભવિષ્યના વિકાસ માટે કાઉન્સિલ ક્યો અભિગમ અપનાવશે તે જણાવવામાં આવેલ હશે.

આ દસ્તાવેજ , પૂરક દસ્તાવેજોનો એક ભાગ છે. કાર્યનિતીઓની વધુ વિગતો તથા તેની સમજણ આપવા તથા વિકાસ કરનારાઓને મદદ કરવા માટે પ્લાનિંગના પૂરક દસ્તાવેજો વિષે પ્લાનિંગની કાર્યનિતીઓ વિકસાવી શકાશે અથવા પ્લાનિંગના પૂરક દસ્તાવેજો મારફત તેને ટેકો આપી શકાશે. જ્યારે પ્લાનિંગની અરજીઓ નક્કી કરવામાં આવશે યારે આ બાબતને ગણતરીમાં લેવામાં આવશે. આ કાયો દસ્તાવેજ ઓલ્ડહામ અને રોચડેલ કાઉન્સિલ મારફત ભાગિદારીમાં તૈયાર કરવામાં આવેલ છે અને તેને અંતિમ મંજૂરી મળી જાય પછી તેઓને પ્લાનિંગના પૂરક દસ્તાવેજ તરીકેનો હોદ્દો મળશે.

પ્લાનિંગના પૂરક દસ્તાવેજોને નીચેનાઓ સાથે તૈયાર કરવામાં આવે તે એક સરકારી જરૂરીયાત છે :

- જળવાઈ રહે તેને લગતુ મૂલ્યાંકન
- સાધન સામગ્રી પૂરી પાડવાને લગતા નિયમોની આકારણી, અને
- સમાનતા ઉપર તેની શું અસર થશે તેની એક આકારણી

આમ જનતાના સભ્યો કદાચ પ્લાનિંગના પૂરક દસ્તાવેજો તથા ટેકો આપતા ત્રણ દસ્તાવેજો ઉપર ટીકા-ટિપ્પણી કરે. આ દસ્તાવેજોની સાથે સાથે, પ્લાનિંગના પૂરક દસ્તાવેજોને તૈયાર કરવા માટે કોની સાથે સલાહમંત્રણાં કરવામાં આવી છે, અને તેઓએ ક્યા મુદ્દા ઉભા કર્યા છે તે જણાવતો એક દસ્તાવેજ ઉપલબ્ધ છે. આને સલાહમંત્રણાંના દસ્તાવેજ તરીકે ઓળખવામાં આવે છે.

જાહેર નોટીસ અને ટીકા-ટિપ્પણી કરવા માટેના ફોર્મ ઉપર જણાવ્યા અનુસાર છ અઠવાડીયાના સમયગાળા દરમ્યાન આમ જનતા આ દસ્તાવેજ ઉપર ટીકા-ટિપ્પણીપણ કરી શકે છે..

દસ્તાવેજ ઉપર કરવામાં આવેલ ટીકા-ટિપ્પણને ખાનગી નહીં રાખી શકાય.

જો તમારે આ દસ્તાવેજનો અનુવાદ કરવા માટે મદદની જરૂર હોય તો મહેરબાની કરીને નીચેનાનો સંપર્ક સાધો.

- ઓલ્ડહામ કાઉન્સિલ સ્ટ્રેટેજિક પ્લાનિંગ એન્ડ ઇન્ફર્મેશન ટીમ, ટેલીફોન 0161 770 4151/4139 અથવા ઇમેઇલ : [spi@oldham.gov.uk](mailto:spi@oldham.gov.uk).

અથવા

- રોચડેલ કાઉન્સિલ સ્ટ્રેટેજિક પ્લાનિંગ ટીમ, ટેલીફોન 01706 924369 અથવા ઇમેઇલ : [strategic.planning@rochdale.gov.uk](mailto:strategic.planning@rochdale.gov.uk)

સ્થાનિક વિકાસના માળખા સાથે સંકળાયેલ દરેક દસ્તાવેજો કાઉન્સિલની વેબસાઇટો ઉપરથી ઉપલબ્ધ છે. [www.oldham.gov.uk](http://www.oldham.gov.uk) અથવા [www.rochdale.gov.uk](http://www.rochdale.gov.uk).

ضمنی منصوبہ بندی کی دستاویزات کے بطور اولڈہم اور راجڈیل کونسل کی جانب سے تیار کیا گیا نقشے کی راہنمائی کا مسودہ

## وضاحتی نکتہ:

حکومت نے انگلینڈ میں تعمیر و ترقی کے سلسلے میں منصوبہ بندی کے نظام میں اصلاح و تجدید کی ہے۔ تعمیر و ترقی کے منصوبوں کو زمین کی اصلاح و ترقی اور استعمال کو کنٹرول کرنے اور راہنمائی کیلئے استعمال کیا جاتا ہے۔ اس ترمیم شدہ نظام کے حصے کے طور پر اولڈہم اور راجڈیل میٹرو پولیٹن بارو کونسل کو لازمی طور پر مقامی تعمیر و ترقی سے متعلقہ ایک لائحہ عمل تیار کرنا چاہیئے۔

مقامی تعمیر و ترقی سے متعلقہ لائحہ عمل مختلف دستاویزات پر مبنی ایک مجموعے کی شکل میں ہو گا مثلاً تعمیر و ترقی کے منصوبے سے متعلقہ دستاویزات جن میں کونسل کی بارو میں آئندہ تعمیر و ترقی کے متعلق سوچ بیان کی جائے گی۔

یہ دستاویز ضمنی منصوبہ بندی کی دستاویز (SPD) کا حصہ ہے۔ اسے اولڈہم کونسل اور راجڈیل کونسل نے مشترکہ طور پر تیار کیا ہے۔ منصوبہ بندی کی حکمت عملیوں میں سپلیمنٹری پلاننگ ڈاکومنٹس یعنی ضمنی منصوبہ بندی کی دستاویزات کے ذریعے توسیع یا تائید و حمایت کی جاسکتی ہے، تاکہ مزید معلومات مہیا کی جاسکیں، حکمت عملیوں کی تشریح کی جاسکے اور ٹھیکیدار کی مدد و تائید کی جاسکے۔ جب تعمیر و ترقی کی منصوبہ بندی ک درخواستوں کا تعین کیا جائے گا تو ان کو زیر غور لایا جائے گا۔ یہ مسودہ اولڈہم اور راجڈیل کونسل نے مشترکہ طور پر تیار کیا ہے اور ایک دفعہ اسے حتمی طور پر منظور کر لیا گیا تو یہ منصوبہ بندی کی ضمنی دستاویزات کی حیثیت اختیار کر لے گا۔

یہ گورنمنٹ کا تقاضا ہے کہ منصوبہ بندی کی ضمنی دستاویزات کو درج ذیل دستاویزات کے ساتھ تیار کیا جانا چاہیئے:

- استحکام کے متعلق جانچ
- نباتات اور جانوروں کے مسکن سے متعلقہ ریلیشنز کا جائزہ، بار
- مساوات کے لحاظ سے اثر کا جائزہ

پبلک کے افراد ضمنی منصوبہ بندی کی دستاویز اور ان تین معاون دستاویزات میں کسی کے متعلق اظہار رائے کر سکتے ہیں۔ ایک دستاویز جس میں بتایا گیا ہے کہ ضمنی منصوبہ بندی کی دستاویز کی تیار کیا گیا ہے۔ اس کے ساتھ مشاورت کی گئی ہے اور ان کی جانب سے اٹھائے گئے نکات (مسائل) اور دستاویزات کے علاوہ بھی دستیاب ہے۔ اس کو مشاورت کیا گیا ہے۔

پبلک کے افراد چھ ہفتوں پر مشتمل مشاورتی عرصے کے دوران اپنی رائے کا اظہار کر سکتے ہیں جیسا کہ پبلک نوٹس اور اظہار رائے کے فارم میں بتایا گیا ہے۔ دستاویز کے متعلق ظاہر کئے گئے خیالات کو صیغہ راز میں نہیں رکھا جائے گا۔

اگر اس دستاویز کو سمجھنے کیلئے آپ کو کوئی مزید مدد درکار ہو تو براہ کرم درج ذیل سے رابطہ کریں۔

- اولڈہم کونسل کے پلاننگ اینڈ انفارمیشن ٹیم کو اس نمبر پر فون کریں:

0161 770 4151/4139

آپ ٹیم کو [spi@oldham.gov.uk](mailto:spi@oldham.gov.uk) پر میل بھیج کر سکتے ہیں۔

یا

- راجڈیل کونسل کے پلاننگ ٹیم کو اس نمبر پر فون کریں:

01706 924369

آپ ٹیم کو [Strategic.planning@rochdale.gov.uk](mailto:Strategic.planning@rochdale.gov.uk) پر میل بھیج کر سکتے ہیں۔

