

**Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council / Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council**

**Schedule of Changes and Responses**

**Supplementary Planning Document on:  
'Urban Design Guide'**

In accordance with Regulation 19 (a)(i) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, this statement sets out a summary of the main issues raised in representations received to the consultation on the 'Urban Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document, and how these have been addressed.

(Comments with reference number ending in SPD relate to the draft SPD, those ending in SA relate to the Sustainability Appraisal, those ending in HRA relate to the Habitat Regulations Assessment.)

	<b>Individual/ Organisation</b>	<b>Reference Number</b>	<b>Comments Received</b>	<b>RMBC/OMBC's Response</b>	<b>Change / Comments</b>
1	The Theatres Trust	OMBC ref: 526/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 1/DG/001	<b>Urban design Guide:</b> Supports page 20 5b. However, any restrictive generic signage policies could weaken theatres ability to advertise on the streetscape and impact on economic viability. Specific guidelines for design of signage connected to theatres in the Boroughs should be included to recognise the unique role of these buildings.	The SPD provides guidance relating to the street scene, not in relation to buildings. It is felt that guidelines for the design of signage connected to the theatres is too specific for the SPD. There are policies contained within the UDP's of Oldham and Rochdale that adequately deal with advertisements, generally and within the context of conservation areas and listed buildings, and that appropriate consideration should be given to their impact on visual amenity, residential amenity, and the appearance of the street scene or landscape.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
2	Home Builders Federation	OMBC ref: 122/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 2/DG/001	(1). <b>Residential Design Guide / Section 5 / pg 38:</b> Supports flexible approach to density based on a number of criteria involving character assessment and accessibility to services, that this document proposes.	Noted.	No change required.
		122/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 2/DG/002	(2). <b>Residential Design Guide / Section 5 / pg 38:</b> Objects to guidance on "lifetime homes". Option should require provision of flexibility, without detailing the need for "lifetime homes."	The reference to 'Lifetime Homes' is used as an example of where practical advice can be sought on how to design flexible buildings.	<p>Amend pg38 of the Residential Design Guide to read: 'Lifetime Homes' gives practical advice on how to design flexible buildings, and developers will be <u>expected to consider adaptability and demonstrate how it has been considered within the Design and Access Statement.</u></p> <p>Measures to promote adaptability <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>incorporating adequate circulation space for wheelchairs within dwellings;</u></li> <li>• <u>ensuring that car parking is capable of being enlarged and is an appropriate distance from the dwelling;</u></li> <li>• incorporating information and communication technology into dwellings; and</li> <li>• designing dwellings so that a home office can be easily provided."</li> </ul>

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		122/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 2/DG/003	(3). <b>Residential Design Guide / pg 40:</b> Page 40: Objects to all new dwellings meeting the Eco Homes "Very Good" standard as a minimum. HBF notes that the Council requires standards to be set by the new code for Sustainable Homes, which is replacing the Eco Homes standards.	The reference to as a "minimum" should be deleted. Paragraph should be amended to refer to Code for Sustainable Homes.	Amend pg 40 - delete 'as a <i>minimum</i> '.  Replace reference to Eco Homes with " <u>Code for Sustainable homes</u> ".