وہ تمام دستاویزات جن کا تعلق مقامی تعمیر و ترقی سے متعلقہ لائحہ عمل سے ہے کونسل کی ویب سائٹ سے حاصل کی جاسکتی ہیں: [www.oldham.gov.uk](http://www.oldham.gov.uk)

یا [www.rochdale.gov.uk](http://www.rochdale.gov.uk)

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
1. Why Prepare a Statement of Consultation?	7
2. About the Statement of Consultation	7
3. The Regulations	7
4. Participation and Consultation so far	8
5. Stage One: Scoping and Options	9
6. Stage Two: Testing the Content	11
7. Sustainability Appraisal	12
8. Equalities Impact Assessment	12
9. Habitat Regulations Assessment	13
10. Approval of draft by Elected Council Members	13
11. Public Consultation in Draft SPD(s)	13
Appendix 1 – Consultation on the Scoping Report – Comments received and Councils responses	15
Appendix 2 – Organisations/stakeholders consulted at each Pre-Draft stages	18
Appendix 3 – Consultation at Pre-Draft Stages – Comments received and Consultants/Client Team responses.	19
Appendix 4 Specific Consultation Bodies and Government Departments to be Consulted on Draft SPD	30
Appendix 5 – General and Other Consultees	31

Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council and Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council will arrange for this document to be made available in alternative formats including large print, electronically, and community languages if requested, and subject to resources being available. For further information please contact ring Oldham MBC on 0161 770 4139, 4163 or 4151, or Rochdale MBC on 01706 924369 or 01706 924371.

## **1. Why Prepare a Statement of Consultation?**

- 1.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 it is a requirement to prepare and publish a consultation statement for a range of planning policy documents, including Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). This statement sets out information on the consultation process that has been carried out during the preparation of the draft Urban Design Guide. A final statement will be prepared to set out how the Council has consulted on the formal draft version and how it has taken into account any comments received.

## **2. About the Statement of Consultation**

- 2.1 The draft guidance on urban design has been prepared by Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd, in partnership with Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council (MBC), Oldham MBC and the Oldham and Rochdale Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder.
- 2.2 This statement of consultation explains how the four partners have sought to involve all relevant organisations and interested parties in the preparation of the draft Urban Design Guide
- 2.3 The guidance comprises a series of documents:
- The Urban Design Guide;
  - The Residential Design Guide; and
  - The Public Realm Design Guide.
- 2.4 The guidance has been prepared through joint-working by the four partners identified above. However it is the intention that Oldham MBC will adopt the series of documents as one Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as outlined in it's Local Development Scheme (LDS). Rochdale MBC are intending to adopt the documents as a series of separate SPDs as identified in it's LDS.
- 2.5 Following extensive consultation on local design issues and the options for tackling them (ie, the focus and content of the guidance) the draft Urban Design SPD(s) has now been published for formal public consultation.
- 2.6 Whilst not formally part of the SPD(s) the Council's are also taking the opportunity to consult on the Design and Planning Process: A Guide to Good Practice. This document aims to promote best practice and clearly set out the local authorities' expectations.

## **3. The Regulations**

- 3.1 The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (the Regulations) require that planning authorities should prepare SPDs in accordance with their Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) or with the minimum requirements in the Regulations where there is no adopted SCI. Both Councils are still in the process of preparing their SCIs (Oldham MBC have

received the Inspectors Report on the submitted SCI; Rochdale MBC are seeking approval in March for submission).

- 3.2 Consultation and participation has been consistent with the Draft SCI and formal consultation on the draft Urban Design SPD(s) will be in accordance with the SCIs. The Regulations require the Council to consult each of the specified bodies to the extent that the Council thinks the SPD affects that body and any other bodies that the Council considers appropriate and sets out what publicity should be given. The Regulations also require that a statement must be published at the time of formal consultation on the SPD, which should detail how Councils have sought to involve the community and stakeholders in its preparation.
- 3.3 This consultation statement demonstrates that both Councils have more than met the requirements set out in:
- Regulation 17 of The town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004; and
  - The guidance set out in Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks.

#### **4. Participation and Consultation so far**

- 4.1. The Brief for the Oldham Rochdale Urban Design Guidance sought not only to create comprehensive urban design guidance for the two boroughs, but also to ensure that the *process* of producing the guidance helped to raise the profile of design through consultation with all those involved in development. In other words, the process of developing the Urban Design Guidance was seen as important as the guidance itself.
- 4.2 Tibbalds was selected to lead the team producing the Guidance. In partnership with the two Boroughs and the HMR, Tibbalds devised an approach to consultation that consisted of the following stages:

##### *Stage One: Scoping and Options*

This stage of the consultation aimed to gain an understanding of:

- what local stakeholders felt made a good place, so leading to a discussion about the broad urban design principles that are common to good places;
- the lessons learned from good and bad practice in the local area;
- the obstacles to achieving good quality design at present; and
- the key issues that the Design Guidance needed to address.

##### *Stage Two: Testing the Design Guidance*

This stage of consultation was aimed at:

- helping all stakeholders understand the role of the Design Guidance so that they can make informed comments on the drafts; and
- enabling stakeholders to review draft copies of the Design Guidance and provide feedback to the client and consultant team.

Sections 5 and 6 below provide a summary of these two consultation stages.



## 5. Stage One: Scoping and Options

5.1 Stage One consisted of two workshop sessions and a series of one-to-one follow-up interviews with key stakeholders. The two workshop events were:

- for planning, highways and environmental health officers of Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC, and was held on 7 April 2005 at Rochdale Town Hall;
- the second consisted of two identical workshops in one day for wider stakeholders (including housing associations, developers, and local architects) on 9 May 2005 at Touchstones Gallery in Rochdale.

5.2 The officer workshop was useful for identifying the scope of the Design Guidance, particularly how it should relate to other planning policy, the status it should be afforded and its general approach – which should be inspirational and encouraging as well as providing clear guidance on what is not acceptable.

### Officer Workshop

In summary, the key points were:

- There's not much to celebrate in terms of quality design. The majority of Oldham and Rochdale is rather average, with small pockets of very poor quality environments.
- New estates lack character – don't relate to locality, led by standards (such as back-to-back distances).
- The road corridors have a very poor image and identity.
- The mills are good.
- Developers see 'good design' as having a high monetary cost. This is especially relevant on brownfield sites, which are already expensive to develop.
- Density standards are leading to better designs and a better mix of housing types.
- There are tensions between new design concepts and with highway safety issues. More guidance on highways is required.
- Planners and engineers need firm guidance to support negotiation and to refuse poor applications/win appeals. Planners are asking 'Is this refusable?' not 'Is this good design?'
- Low expectations – there is no culture of EXPECTING good design. We need to communicate that design isn't an optional extra.
- The SPD Documents need to be accessible to everyone.
- Lack of design skills amongst officers and members: training is needed.
- We need to create consensus of what good urban design is for Rochdale and Oldham by understanding the characteristics of the area.
- We should help developers and officers understand that good design goes beyond how things look.
- We should secure better quality design in smaller developments rather than trying to raise the standard over large areas.

- 5.3 The wider stakeholder workshop involved officers as well as wider stakeholders, and aimed to establish the range of options that the Design Guidance should address. This workshop began by inviting stakeholders to think of good places (whether in the local area or further afield) and what characteristics made them good places to be. These are summarised below. Many of the characteristics are similar to the themes set out in By Design. In discussions on what the design guidance should address, there were a wide range of opinions, but also a group of themes that repeatedly came up in discussion.

#### Stakeholder Workshop

##### What Makes A Good Place?

- A good place is a safe place
- Links (within and outside)
- Accessibility and a range of uses
- Good quality buildings – scale
- Well defined spaces – public / private / communal
- Community ownership / pride
- Human Scale
- Good quality materials
- A clear function

##### What should the design guidance address?

- House extensions
- New Housing
- Existing terraced housing
- Treatment/use of mills
- Main corridors
- Landscaping / public realm
- Managing the car

##### What should the guidance comprise?

The client and consultant team met following the workshops to discuss what the guides should address from the range of options discussed at the workshops. It was decided that, in addition to an overall guide setting out design principles that apply to all forms of development in both boroughs, there would be further guidance relating to:

- New housing;
- Public Realm; and
- Design and Planning Process.

New housing is the principal form of development coming forward in the two Boroughs at present and in the foreseeable future, and so a guide on this topic would be particularly useful. House extensions are already reasonably well covered under various policies and existing Supplementary Planning Guidance, and so it was felt that this was not a good area in which to focus limited resources.

The improvement of existing streets and spaces, and the creation of new public realm was felt to be an important topic that forms the basis of many projects within

both boroughs. A public realm design guide was therefore agreed upon. Managing the car could form part of both this guide and the residential design guide. Similarly, main road corridors could be addressed in the public realm guide.

The processes underpinning design were not explicitly raised at the wider stakeholder workshop, but they proved a key area of discussion with officers. A good practice guide to the design and planning process was agreed as the third guide.

## **6. Stage Two: Testing the Content**

6.1 The second stage of stakeholder workshops was held in August 2006. The same stakeholders who attended the Stage One workshops were invited to attend one of three workshop sessions over a single day. These sessions were structured as follows:

- a presentation to set the scene: reminding everyone of the role and purpose of the guides, and how the previous consultation workshops had informed them;
- a presentation of the Urban Design Guide and the Planning Process Guides, focussing on their structure and purpose rather than the detail of their content;
- a coffee break where stakeholders could quickly look at the guides, followed by a question and answer session at which any key points or misunderstandings could be clarified;
- a presentation of the Residential and the Public Realm Guide, again focussing on structure and purpose rather than detail;
- a coffee break where stakeholders could quickly look at the guides, followed by a question and answer session at which any key points or misunderstandings could be clarified; and
- the distribution of feedback forms, so that stakeholders could have a more thorough examination of the guides and provide detailed feedback to the client and consultant team.

6.2 The feedback forms encouraged stakeholders to provide feedback on the content, appearance and usability of the guides. The feedback was very positive and supportive and written responses from eighteen stakeholders were received, and a summary is provided below:

### Stakeholder Comments on Developing Draft

#### **APPEARANCE**

There were a number of detailed points regarding typos, quality of illustrations, labelling etc but the key points were:

- the layout of the A4 documents is confusing. Text and images need to relate better to one another. It is not clear in which direction the pages should be read;
- many of the photos are rather dark; and
- some of the text is difficult to read – e.g. pale blue on a white background.

#### **CONTENT**

There were a number of detailed points about content, and the main concerns were:

- length and repetition, especially between the streets and spaces guidance in the Residential Design Guide and the Public Realm Design Guide;
- the new government circular on Design and Access Statements, and the CABI guidance, need to be reflected in the Process Guide;
- there is a widespread desire for the documents to relate more specifically to Oldham and Rochdale; and
- Residential density should be referred to.

#### USEABILITY

- Most consultees felt that the guides are clearly written, but a couple wanted less jargon
- The status of the guides and their relationship to other statutory documents needs to be made clearer.

- 6.3 In agreement with the client team, Tibbalds made a number of changes to the documents prior to statutory consultation to ensure that the feedback from key stakeholders had been taken on board as far as was possible.
- 6.4 A detailed schedule of all comments received during pre-draft consultation, and the consultants and client teams responses to these comments, is available at inspection venues (see below) and on the Councils' web sites.

## 7. Sustainability Appraisal

- 7.1 The preparation of these documents have been tested for their sustainability through the formal sustainability appraisal process. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping Report was sent to the following stakeholders for comment between 23<sup>rd</sup> May and 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2006:

- Environment Agency
- English Nature
- English Heritage
- The Countryside Agency
- Government Office for the North West
- North West Regional Assembly
- Greater Manchester Architectural Liaison Unit
- Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive
- Greater Manchester Geological Unit
- Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit
- United Utilities

- 7.2 Following consideration of the responses on proposed scope of the SA (see Appendix 1), which required minor changes, Oldham MBC and Rochdale MBC carried out a detailed appraisal of the documents. The SA report is now published and is available for comment along with the SPD documents themselves.

## 8. Equalities Impact Assessment

- 8.1 Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC have also carried out an Equalities Impact Assessment on the draft SPD(s) in order to assess the potential impact of the

SPD(s) on the various equalities categories within the Boroughs. This was carried out by officers in the Strategic Planning and Information section at Oldham MBC and the Partnership and Regeneration Service at Rochdale MBC on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2006. The resulting document is available for consultation alongside this draft SPD(s).

## **9. Habitat Regulations Assessment**

- 9.1 Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC have also carried out a Habitat Regulations Assessment as required under Article 6(3) and 6(4) of the Habitats Directive as implemented by the draft Habitat Regulations 2004. This involved consultation with the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit and Natural England. A copy of this Assessment is available for consultation alongside the draft SPD(s).

## **10. Approval of draft by Elected Council Members**

- 10.1 Rochdale Council: The documents were presented to a panel of Cabinet and Township elected members on 16 November 2006. Whilst the documents were broadly welcomed and supported, a number of amendments were sought. The two most significant amendments were: a stronger statement about how the density of new housing development will be considered, and the need to consider 'maintenance' as a key issue and design principle. The Council's Cabinet formally approved a draft version of the documents as a basis for formal public participation on 27 November. 2006.
- 10.2 Oldham Council: The documents were presented to the Local Development Framework Members Panel on the 18<sup>th</sup> January 2007. Again the documents were broadly welcomed and supported, however there were concerns that local distinctiveness was not addressed clearly enough in documents and that more specific guidance about what is appropriate in different areas should be included. In particular it was felt that there is the need for a clearer distinction about what is appropriate in urban, suburban and rural settings. However it was agreed that consultation should proceed based on the documents in their present form and that the Council would come to a final conclusion in the light of responses received. The Executive Director for Regeneration and Lead Member approved the draft SPD as a basis for formal public consultation on 16<sup>th</sup> February 2007.

## **11. Formal Public Consultation on Draft SPD(s)**

- 11.1 The draft SPD(s) is subject to a period of formal consultation as identified in the accompanying Public Notice and Statement of Availability.
- 11.2 The documents available for inspection are as follows:

*Draft SPD documents:*

- *Draft Urban Design Guide*
- *Draft Residential Design Guide*
- *Draft Public Realm Guide*

*Other related SPD documents:*

- *Sustainability Appraisal of SPD documents*
- *Habitat Regulations Assessment*
- *Equality Impact Assessment*
- *Consultation Statement on SPD*

*Draft Design and the Planning Process – A Guide to Good Practice* (as previously stated this is not formally part of the SPD(s))

- 11.3 Appendix 4 contains a list of specific Consultation Bodies and Government Departments that will be invited by letter or email to comment on the draft SPD(s) and it's supporting documents.
- 11.4 Appendix 5 contains a list of other Consultees that will be invited to comment on the draft SPD(s) and it's supporting documents.
- 11.5 A Public Note and Statement of Availability will be published and a press release issued.
- 11.6 The SPD(s) and it's supporting documents will be available for inspection at the venues listed in the accompanying Public Notice and Statement of Availability.
- 11.7 Paper copies of the SPD can be purchased for £60 (inclusive of postage and packing). This is for the three documents that form the Urban Design Guide SPD(s) and the Design and Planning Process: A Guide to Good Practice document, as well as the supporting documents.

To order a copy, please send a cheque made payable to Oldham MBC to:

Strategic Planning & Information  
Regeneration Directorate  
PO Box 452  
Oldham Business Centre  
Cromwell Street  
Oldham  
OL1 1WR

Telephone: 0161 770 4151

Email: [spi@oldham.gov.uk](mailto:spi@oldham.gov.uk)

## Appendix 1 – Consultation on the Scoping Report – Comments received and Councils responses

Respondent	Issue	Council Response
United Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan may wish to acknowledge that statutory undertakers have 5 year investment programmes set by the regulator. This is currently AMP4 between 2005-10.</li> <li>It is possible to obtain a “good” score on BREAM criteria without attention to potable water saving measures. Various measures are suggested.</li> <li>Unmetered water usage figures cannot be provided for each district. UU and national averages/trends provided.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. This is not appropriate detail for the SA Scoping Report.</p> <p>Noted. This indicator using BREAM may be changed/refined in the light of experience and subject to the availability of other practical indicators re: water usage/consumption.</p> <p>Noted. Background information about trends will be included in the SA Scoping Report.</p>
GMPTE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LTP2 and the GM Accessibility Strategy needs to be referred to.</li> <li>Accessibility to services by a choice of sustainable modes should be referred to as a sustainability issue.</li> <li>Rewording of Objective K suggested.</li> <li>The effect of traffic in the community could be broadened to include noise pollution and</li> </ul>	<p>Noted and SA Scoping Report will be updated.</p> <p>There is appropriate reference to accessibility and modal choice for an Urban Design document. The level of detail suggested may be more appropriate for transport and travel related guidance.</p> <p>Noted. The objective is broader than the proposed change and there is sufficient detail in the supporting document.</p> <p>Noted. Too detailed for the SPD proposed. More appropriate in specific traffic and travel documents.</p>

	congestion including the economic impact.	
GMP Architectural Liaison Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A high percentage of developments should be constructed to ODPM guideline standards in Safer Places and Secured by Design.</li> <li>• Proposals for new walkways, pedestrian and cycle routes should be approved only after consultation with GMP.</li> <li>• Suggests that all new development should be accredited the Safer by Design award/submitted to GMP for comment prior to approval. SBD should be included as a key target indicator.</li> <li>• Recognise crime and disorder as a key issue.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed. Reference will be made to these documents/standards re: PPS1 and 3.</p> <p>Noted. Detail to be discussed for inclusion in SPD.</p> <p>Noted. Detail to be discussed for inclusion in SPD. Further indicators such as SBD will be considered as refinements to SA monitoring.</p> <p>Noted. The text can refer to this as an issue.</p>
Countryside Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generic advice provided for SA.</li> <li>• No reference is made to the Peak National Park</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Much of this relates to the wider countryside and is not specific to urban design issues. This will be useful for the wider SA of the developing LDF. Many of the existing key issues and indicators express the Agency's concerns with a specific urban angle.</p> <p>Oldham Borough characterisation will be amended to make reference to the Park National Park.</p>
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the document as written.</li> <li>• An indicator is required to measure the number and type of habitat lost to development. Ponds will not provide a trend/position statement</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The indicators as listed will be expanded subject to the availability of monitoring data. The input of GMEU and Environment Agency to identifying further</p>