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		122/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 2/DG/004	(4) <b>Design and Planning Process / Section 5:</b> Objects to the expectation for major developments and other developments of community significance to undertake pre- submission community involvement. A more flexible approach to the type of consultation used should be adopted.	Consultation as early as possible with the design and planning process is very important. Encouraging developers to undertake pre-submission community involvement also accords with OMBC's and RMBC's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Oldham Council's SCI states " <i>Where the Council considers a proposal to be of a scale and/or nature that is likely to generate significant levels of public interest, the prospective developer will be encouraged to engage the local community and undertake wide consultation. The developer will be expected to submit a statement outlining the extent of the consultation completed with the planning application, and explain how the feedback from the consultation process has influenced the submitted scheme</i> ". Rochdale Council's SCI states " <i>For significant development proposals, the Council would encourage applicants to consult with the local community before submitting their application</i> "	No change required.
		122/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 2/DG/005	<b>Design and Planning Process / Section 5:</b> Reference should be made to house builders/ developers/ landowners/ planning and estate agents, when determining who to consult.	Section 5 provides an indication of who may be consulted when designing and planning for development proposals. It is not prescriptive and the process/level of consultation will vary according to the nature of the project.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
3	Government Office North West	OMBC ref: 045/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 3/DG/001	(1) <b>General:</b> Support the principles set out in the guidance. The documents helpfully include appendices, which set out the various parent policies to which the individual principles in the SPD relate. It is noted however that there are some gaps where it appears that there are no policy linkages.	Planning Policy Sources to be amended to ensure that all necessary policy linkages are identified.	<p>Amend planning policy sources in the Urban Design Guide to include:</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 5a – Insert '<u>Design Criteria for New Development: Policy BE/2</u>'.</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 5c – Insert '<u>Design Criteria for New Development: Policy BE/2</u>'.</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 6a – Insert '<u>Physical Regeneration: Policy G/R/1</u>'.</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 6b – Insert '<u>Design Quality: Policy G/BE/1</u>' and '<u>Design Criteria for New Development: Policy BE/2</u>'.</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 8b – Insert '<u>Design Criteria for New Development: Policy BE/2</u>'.</p> <p>Amend planning policy sources in Public Realm Design Guide to include:</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 'adaptability': Insert '<u>Accessibility: Policy G/A/1</u>'.</p>

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		045/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 3/DG/002	(2) <b>General:</b> With regard to design principle 7b the Council (RMBC) may also be able to rely upon the guidance in the PPS on Planning and Climate Change once the final version is published assuming that it continues to take the line that LPA's should require a standard of 10% renewable energy provision.	Planning Policy Sources to be amended to ensure that all necessary policy linkages are identified.	Amend planning policy sources in the Urban Design Guide to include:  (2) Right hand column relating to 7b – Insert (in italics) the following: " <u>Rochdale Council will have regard to the draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning and Climate Change Supplement to PPS1 and will seek , where feasible and appropriate, development proposals to be designed to provide 10% of their total predicted energy requirements on site from renewable resources. Should the final PPS: Planning and Climate Change Supplement to PPS1 require a percentage of predicted energy requirements for new developments to be produced on site from renewable resources, the Council will then have regard to that requirement in considering new developments.</u> "
4	Natural England	OMBC ref: 002/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 4/DG/001	(1) <b>General:</b> Welcome references to local character, topography, landscape and other features; the desire to retain existing natural and landscape features and to safeguard areas of ecological and landscape value; and the section on Design and Access Statements.	Noted.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		002/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 4/DG/002	(2) <b>General:</b> Would welcome reference to the submission of protected species surveys with applications for development where appropriate.	There are a variety of surveys/documents that may need to be submitted as part of a planning application. The SPD(s) just provides an example of what may need to be submitted. Applicants are advised to contact Development Control as the exact requirement will depend upon the particular circumstances of the site and type of development proposed.	Add sentence to pg 25 of Design and Planning Process Guide to read: " <u>Applicants may also be required to submit other documents with their applications, such as flood risk assessments and contaminated land surveys, depending on the circumstances. Planning authorities can advise on what is likely to be required.</u> "
		002/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ewf: 4/DG/003	(3) <b>Public Realm Guide:</b> Support sections concerning sustainability, green spaces and biodiversity in the Public Realm document but would appreciate reference to protected species too.	Reference should be made in pg 25 of the Public Realm Design Guide to refer to the protection of habitats as well as the creation of new. The Oldham UDP and Rochdale UDP also include detailed policies to deal with protected species.	Amend 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet point on pg 25 of Public Realm Design Guide to refer to " <u>protecting existing and creating new habitats for wildlife</u> ".
		002/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 4/DG/004	(4) <b>Habitat Regulations Assessment:</b> Satisfied with the Habitat Regulations Assessment.	Noted.	No change required.
5	North West Regional Assembly	OMBC ref: 001/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 5/DG/001	(1) <b>General:</b> RPG13 forms an integral part of the development plan and should be given due consideration in the production of the SPD and accompanying SA. Due consideration should also be given to draft RSS.	Noted. The SPD provides further guidance on the implementation of policies within the UDP, which are in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West. Due consideration has also been given to the draft RSS during the preparation of the SPD.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		001/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 5/DG/002	(2) <b>General:</b> May find the North West Best Practice Design Guide a useful document as it provides guidance on areas that the SPD may consider such as Design and Security, EcoHomes, Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy, Sustainable Drainage and Modern Methods of Construction.	Reference to be made to the North West Best Practice Guidance where appropriate within the SPD and the appendices.	Include references to "North West Best Practice Design Guide" as follows: - pg 54 of the Urban Design Guide - pg 52 of the Public Realm Design Guide - bottom left hand corner of pg 10 of the Residential Design Guide - pg 48/49 of the Residential Design Guide.
		001/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 5/DG/003	(3) <b>General:</b> The SPD may also consider including more detailed guidance on subjects such as incorporation of bin and recycling facilities and cycle storage.	Additional references should be made emphasising the importance of designing-in quality bin and recycling facilities and cycle storage as part of all development where appropriate.	Amend the Urban Design Guide as follows: - Pg 16/4c/6 <sup>th</sup> bullet point – "secure <u>and convenient</u> cycle parking".  Amend Pg 39 of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Reword the first bullet point to read "bin and <u>recycling</u> facilities".  Add headline – " <u>Bicycle storage: It is important to ensure that storage facilities are secure and also conveniently located for the use of residents.</u> "
6	National Trust	OMBC ref: 116/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/001	(1) <b>General:</b> SPD welcomed. Advice that helps the understanding of design issues and how to address them is encouraged.	Noted.	No change required.