	<p>with all species and habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An indicator used for prudent use of natural resources should be land reclaimed to beneficial use for all land uses.</li> <li>• There is a lack of information regarding sustainability issues around climate change. SUDS had not been mentioned.</li> </ul>	<p>indicators and how they will be measured will be welcomed.</p> <p>Noted. This could be expanded subject to suitable data sources being available.</p> <p>Noted. Further climate change references will be considered as appropriate data sets are identified for the urban design focus of this SPD. SUDS is mentioned as an indicator.</p>
--	---	--

## **Appendix 2 – Organisations/stakeholders consulted at each Pre-Draft stages**

### **Reg 17 (b) (i) the names of any persons whom their authority consulted in connection with the preparation of the SPD.**

The following is an indicative list of those that were invited to take part in one or more of the workshops held during the preparation of the SPD(s):

- Officers from various departments within Oldham MBC and Rochdale MBC, including planning, transportation, environmental services, corporate policy, equality and diversity unit, regeneration, community safety, town centre manager, housing strategy and Housing Market Renewal.
- External organisations, such as Countryside Agency, Rochdale Development Agency, English Partnerships, RENEW Northwest, GM Architectural Liaison Unit, English Heritage, Oldham and Rochdale Groundwork Trust, North West Regional Assembly, North West Development Agency, Government Office for the North West, Environment Agency, Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit, English Nature, Greater Manchester Ecology Unit, CABI, and University of Manchester.
- Selected Community Groups, such as Littleborough Civic Trust, Littleborough Historical and Archaeological Society, Pennines Environment Group, Rochdale Environment Working Party, Saddleworth Parish Council, Oldham Access Group, Oldham Civic Trust, and Saddleworth Civic Trust.
- Selected Developers
- Selected Councillors from Oldham MBC and Rochdale MBC

## Appendix 3 – Consultation at Pre-Draft Stages – Comments received and Consultants/Client Team responses.

### FEEDBACK - URBAN DESIGN GUIDE

Consultee	Comment	Response
1. Government Office for the North West (GONW)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific comments, but notes that Guides are Useful and clearly written</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None required</li> </ul>
2. Oldham MBC – Derker Programme	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The opening statements were O.K</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction is difficult to read in terms of layout and colour</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Layout of introduction amended</li> </ul>
3. Home Builders Federation	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The urban design principles identified in this guide are generally supported</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The photographs and diagrams are useful however it is important they are not over complicated</li> <li>Local examples of good practice could be made available from house builders that work in the area</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The guide included a lot of text, so a summary, or checklist of issues may be useful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would welcome examples of good practice. However – despite requests – few examples have been forthcoming from consultees.</li> <li>Concerned that a ‘checklist’ approach would mean that (i) people would not read the body of the document; and (ii) good design may be considered as a series of boxes to be ticked where, in fact, it is more complicated than that.</li> </ul>
4. Gleeson Regeneration	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attractive Layout, horrible colour combination</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Easy to use and useful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is the only comment received on colour combination, so have not changed it</li> </ul>

5. Rochdale Development Agency	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fairly generic, with a lack of reference to specific qualities of Oldham &amp; Rochdale</li> <li>It needs to be made clear how the SPD relates to both 'higher' and 'lower' level documents, e.g. UDPs and development briefs</li> <li>There is repetition between the documents, and its unclear as to whom the documents are aimed.</li> <li>It may be worth condensing the design principles into one small 'quick reference' booklet</li> <li>The emphasis of all the documents is very much on the residential development, and neglects the issue of town centre developments, of which there is a significant amount in Rochdale</li> <li>The canal-side development is also neglected.</li> <li>The chapters on sustainability contain a significant amount of repetition, and it may be useful to combine the chapters</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 11/12, it may be useful to have pictures of Oldham and Rochdale to illustrate these points rather than 'generic' ones</li> <li>Page 16, a photograph of Middleton bus station could be used to illustrate the point in the section</li> <li>Page 24, a photograph of Globe House in Rochdale could be used to illustrate this point</li> <li>It may be less confusing if the document was portrait in format</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tried to include more photos of Oldham and Rochdale in revised documents</li> <li>The relationship between the SPD and relevant UDP policies is explained and has been further clarified.</li> <li>There is inevitably some repetition as it is intended that each document is largely free standing and aimed at housing developers, those who are involved in the design of the public realm. They are topic based and it is clear to all what the focus of each is. The 'Guide to Good Practice' document explains how these and UDP policies should be used to identify design issues.</li> <li>The Design Principles should apply to all developments and the Public Realm Guide will be relevant to town centre schemes. The consultation with stakeholders clearly identified that detailed guidance on Residential Development and Public Realm were the priorities.</li> <li>Explanation as to why principles may seem quite general included</li> <li>Introduction amended to make it clearer who should be using the documents</li> <li>Additional references to canals inserted, and photos of more non-residential uses included;</li> <li>Believe that it is important to emphasise that sustainability should apply to layout as well as to buildings themselves, so have retained two sections.</li> <li>Quick reference booklet may be an interesting idea – to be explored.</li> <li>Where good quality photos have been supplied, these have been added into the document</li> <li>Residential guide has been amended to portrait format so that landscape vs. portrait debate can be had during statutory consultation</li> </ul>
6. Great Places Housing Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments made on Urban Design Guide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None required</li> </ul>
7. Oldham MBC – Cllr Roger Hindle	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None required</li> </ul>

	<p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good</li> </ul>	
8. Artisan	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principles are set out effectively and clearly explained</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the photos are too small and lose their impact</li> <li>• Showing good and bad examples is very useful</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The format is very user friendly, and it benefits from being part of a series rather than one large document with sub-sections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have not changed photo sizes but have lightened them / sorted out printing problem (where they appeared to dark) to make them more readable</li> </ul>
9. Oldham MBC Strategy and & Resources Directorate	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive in scope, accessible and engaging</li> <li>• The BRE Eco-homes standard covers far more than purely buildings and should therefore be referenced in the UDG document</li> <li>• No reference has been made to the need to consider district heating schemes and how schemes can be fuelled (e.g. gas or biomass fuelled CHP)</li> <li>• Appendix A of part 7b needs to reference Oldham Borough's forthcoming Renewables SPD (March 2007)</li> <li>• Adaptation to Climate Change is a significant issue within Urban Design, and is not explicitly referenced; it should be included where reference is made to SUDS rainwater recovery systems, flood plain issues, projected increases in solar gain/need for additional cooling etc</li> <li>• Reference should be made to the existence of the Renewable SPD. Within the UDG Principles section 7, 7a, 7b, it might be more appropriate to detail the specific NR3.3 RUDP Policy wording, that the 10% is a requirement above developments of 10 residential units and 1000m2 in Oldham.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to EcoHomes introduced</li> <li>• Ref to fuelling district heating included</li> <li>• Appendix A limited to UDPs, so do not plan to start to introduce reference to SPDs</li> <li>• Not providing detailed wording of other policies (as appendix would get very long), so have not introduced it for this one</li> <li>▪ Further detail has been included on sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency all of which is intended to combat climate change. Further explanatory text would introduce unnecessary detail.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oldham image on page 31, showing pavement materials that relate to the character of the area, note that the paving in the images has since been removed and replaced with tarmac</li> <li>• Under the general principle of 'poor designs are unacceptable', how will such designs be assessed against this good/best practice?</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design standards of the documents are excellent</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The hierarchy of documents is not clear on initial readings; this could be clarified through text/graphic design.</li> <li>• The purpose of each document and relevant audience needs to be made explicit</li> <li>• Could these documents be combined to form a single urban design guide with overview/summary (UDG) and detail (RDG &amp; PRDG) with Design and Planning Process Guide as an appendix? To avoid duplication, and reduce confusion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unable to identify image in this guide (and other documents checked) – so uncertain to which image this relates.</li> <li>• Designs will be assessed against the design principles contained within the Guide by planning officers. The nature of design assessment will mean that the assessment will not just be whether or not a design meets the requirements of a principle, but also how well the design meets a principles and – where there are tensions between different requirements – how the design balances these</li> <li>• Graphic showing hierarchy introduced to all four documents</li> <li>• Introduction revised to make purpose clearer</li> <li>• There are mixed views on whether one larger design guide would be preferable to three smaller guides. We will await the results of consultation on the drafts before considering this further.</li> </ul>
10. Sustainability Northwest	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 2 needs to mention the importance of ensuring the street lighting is as energy efficient as possible</li> <li>• Section 4 should note that waiting areas should be provided which are considered safe and out of the weather</li> <li>• Having two sections – 7 (sustainability) and 9 (Good Sustainable Buildings) may be confusing due to overlapping, so these could be combined and also make mention of the 'Building for Life' standard</li> <li>• Section 7a could add that proposals should ensure there is a high efficiency through incorporating elements such as high thermal mass wall materials, green roofs etc, and that EcoHomes should meet the 'very good' standard</li> <li>• Section 7b could mention; renewable energy technologies, and that developments should be flexible to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ref. to energy efficient lighting included</li> <li>• Ref. to waiting areas included</li> <li>• See comments above regarding separate sections for layout and buildings</li> <li>• EcoHomes 'very good' introduced. Other proposals too specific for this overall guide. Resi guide has more detail on this.</li> <li>• Flexibility reference included</li> <li>• Water recycling, flooding included</li> <li>• Ref. to native species included</li> </ul>

	<p>allow the future implementation of renewable energy technologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7c should mention grey water recycling, and measures to reduce the risk of flooding</li> <li>• Section 7e should recommend the use of native species in planting, and no mention is made of ensuring the most effective and efficient use of land</li> <li>• Section 8f should include the idea of using paving and surfacing materials that are reclaimed and recycled (locally if possible)</li> <li>• Section 9b should recommend that as many construction materials as possible should be A-rated (BRE Green Guide), and timber should be from sustainable sources</li> <li>• Section 9g, it is important to make clear that materials with high environmental performance can also be of good quality</li> <li>• It may be useful to raise the issue of the sustainability performance of developers themselves; do they have an environmental management systems, what measures do they take to reduce their construction waste etc?</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reclaimed / recycled materials included</li> <li>• Construction materials amended</li> <li>• Outside of the scope of this guide, which focuses more on physical design</li> </ul>
11. David Mycock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments provided on Urban Design Guide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>
12. The Impact Partnership	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The legal weighting of these documents needs to be clarified</li> <li>• A fundamental requirement on all road design is that it is safe for purpose. This is a legal responsibility on all parties to the design. To ensure this occurs we require all road improvements to be safety audited by the Highway Authorities safety auditor. Please ensure this requirement appears in all four guides.</li> <li>• The two Councils have adopted a requirement for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relationship between the SPD and relevant UDP policies is explained and has been further clarified. SPD status to be debated</li> <li>• Reference to requirement for road safety audit introduced into Residential, Public Realm and Process Guides</li> </ul>

	<p>walking and cycling audits on all schemes. There is also the need to consult with disabled groups over the designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At no point in any document is the Local transport Plan mentioned which is a statutory document and carries the same weight as the UDP.</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed points that should follow on from requirements for connected places, creating pedestrian friendly environments and consultation, so not included in guides.</li> <li>LTP not mentioned – SPD intended to supplement policy in LDS</li> </ul>
13. Oldham Environment Partnership	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The documents lack Oldham/Rochdale specific issues, such as supporting community cohesion or raising the image of the Boroughs and their industrial heritage</li> <li>Page iv paragraph 2, refers to providing a greater sense of involvement in the planning and development processes, yet there is only reference in the documents to consultation after the design stage, therefore where can the public feel they have influenced the design from this?</li> <li>1b Character: Who will decide which the unattractive or inappropriate buildings are?</li> <li>2. Safety and inclusion: The need for good lighting must be balanced against energy needs and light pollution</li> <li>3b Diversity: Pictures in the documents do not show a diverse community either in age or race</li> <li>4. Ease of movement: Generally an excellent section.</li> <li>7. Sustainability: Should this not be higher up the list?</li> <li>7d Waste: Perhaps its needed to set out the space needed for all our various recycle bins etc. Should it be specified that developments over a certain size should have their own recycling centres?</li> <li>7e bio-diversity: Needs to reference the incorporation of native plants and trees as food for birds, insects etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a limit to the extent to which a design guide can raise these issues although the design principles will help to address them. Other documents and heritage assessments for certain areas will be used to identify potential for image improvement and features of interest and used when considering design and planning applications.</li> <li>Introduction changed to included text related to raising the image.</li> <li>References to consultation (especially in Process Guide) amended to make clear that it should happen during the design process and not just after</li> <li>1b: developers and the LPA will need to agree this together as part of the design and planning application process</li> <li>Lighting – text amended</li> <li>Diversity – HMR asked to supply pictures that better reflect the local area</li> <li>List derived from consultation, and other principles considered more important</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 Good sustainable buildings: Excellent</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attractively presented in simple English with a logical structure</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7d – too specific for this guide</li> <li>Ref. to native plants included</li> </ul>
14. Rochdale MBC – Roger Ellis	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Taken together all four guides are very long - if the intended users have to plough through all the material to find the detail, they may be discouraged and not bother. So, some way of summarising the main points, meaningfully and not blandly, and signposting detail would help.</li> <li>Could be an "Anytown" guide to design. More content on specific local forms of design (good and bad); some commentary on local vernacular styles of architecture and local materials needed. The Borough Renaissance Masterplan and Gateways and Corridors Strategy seem to have been overlooked</li> <li>"easy maintenance" should be one of the key design principles; designers should not only think about "easy maintenance" as one of their key considerations in the design process but also actively involve the agencies responsible for maintenance at an early stage - a point which the Guide to Good Practice could make</li> <li>Page 10 - the guide doesn't fully explain the assertion that "diverse environments support social cohesion and understanding."</li> <li>Pages 11 and 12 are among the most vague and bland parts of the documents</li> <li>Page 16, 4b says developments "should ensure... local and corner shops within 400 metres." What if those aren't viable?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See concerns about summary / tick box above</li> <li>More local examples introduced</li> <li>Borough Masterplan and Gateways and Corridors Study have informed the guides</li> <li>Principles are derived from three sources (consultation, urban design best practice and analysis of the local area). Maintenance – whilst a concern – is not considered a principle of making good places in its own right: it is a process that supports places that have already been designed using the nine principles. However, now included as a principle.</li> <li>The role of diversity in supporting social cohesion by reflecting specific local needs is explained under principles 3a, 3b and 3c.</li> <li>Reference to including agencies involved in future maintenance in the design process added</li> <li>Pages 11 and 12 reworded to make them more specific and easier to read</li> <li>4b amended to be more general about facilities within walking distance</li> <li>6a amended to address this point</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 23 - 6a requires principal roads to be "designed to ensure" that they are "capable of accommodating increases or decreases in the demand" for use. What does that imply in practice? Is there a danger that this could encourage the design of excessive capacity at new junctions. How does the guide expect the five points in 6a to be balanced and prioritised? What is most important?</li> <li>Page 27 - 7b - why at least 10%? Why not more or less?</li> <li>Page 39 - 9c - this would be a good place to give some specific local examples.</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The layout and appearance of the documents is good and clear, although most of the pictures are rather dark and small and therefore difficult to read. The relationship between text and pictures on each page isn't always clear and it may be better to refer in the text to photos which illustrate the points being made</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a lot of jargon which makes it hard to follow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10% derived from OMBC planning policy</li> <li>Agree: however do not currently have suitable images – suggest that this is addressed during / following statutory consultation period.</li> <li>Problem of dark images addressed (see above) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will be examined and improvements made.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Have amended text to make it easier to understand where possible.</li> </ul>
15. Oldham MBC Community Safety Unit	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2a Include reference to avoiding segregation of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles; routes should be as straight and wide as possible; avoid underpasses, subways, footbridges etc</li> <li>2C development should be influenced by 'Secured By Design' standards</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good appearance with a pleasing balance of text and illustration making for easier reading</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text amended</li> </ul>

## FEEDBACK – DESIGN & PLANNING PROCESS: GUIDE TO GOOD PRACTICE

Consultee	Comment	Response
1. GONW	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question the need for 'Guide to Good Practice' to be produced as an SPD, rather than as part of the LDF</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Useful and clearly written</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status to be discussed.</li> </ul>
2. Oldham MBC – Derker Programme	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject matter very dry</li> <li>Page 5 – Key Messages are good</li> <li>Page 11 – what does topography mean?</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maps on pages 34/35 are very small, and people will struggle to read them</li> <li>Headings at the top of the pages are not necessary – detailing the subject matter</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Book is a good size</li> <li>Text could be bigger for the a visual impairment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The content is intended to provide a procedural tool and has been broken up into discreet sections and illustrated to make it easy to use.</li> <li>Feel that text following topography ('Does the site slope?' explains this)</li> <li>Intended as an overall example of a page layout, rather than encouraging people to read the plans – so no change</li> <li>Headings retained to aid navigation</li> </ul> <p>Text size consistent for all four documents. Retained at this stage, although issue needs to be discussed with client team</p>
3. Home Builders Federation	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would be appropriate to update page 17 referring to PPG3, but not draft PPS3</li> <li>Welcome the inclusion of the Design Statement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended to refer to PPS3</li> </ul>