	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		116/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/002	<p>(2) <b>General:</b> Not convinced about value of individual documents as there is duplication between them. For example, in respect of sustainable construction and the approach to reducing energy needs/renewables, is a separate section 9 necessary, or would it make sense to amalgamate it with section 7? Equally this is then touched upon briefly in the Residential Design Guide but without cross-reference to the Urban Design Guide; there are some matters such as orientation that are especially relevant.</p> <p>Overall it is considered that some rationalisation of text between the documents together with more cross-referencing would be helpful.</p>	The documents have been prepared so that they can be read in their entirety. It is agreed that more cross-references should be added where appropriate to enable the reader to navigate more easily within and between the documents. Those elements within section 9 that relate to sustainable buildings should be relocated to section 7 and section 9 renamed.	<p>Amend Urban Design Guide as follows:</p> <p>Remove 9a and 9b from Chapter 9 and insert into Chapter 7. Amend title of Chapter 9 (and related principle) accordingly – “Well-designed buildings”</p> <p>Amend pg 40 of the Residential Design Guide under “Providing Energy in Sustainable Ways” to read “<u>Where feasible and appropriate 10% of the total predicated energy requirements of new developments should be provided on-site from renewable resources. These measures should not have an adverse impact on amenity and townscape character and could include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Solar panels for pre-heating water;</li> <li>- photovoltaics;</li> <li>- wind;</li> <li>- micro CHP (combined heat and power).”</li> </ul>
		116/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/003	<p>(3) <b>General:</b> Planning policy sources/glossary and references are duplicated. Once is sufficient.</p>	The documents have been prepared so that they can be read in their entirety.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		116/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/004	(4) <b>General:</b> Planning policy sources should acknowledge role of RSS as part of the Development Plan.	Pg14 of the Design and Planning Process document acknowledges the role of regional planning guidance and states that developments is expected to conform with regional planning policy.	No change required.
		116/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/005	(5) <b>General:</b> Reference should be made in the planning policy sources section to Oldham MBC UDP policy C1.13, which relates to Historic Parks and Gardens, and Rochdale MBC's equivalent policy.	Oldham MBC UDP policy C1.13 relates to the protection of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The policy identifies three such parks and states that planning permission will not be granted for development, which would lead to the loss of, or cause harm to, the historic character or setting of any part of a designated historic park or garden. The policy specifically relates to development affecting historic parks and gardens and it is not considered to be necessary to cross-refer to it within the SPD. Policy BE/19 of Rochdale's UDP states that development proposals which would result in the loss of, or cause harm to the historic character, structure or setting of any part of a designated historic park or garden will not be permitted.	No change required.
		116/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/006	(6) <b>General:</b> It would be sensible to note the role of PPS's/PPG's.	This has been done on page 15 of the Design and Planning Process Guide.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		116/UDG/007/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/007	<b>(7) Urban Design Guide / pg 3 / 1a/4<sup>th</sup> bullet point:</b> Wider landscape context will be an important consideration, particularly for developments on the fringe of an urban area. Reference should be made to the role of Landscape Character Assessment, in accordance with advice in PPS7.	The fourth bullet point reads:  "All new development should relate positively to the topography, landscape and other features (such as canals) of the wider area, and respond positively to views towards the site."  As part of the preparation work for the Local Development Framework, the Oldham MBC will be reviewing its evidence base insofar as it relates to landscape character assessment.	No change required.
		116/UDG/008/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/008	<b>(8) Urban Design Guide / pg 3 / 1a/5<sup>th</sup> bullet point:</b> Only partially considers designated features of the historic environment. The wider setting of Registered Parks and Gardens will also be an important consideration.	1a to be amended to refer to heritage buildings and spaces to take into account the wider setting of Registered Parks and Gardens as well as other spaces of historic significance.	Amend Fifth bullet point of 1a on pg 3: add " <u>and spaces</u> " after "heritage buildings".
		116/UDG/009/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/009	<b>(9) Urban Design Guide / pg 19 / 5a:</b> The two line drawing (or their captions) have been transposed.	Drawings on page 19 to be amended as captions do not relate to the correct drawing.	Amend pg 19: transpose line drawings.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		116/UDG/010/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/010	<b>(10) Urban Design Guide / pg 27 / 7a:</b> Section is particularly useful and supported however in addressing causes of climate change the most important consideration is to reduce energy use. Last bullet point should be moved to beginning.	Final bullet point to be moved to second place within the list.	Amend pg 27 / 7a: move final bullet point to second place in list.
		116/UDG/011/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/011	<b>(11) Urban Design Guide / pg 31 / 8a:</b> Headline statement is agreed, however, the bullet points should be supplemented to make reference to the need to consider heritage features and the benefits these bring in providing a locally distinctive context to lead new development.	References to the need to consider heritage features and their role in providing a locally distinctive context are made elsewhere in the SPD(s) (e.g. 1a and 1b). As such it is not felt to be appropriate to specifically refer to heritage features in 8a.	No change required.