	<p>section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Checklist in section 8 will be very useful to developer, house builders etc.</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The photographs and diagrams are useful however it is important they are not over complicated</li> <li>Any local examples of good practice could be made available from house builders that work in the area</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It needs to be made clear what weight these guides will be given when deciding planning applications. It also needs to be demonstrated that the usefulness and implementation of the guidance will be monitored and reviewed as appropriate</li> <li>The users of this guide need to be clearly identified in the introduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>Noted</li> <li>Would welcome examples of good practice. However – despite requests – few examples have been forthcoming from consultees.</li> <li></li> <li>Users already identified in introduction</li> </ul>
4. Gleeson Regeneration	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Easy to use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No action required</li> </ul>
5. Rochdale Development Agency	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 15 should refer to flooding as a 'key technical issue' (of particular reference to ECR sites)</li> <li>Page 17 should be DCLG not ODPM</li> <li>Page 36, the planning process checklist is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flooding included</li> <li>DCLG included</li> <li>Planning process kept simple – however, to be reviewed following statutory consultation</li> </ul>

	<p>limited, RMBC have their own checklist which is far more comprehensive</p> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	
6. Great Places Housing Association	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent guide, that steers you through the process well and avoid a lot of planning jargon and technical references</li> <li>Clarification as to whether the design principles on page 19 are of a typical scheme? If so, it should say, otherwise one would think it applies to all schemes.</li> <li>Should make reference to CABE's publication "Design and Access Statements – how to write, read and use them"?</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good size, overall very good</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification provided that principles are for imaginary scheme</li> <li>Reference made to CABE's Design and Access Statements document</li> </ul>
7. Oldham MBC – Councillor Roger Hindle	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No action required</li> </ul>

8. Artisan	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This document is of more use to the non-professional, as Architects would be expected to follow this process as a matter of course</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some photos are too small</li> <li>The use of bullet points is clear and useful</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The pocket size format makes it very user friendly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No action taken – size of document limits size of photos, and most are only providing a ‘flavour’ of the point rather than trying to illustrate something specific</li> </ul>
9. Oldham MBC Strategy and Resources Directorate	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comprehensive in scope, accessible and engaging</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design standards of the documents are excellent</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The hierarchy of documents is not clear on initial readings; this could be clarified through text/graphic design.</li> <li>The purpose of each document and relevant audience needs to be made explicit</li> <li>Could these documents be combined to form a single urban design guide with overview/summary (UDG) and detail (RDG &amp; PRDG) with Design and Planning Process Guide as an appendix? To avoid duplication, and reduce confusion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comments on consultee 9 above</li> <li>Points covered above</li> </ul>
10. Sustainability Northwest	<p><u>Content:</u></p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 15 should mention the issue of good cycle routes under 'transport', and the use of SUDS under 'drainage'</li> <li>• Section 4 should ensure that sustainability criteria are included within the development brief, e.g. meeting EcoHomes 'Very Good' , and requirements could be incentivised</li> <li>• Section 6 – Would a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) be needed in certain instances?</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle routes included</li> <li>• Flooding / SUDs included</li> <li>• Sustainability included in Briefing process</li> <li>• Guide makes clear it does not deal with EIA – same goes for SEA</li> </ul>
11. David Mycock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments provided on Process Guide</li> </ul>	
12. The Impact Partnership	<p><u>i) Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The legal weighting of these documents needs to be clarified</li> <li>• A fundamental requirement on all road design is that it is safe for purpose. This is a legal responsibility on all parties to the design. To ensure this occurs we require all road improvements to be safety audited by the Highway Authorities safety auditor. Please ensure this requirement appears in all four guides.</li> <li>• The two Councils have adopted a requirement for walking and cycling audits on all schemes. There is also the need to consult with disabled groups over the designs.</li> <li>• At no point in any document is the Local transport Plan mentioned which is a statutory document and carries the same weight as the UDP.</li> <li>• Page 15 has no mention of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the need to ensure that we enhance road safety in the locality</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response above.</li> <li>• Reference to requirement for road safety audit introduced into Residential, Public Realm and Process Guides</li> <li>• Detailed points that should follow on from requirements for connected places, creating pedestrian friendly environments and consultation, so not included in guides.</li> <li>• LTP not mentioned – SPD intended to supplement policy in LDS</li> <li>• References added</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reviewing the existing recorded injury accident record in the area and how the development may improve or make this worse</li> <li>- walking and cycling access and links to facilities and transport</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 24 has no mention of consulting the local highway authority or in some instances the highways agency if near the motorways or Oldham Broadway</li> <li>• Page 28, great mention is made of the need for an EA no mention is made of the need for a Transport assessment and that this may need a considerable time to undertake prior to application. A meeting with the highway authority to agree the scope of the study prior to commissioning work is strongly advised to avoid the application being refused in an inadequate TA.</li> <li>• Page 36 – should there be a checklist EIA and TA?</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference introduced to consulting highway authority</li> <li>• Reference already made to a TA – but now strengthened in relation to ES</li> <li>• Checklist amended</li> </ul>
13. Oldham Environment Partnership	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where is the early involvement of the community? Consultation after the design stage means, the planners are reluctant to reassess initial assumptions and the community feel they are being offered a fait accompli. It would be much better to have some involvement at the concept phase where the local community can spell out their hopes and particular needs.</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attractively presented in simple English with a logical structure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation process text amended to include reference to consultation during design process and not just after</li> </ul>



	<u>Usability:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	
14. Rochdale MBC – Roger Ellis	<u>Content:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific comments about Process Guide</li> </ul> <u>Appearance:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The layout and appearance of the documents is good and clear, although most of the pictures are rather dark and small and therefore difficult to read.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree, the quality of photographs and the printing process will be addressed.</li> </ul>
15. Oldham MBC Community Safety Unit	<u>Content:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction should include references to sustainable communities</li> <li>Reference should be made to secured by Design</li> <li>The Guide should acknowledge the Crime and Disorder Act</li> </ul> <u>Appearance:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good appearance with a pleasing balance of text and illustration making for easier reading</li> </ul> <u>Usability:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will be a very useful practical tool with some fine adjustment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These issues not relevant to this guide and are covered elsewhere</li> </ul>

## Feedback – Residential Design Guide

Consultee	Comment	Response
1, GONW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comments on Residential Guide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No action required</li> </ul>
2. Oldham MBC – Derker Programme	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is repetition between this guide (Section 4) and the PRDG</li> <li>It would be useful to include some statistics of people interviewed regarding HomeZone, such as age groups, to indicate how the decision was made to transform an area to HomeZone</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good combination of text, photos and diagrams to provide examples of both good and bad practice</li> <li>Some photos are dark making it difficult to visualise the point s they are making, repetitive photos for each guide would be better with different examples</li> <li>Some jumbled layouts and poor use of graphic text colours</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complicated English and graphics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guides need to stand alone, so repetition remains</li> <li>Statistics would be rather too detailed for this guide.</li> <li>Dark photos addressed</li> <li>Colour of caption text changed from pale blue to black</li> <li>Have tried to simplify language where possible</li> </ul>
3. Home Builders Federation	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Repetition between the public realm section in this document and the stand alone public realm document, could be referenced instead</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The photographs and diagrams are useful however it is important they are not over</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guides need to stand alone, so repetition remains</li> <li>Would welcome examples of good practice. However – despite requests – few examples have been forthcoming from consultees.</li> </ul>

	<p>complicated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any local examples of good practice could be made available from house builders that work in the area</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It needs to be made clear what weight these guides will be given when deciding planning applications. It also needs to be demonstrated that the usefulness and implementation of the guidance will be monitored and reviewed as appropriate</li> <li>The users of this guide were clearly identified in the introduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. The documents will be kept under review and their implementation will be assessed through Oldham and Rochdale's Annual Monitoring Reports.</li> </ul>
4. Gleeson Regeneration	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Easy to use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No action required</li> </ul>
5. Rochdale Development Agency	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 41, chapter 6, should be the most important but actually receives the least attention, more explanation of the principles would be helpful and the first paragraph should be emphasised</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes made. However, to be looked at in more detail during / after statutory consultation if required.</li> </ul>

<p>6. Great Places Housing Association</p>	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific reference to topography, and a lot of sites in Oldham &amp; Rochdale are steeply sloping</li> <li>• The Didsbury Point example on page 27 shows how parking can be placed in front of a house successfully, yet the text states; "Parking in front of dwellings is discouraged".</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally very good, however some photos seem dark and gloomy</li> <li>• Good mixture of real example and illustrative diagrams</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not sure why the layout is landscape?</li> <li>• Good length – making it more readable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both points addressed</li> <li>• Dark photos addressed</li> <li>• Format changed to portrait to allow debate / comparison during consultation so that final version can be agreed</li> </ul>
<p>7. Oldham MBC – Councillor Roger Hindle</p>	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>
<p>8. Artisan</p>	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable approach but could have included more on materials and the impact of good/bad choices</li> <li>• Repetition throughout the 'suite' of documents, but this is inevitable and does help to emphasise points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action taken</li> </ul>

	<p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good illustrations</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The format is very user friendly, and it benefits from being part of a series rather than one large document with sub-sections</li> </ul>	
9. Oldham MBC Strategy and Resources Directorate	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive in scope, accessible and engaging</li> <li>• The encouragement of all new dwellings to meet eco-homes 'good' standard as a minimum is not stretching enough; this should be set at 'very good'.</li> <li>• No reference has been made to the need to consider district heating schemes and how schemes can be fuelled (e.g. gas or biomass fuelled CHP)</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design standards of the documents are excellent</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The hierarchy of documents is not clear on initial readings; this could be clarified through text/graphic design.</li> <li>• The purpose of each document and relevant audience needs to be made explicit</li> <li>• Could these documents be combined to form a single urban design guide with overview/summary (UDG) and detail (RDG &amp; PRDG) with Design and Planning Process Guide as an appendix? To avoid duplication, and reduce confusion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Very Good' inserted</li> <li>• District heating fuel consideration introduced</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diagram introduced to demonstrate hierarchy</li> <li>• See comments above about stand alone / combined guides</li> </ul>
10. Sustainability Northwest	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4 – Car Parking, should raise the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All three points reflected in amended text</li> </ul>

	<p>issue of reducing car parking available as an incentive to use public transport and other sustainable transport methods, reference could be made to BedZed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4 – Green Spaces, should recommend that native species be used in planting</li> <li>• Section 5 – Sustainable Design, all new dwellings should meet the EcoHomes ‘very good’ rather than just ‘good’; also mention that reducing the demand for energy can be achieved through high levels of insulation and energy efficient lights and appliances; and sustainable lifestyles can be encouraged by providing new home owners with information on the use of environmental features</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	
11. David Mycock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments provided on Residential Guide</li> </ul>	
12. The Impact Partnership	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The legal weighting of these documents needs to be clarified</li> <li>• A fundamental requirement on all road design is that it is safe for purpose. This is a legal responsibility on all parties to the design. To ensure this occurs we require all road improvements to be safety audited by the Highway Authorities safety auditor. Please ensure this requirement appears in all four guides.</li> <li>• The two Councils have adopted a requirement for walking and cycling audits on all schemes. There is also the need to consult with disabled groups over the designs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ See above.</li> <li>• Reference to requirement for road safety audit introduced into Residential, Public Realm and Process Guides</li> <li>• Detailed points that should follow on from requirements for connected places, creating pedestrian friendly environments and consultation, so not included in guides.</li> <li>• LTP not mentioned – SPD intended to supplement policy in LDS</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At no point in any document is the Local transport Plan mentioned which is a statutory document and carries the same weight as the UDP.</li> <li>No comments on appearance and useability</li> </ul>	
13. Oldham Environment Partnership	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The documents cover most of the important issues on environment and sustainability, however they lack Oldham/Rochdale specific issues</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attractively presented in simple English with a logical structure</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have tried to introduce more local examples in photos</li> </ul>
14. Rochdale MBC – Roger Ellis	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The guides are very generalised, apart from a few local examples, mostly in photos, it could be an "Anytown" guide to design.</li> <li>Page 6, it should be stated that the plans on this and following pages are purely hypothetical otherwise it may be confusing</li> <li>Page 21, here (and on page 13 of the public realm guide) it says that 20mph "is the maximum speed that will be permitted." Is that a proposed new policy? If so has it been formally adopted or will it need specific consideration by the authorities?</li> <li>Pages 33 &amp; 34, this is a place where the links between the photos and text need to be improved.</li> <li>There is no reference to density. Isn't that a design issue? I think relatively high densities should be encouraged, not least because this reduces pressure on green field sites and supports the viability of community facilities, such</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have tried to introduce more local examples in photos</li> <li>Have reinforced references to imaginary site</li> <li>20mph – see policy A/9 of adopted Rochdale UDP in relation to residential roads</li> <li>Revised layout may overcome this problem</li> <li>Density reference strengthened, and new page introduced.</li> <li>Darkness of photos addressed, which should help clarity – size remains the same</li> </ul>

	<p>as the corner shops referred-to above and public transport</p> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The layout and appearance of the documents is good and clear, although most of the pictures are rather dark and small and therefore difficult to read. The relationship between text and pictures on each page isn't always clear and it may be better to refer in the text to photos which illustrate the points being made</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a lot of jargon which makes it hard to follow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relationship between text and pictures: revised layout should help</li> <li>Other consultees praise the simple language. Nevertheless, have tried to simplify language where possible</li> </ul>
15. Oldham MBC Community Safety Unit	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rear parking in courtyards should be designed to be secure using changes in paving, road surface, texture, landscape and signage.</li> <li>In curtilage parking is the preferred option whenever possible from a security point of view. Low level shrubs can soften the visual impact.</li> <li>Garages provide the ultimate security.</li> <li>Mews houses are successful in reducing levels of anti-social behaviour. Where they are used, the first floor should overhang by one metre to deter people climbing in.</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good appearance with a pleasing balance of text and illustration making for easier reading</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will be a very useful practical tool with some fine adjustment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security issues relating to rear courtyards already covered in design guide</li> <li>Noted. The guide acknowledges that visual impact can be reduced by low level shrubs</li> <li>Guidance on mews houses rather prescriptive. If they overhang, does that mean that people inside the mews house would not be able to look out of the window to see who was at their front door? Not included.</li> </ul>



## Feedback – Public Realm Design Guide

Response	Comment	
1. GONW	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Useful and clearly written</li> </ul>	
2. Oldham MBC – Derker Programme	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intended audience for the guide is given in the last sentence of the Introduction and the type of multi-disciplinary team referred to is the last paragraph on page 49; perhaps the two could be brought together, expanded, and given greater prominence in the Introduction</li> <li>Page 6 the 'good streets above' then reversing for 'good spaces below' is found confusing</li> <li>Page 12, the sketch 'fit streets between the buildings' is confusing, if a street had been drawn in it would have been clearer</li> <li>The language is confusing; words such as 'pantehnican', 'setts' and 'echelon' should be substituted with their more common forms</li> <li>Page 45/46 - the comparison is confusing; firstly the second layout has wider roads, and isn't clear if that was because of complete demolition. The partial demolition was clear although the after photographs did not match</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The good and bad examples were very helpful illustrations of the text</li> <li>The small blue print around the photos was</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction amended, but may still need to revisit this point</li> <li>Page 6 – amended</li> <li>Page 12 – not amended: taken from Places, Streets and Movement, and difficult to see how to improve it</li> <li>Confusing language simplified</li> <li>45/46 – width marginally wider for one street, other street the same width: to be amended following statutory consultation</li> <li>45/46 – captions to photos added to explain that they are illustrative</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blue captions changes to black</li> <li>Darkness of photos addressed</li> </ul>

	<p>difficult to read</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some photos are dark making it difficult to visualise the points they are making, repetitive photos for each guide would be better with different examples</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	
3. Home Builders Federation	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The photographs and diagrams are useful however it is important they are not over complicated</li> <li>Any local examples of good practice could be made available from house builders that work in the area</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It needs to be made clear what weight these guides will be given when deciding planning applications. It also needs to be demonstrated that the usefulness and implementation of the guidance will be monitored and reviewed as appropriate</li> <li>The users of this guide need to be clearly identified in the introduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. The use of photographs and diagrams will be further examined/improved.</li> <li>See comments above regarding examples of good practice.</li> <li>See earlier response</li> </ul>
4. Gleeson Regeneration	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informative</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well laid out</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Easy to use</li> </ul>	

<p>5. Rochdale Development Agency</p>	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reference to 'street-by-street' basis of street furniture should be removed in favour of co-ordination of street furniture over a wider area in order to achieve the objectives of strong character and ease of maintenance</li> <li>• There is a strong focus on residential development, and its worth noting that a significant amount of change planned for the public realm in Rochdale Borough is planned for town centre areas</li> <li>• Page 27, it may be helpful to revise the 'hierarchy' of roads types as part of the Rochdale Borough gateways and corridors strategy in relation to this page</li> <li>• There is a contradiction between page 28 and 36 in regards to low planting strips</li> <li>• Page 39/40 – the 'furniture zone' section doesn't offer any guidance for what to do when there is a narrower footway, and there is a conflict between the two sets of diagrams on page 40</li> <li>• The reference to DB32 when considering highways issues will be replaced in 2007 by the Manual for Streets, which takes very different views to the DB32, and it would be useful to take account of this change in situation.</li> <li>• There is repetition between this document and the RDG and UDG</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More photographs of Rochdale and Oldham Boroughs would be good</li> <li>• Page 40 – some of these drawings are difficult to read</li> <li>• Page 42, it is difficult to pick out the numbers on the right hand plan</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have been unable to locate this reference – to be amended if it is still there following statutory consultation</li> <li>• More images on non-residential development introduced</li> <li>• Guidance on non-residential car parking expanded</li> <li>• Hierarchy not revised</li> <li>• Contradiction between 28 and 36 removed</li> <li>• 'where possible' added to deal with issue of narrower pavements</li> <li>• References to Manual for Streets introduced</li> <li>• Repetition a necessary evil as documents need to stand alone</li> <li>• More local photos introduced</li> <li>• Numbers clarified</li> </ul>