		116/UDG/012/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/012	<b>(12) Urban Design Guide / pg 39:</b> Headline bullet points lack reference to context or the wider setting within which a site sits.	Throughout the SPD the importance of responding to local character and context is emphasised, indeed within section 9 (pg 39) reference is made to the need to ensure new development responds positively to it's context and that careful consideration should be given to, amongst others, character.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		116/UDG/013/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/013	<b>(13) Residential Design Guide / pg 8:</b> There is some duplication between this section and 1a of the Urban Design Guide. If it is to be retained it should consider the wider landscape character context of a site. Particular consideration should be given to heritage and potential impacts upon the settings of designated features.	The Residential Design Guide builds upon the principles set out within the Urban Design Guide. It is agreed that consideration should be given to the wider landscape character context of the site, however, it is considered that such references would be best placed in pg4 and 6 of the Residential Design Guide as they relate to understanding the wider context.	Amend documents as follow: Pg4 – under Character of the Context add bullet point " <u>wider landscape character</u> ".  Pg6 – Add heading " <u>Wider landscape context</u> ", under which add the following: " <u>Consideration should be given as to how the development sits in the wider landscape context of the area, so that it respects this character and does not look out of place.</u> "
		116/UDG/014/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/014	<b>(14) Residential Design Guide / pg 23:</b> Advice here is important and endorsed, however, reference to the layout of streets and buildings in order to maximise passive solar gain should be incorporated.	Pg 23 of the Residential Design Guide is concerned with the way in which buildings and spaces work together to create townscape. Reference to the layout of streets and buildings in order to maximise passive solar gain is not felt to be appropriate here. Pg 40 of the Residential Design Guide acknowledges the use of passive solar gain to reduce the demand for energy.	See amendment above relating to pg 40 of the Residential Design Guide (116/UDG/002/SPD).
		116/UDG/015/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/015	<b>(15). Residential Design Guide / pg 31:</b> Landscape should also be considered with regards to landform and quality of views. The main heading on pg 30 should be amended to read "Green Spaces, and Landscape and Biodiversity" and the section heading amended to read "Landscape and Biodiversity".	Pages 30 and 31 of the Residential Design Guide relate to the creation of new green spaces and the positive opportunity to maintain and enhance the ecological value and biodiversity, which will form part of the wider landscape. It is not considered necessary to add "landscape" to the title as requested.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		116/UDG/016/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/016	(16) <b>Residential Design Guide / pg 40:</b> The wording is considered preferable to that on pg 27 of the Urban Design Guide.	The Urban Design Guide sets out the key principles of good design, whilst the Residential Design Guide provides more information on how these principles may be delivered. It is proposed to reorder the bullet points on pg27 of the Residential Design and Guide and also amend the wording on Pg 40 to better reflect the wording of the Urban Design Guide (see 116/UDG/002/SPD).	No change required.
7	Yorkshire Forward	OMBC ref: 043/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 7/DG/001	No comments.	Noted	No change required.
8	Lancashire County Council	OMBC ref: 698/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 8/DG/001	No comments.	Noted	No change required.
9	Failsworth Historical Society	OMBC ref; 665/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 9/DG/001	(1). <b>Urban Design Guide:</b> Supports the layout and presentation. A Glossary of terminology used would be helpful.	A glossary has been provided at the end of each document. This will be reviewed and updated to ensure that explanation is provided of appropriate terminology where appropriate.	Glossary to be reviewed and updated as necessary to ensure that explanation provided of terminology where necessary.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		665/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 9/DG/002	<b>(2). Urban Design Guide:</b> Many of the examples of layout, design etc have been introduced into Oldham Town Centre, it is believed that District Centre/township planning development should pay attention to some of these ideas, along with localised consultation with the public and businesses in the area.	Noted.	No change required.
		665/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref; 9/DG/003	<b>(3). Urban Design Guide:</b> More plain English explanations and less planning jargon would be helpful.	Planning jargon has been kept to a minimum within the document and key terms and phrases have been explained as appropriate within the glossary appended to each document.	No change required.
		665/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 9/DG/004	<b>(4). Design and Planning Process:</b> Supports document, gives a reasonable insight, although in brief, to the differing aspects ensuring a good approach to an end product.	Noted.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		OMBC ref; 665/UDG/005/SA RMBC ref: 9/DG/005	<p><b>Sustainability Appraisal:</b> Request a more clearly defined statement of intent, outcome and reference to Table 2 Baseline Data in relation to the historic environment.</p> <p>Comparisons, targets, trends and issues leave everything to be debated.</p>	<p>Table 2 "Baseline Data" provides factual information regarding the current position, to assist in the identification of issues and indicators for future monitoring.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above it is acknowledged that the issue identified for the historic environment could be made clearer. It is therefore proposed to amend the "Issue" column in Table 2 on pg 58 the Sustainability Appraisal to read "To conserve the Borough's historical assets". Pg 74 will also need be amended to reflect this change.</p>	<p>Amend Table 2 on Pg 58 of the Sustainability Appraisal as follows: Delete "The SPD should ensure that the issues around this finite resource remain stable" and replace with "<u>To conserve the Borough's historical assets.</u>"</p> <p>Amend Pg 74 of the Sustainability Appraisal as follows: Add "<u>To conserve the Borough's historical assets</u>" as a bullet point under the Environmental sub-heading of the Key Issues and Problems section.</p>
		665/UDG/006/SA RMBC ref: 9/DG/006	<p><b>Sustainability Appraisal:</b> Much else seems to follow planning, regeneration and redevelopment patterns satisfactorily.</p>	Noted	No change required.
		665/UDG/007/SA RMBC ref: 9/DG/007	<p><b>Sustainability Appraisal:</b> Indicators relating to the historic environment are considered to be of importance.</p>	Noted	No change required.
		665/UDG/006/SA RMBC ref: 9/DG/008	<p><b>Sustainability Appraisal:</b> Appendix 3 page 83, testing the plan objectives against the sustainability objectives-comments are meaningless as they refer to nothing as a contribution.</p>	The purpose of Appendix 3 to the Sustainability Appraisal is to ensure that there are no conflicts between the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Plan Objectives and that they are consistent with one another.	No change required.