6. Great Places Housing Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments provided</li> </ul>	
7. Oldham MBC – Councillor Roger Hindle	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good</li> </ul>	
8. Artisan	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The best guide from a content and illustration point of view, the various points are well explained and some of the before and after views, and annotated are very good</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good photos and drawings</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The format is very user friendly, and it benefits from being part of a series rather than one large document with sub-sections</li> </ul>	
9. Oldham MBC Strategy and Resources Directorate	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comprehensive in scope, accessible and engaging</li> <li>Overlaps with pages 19-32 of the RDG in terms of public realm design, at the very least cross-referencing is required.</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design standards of the documents are excellent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed there is some overlap, but the guides are intended to be self contained as far as possible.</li> <li>Diagram on hierarchy introduced</li> </ul>

	<u>Usability:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The hierarchy of documents is not clear on initial readings; this could be clarified through text/graphic design.</li> <li>The purpose of each document and relevant audience needs to be made explicit</li> <li>Could these documents be combined to form a single urban design guide with overview/summary (UDG) and detail (RDG &amp; PRDG) with Design and Planning Process Guide as an appendix? To avoid duplication, and reduce confusion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comments above regarding combined / separate documents</li> </ul>
10. Sustainability Northwest	<u>Content:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2, could recommend the use of recycled and reclaimed materials and/or materials of low environmental impact</li> <li>Section 3, could mention the use of native species</li> </ul> <u>Appearance:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul> <u>Usability:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both points picked up</li> </ul>
11. David Mycock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments provided</li> </ul>	
12. The Impact Partnership	<u>Content:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The legal weighting of these documents needs to be clarified</li> <li>A fundamental requirement on all road design is that it is safe for purpose. This is a legal responsibility on all parties to the design. To ensure this occurs we require all road improvements to be safety audited by the Highway Authorities safety auditor. Please ensure this requirement appears in all four guides.</li> <li>The two Councils have adopted a requirement for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See earlier response.</li> <li>Reference to requirement for road safety audit introduced into Residential, Public Realm and Process Guides</li> <li>Detailed points that should follow on from requirements for connected places, creating pedestrian friendly environments and consultation, so not included in guides.</li> </ul>

	<p>walking and cycling audits on all schemes. There is also the need to consult with disabled groups over the designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At no point in any document is the Local transport Plan mentioned which is a statutory document and carries the same weight as the UDP</li> <li>Page 27 is a very poor plan and misses most of the strategic road network – it either needs completely redrawing or deleting</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LTP not mentioned – SPD intended to supplement policy in LDS</li> <li>Plan deleted</li> </ul>
13. Oldham Environment Partnership	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The documents lack Oldham/Rochdale specific issues, such as supporting community cohesion or raising the image of the Boroughs and their industrial heritage</li> <li>This document is good, in that working with people covers community involvement, but surely this should be at the front</li> <li>There could be a greater emphasis on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protection and restoration of buildings and features cherished by the community</li> <li>Prominent examples of renewable energy projects; wildlife projects; heritage crafts and tradition projects</li> <li>Public spaces where people can gather to hold outdoor meetings, community events, or view giant screens</li> <li>Street, neighbourhood, and locality naming so people can more easily direct strangers and talk about where they live and work.</li> <li>Recreational facilities in the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a limit to the extent to which a design guide can raise these issues although the design principles will help to address them. Other documents and heritage assessments for certain areas will be used to identify potential for image improvement and features of interest and use when considering design and planning applications.</li> <li>More local photos introduced</li> <li>Working with people specifically relates to Home Zones. Putting at the front would be confusing, as the focus of the document should be on the physical design of streets and spaces – although that should, of course, involve consultation.</li> <li>Difficult to insert these detailed points into the current structure of the document – hard to see where they 'belong'.</li> </ul>

	<p>spaces between diverse communities so they can more naturally meet and share experiences</p> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attractively presented in simple English with a logical structure</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u> No Comment</p>	
14. Rochdale MBC – Roger Ellis	<p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The guides are very generalised, apart from a few local examples, mostly in photos, it could be an "Anytown" guide to design.</li> <li>Page 14 has the best reference to maintenance but should have more prominence and should be made explicit in the process guide</li> </ul> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The layout and appearance of the documents is good and clear, although most of the pictures are rather dark and small and therefore difficult to read. The relationship between text and pictures on each page isn't always clear and it may be better to refer in the text to photos which illustrate the points being made</li> </ul> <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More local photos introduced</li> <li>Maintenance strengthened throughout the guides</li> <li>Darkness of photos addressed</li> <li>Agreed. This will be addressed and improvements made.</li> </ul>
15. Oldham MBC Community Safety Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments identical to those for Residential Guide and Urban Design Guide</li> </ul>	Actions as for Residential Guide and Urban Design Guide

#### **Appendix 4 - Specific Consultation Bodies and Government Departments to be consulted on the SPD (s)**

The following bodies are specific consultation bodies and will be consulted by Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004:

- The Regional Planning Body (North West Regional Assembly)
- The Environment Agency
- The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (English Heritage)
- Natural England
- The Highways Agency
- Local Planning Authorities, County Councils or Parish Councils, any part of whose area is in or adjoins the Boroughs
- A Regional Development Agency whose area is in or adjoins the Boroughs
- Any person to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under Section 106 (3) (a) of the Communications Act 2003
- Any person who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the Boroughs
- The Strategic Health Authority
- A person to whom a licence has been granted under the Section 6(1)(b) or (c) of the Electricity Act 1989
- A person to whom a licence has been granted under Section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986
- A sewage undertaker
- A water undertaker

#### **Government Departments**

The **Government Office for the North West** will be consulted by the Councils and will be the first point of contact for consultation with the following Government Departments:

- Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES)
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)
- Department of Trade and Industry (DTI)
- Department for Transport (DfT)
- Home Office

In addition, the Councils will also consult the following Government Departments, where appropriate:

- Department of Health (through Regional Public Health Group)
- Ministry of Defence
- Department of Work and Pensions
- Department of Constitutional Affairs
- Office of Government Commerce (Property Advisers to the Civil Estate)



## **Appendix 5 - General and Other Consultees**

The following bodies are general consultation bodies and will be consulted by Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC, where appropriate, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004:

- Voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the Borough
- Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the Borough
- Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the Borough
- Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the Borough
- Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying out business in the Borough

### **Other Consultees**

Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC will also consult the following agencies and organisations, where appropriate:

- Age Concern
- Airport Operators
- British Chemical Distributors and Traders Association
- British Geological Survey
- British Waterways, canal owners and navigation authorities
- Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
- Chambers of Commerce, local Confederation of British Industry and local branches of Institute of Directors
- Church Commissioners
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Coal Authority
- Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
- Commission for New Towns and English Partnerships
- Commission for Racial Equality
- Crown Estate Office
- Diocesan Board of Finance
- Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee (now part of the Inclusive Environment Group)
- Electricity, Gas and Telecommunications Undertakers, and the National Grid Company
- Environmental groups at national, regional and local level, including:
  - (i) Campaign to Protect Rural England (Lancashire branch only)
  - (ii) Friends of the Earth
  - (iii) Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
  - (iv) Wildlife Trusts
- Equal Opportunities Commission
- Fire and Rescue Services
- Forestry Commission
- Freight Transport Association
- Gypsy Council
- Health and Safety Executive
- Help the Aged
- Housing Corporation

- Learning and Skills Councils
- Local Agenda 21 including:
  - (i) Civic Societies
  - (ii) Community Groups
  - (iii) Local Transport Authorities
  - (iv) Local Transport Operators
  - (v) Local Race Equality Councils and other local equality groups
- National Playing Fields Association
- National Trust
- Network Rail
- Passenger Transport Authorities
- Passenger Transport Executives
- Police Architectural Liaison Officers / Crime Prevention Design Advisors
- Port Operators
- Rail Companies and the Rail Freight Group
- Regional Housing Boards
- Regional Sports Boards
- Road Haulage Association
- Royal Mail Group plc
- Sport England
- The Home Builders Federation
- Traveller Law Reform Coalition
- Water Companies
- Women's National Commission

### **LDF Mailing List**

Oldham MBC and Rochdale MBC will also notify those individuals and organisations on their respective LDF mailing lists that consultation is underway on the draft SPD(s) and accompanying documents.