	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		OMBC ref; 665/UDG/007/HRA RMBC ref: 9/DG/009	<b>Habitat Regulation Assessment:</b> Importance should be given to develop dialogue between the waterways authority and OMBC to maximise regeneration along towpaths and canals.	Noted. The HRA was undertaken on behalf of the Councils by the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit.	No change required.
		OMBC ref; 665/UDG/008/EqIA RMBC ref: 9/DG/010	<b>Equality Impact Assessment:</b> Other than the reference in Sustainability Objective A the assessment seems satisfactory.	The sustainability objectives listed in Appendix A are those identified within the Sustainability Appraisal.	No change required.
10	Royton Local History Society	OMBC ref: 666/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 10/DG/001	<b>Urban Design Guide / pg viii:</b> Enhancing identity and sense of place is important in a historic context.	Noted.	No change required.
		666/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 10/DG/002	<b>Urban Design Guide / pg 3 / 1a:</b> Supports recognition that mills are an important part of the character.  Supports acknowledgement that context is important in terms of historic qualities of an area.	Noted	No change required.
		666/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref; 10/DG/003	<b>Urban Design Guide / pg 3 / 1b:</b> Supports recognition of sense of place by retaining historic features.	Noted	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		666/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 10/DG/004	<p><b>Design and Planning Process:</b> key messages expressed well but vital that used as intended rather than to justify poor design and planning. E.g. references to "start by developing a good understanding of the site and its context". This should include historic factors and not be a tool for dismissing them as unimportant. More than listed buildings and conservation areas form character.</p>	<p>The Design and Planning Process document sets out good practice and should be read in conjunction with the documents that form the SPD. The need to take into account local character and distinctiveness is emphasised throughout the SPD documents.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		OMBC ref: 666/UDG/005/SA RMBC ref: 10/DG/005	<p><b>Sustainability Appraisal:</b> Objective A is very important.</p> <p>Page 53 on character it must be noted in paragraph 3.4 that in Royton money was spent to celebrate increased wealth e.g. Royton baths was built in an Edwardian style, such buildings should be retained.</p>	Noted, paragraph 3.4 is to be reworded to better reflect the distinctive local character of the borough and its heritage.	Delete para 3.4 on pg 53 and replace within the following: <u>"During the second half of the Industrial Revolution Oldham and it's surrounding villages grew into the most productive cotton spinning mill area in the world, with the fabric of the town illustrating the social and economic development of the Borough during this period. The multi-storey mills each with their own mill lodges (reservoirs), the forest of mill chimneys, and the associated red brick houses, giving Oldham a special character. There are also many other buildings and areas of historical heritage, whether they be listed buildings, conservations areas, or of local historical significance, which add to the distinctive local character of the borough."</u>

	<b>Individual/ Organisation</b>	<b>Reference Number</b>	<b>Comments Received</b>	<b>RMBC/OMBC's Response</b>	<b>Change / Comments</b>
11	Greenfield and Grasscroft Residents Association	OMBC ref: 644/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/001	<b>Urban Design Guide:</b> It would be wrong to apply the same Urban Design Guide to the many picturesque mill villages in Oldham Borough. Should incorporate a complimentary 'Rural Design Guide' to address specific planning and development issues.	Urban design is as much about the way buildings and environments function as with their appearance. It is about ensuring that development reflects and responds to local character and distinctive, as emphasised throughout the SPD. It is felt that principles set out within the SPD can be applied equally to urban and rural situations, and to built and natural elements.  Building on the adoption of the Urban Design Guide the Council may produce additional design-related guidance from time to time as is considered appropriate and necessary. Any additional guidance produced would accord with the general principles set out within the Urban Design Guide, but may look to provide further guidance on specific issues, such as house extensions and canal side development, or may relate to particular areas such as the Saddleworth villages.	No change required.
		644/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/002	<b>Urban Design Guide:</b> Supports the usability and layout. An index of topics would be helpful at the back of the document.	Consideration has been given to the inclusion of an index of topics to the SPD however it is considered to be impracticable. The contents pages to the SPD will be made as detailed and clear as possible.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		644/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/003	<b>Urban Design Guide:</b> Section 6 on 'Adaptability' Requests to add comment regarding the provision of additional parking spaces for residents and visitors when converting houses into flats to reduce on-road parking and accidents.	Car Parking standards are set out within the UDP's for both Oldham and Rochdale. Car parking would therefore be sought as part of any planning application in accordance with these standards and the relevant policy. It is not the role of the Urban Design Guide SPD to seek the provision of additional parking spaces as requested.	No change required.
		644/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/004	<b>Urban Design Guide:</b> Section 7 on 'Sustainability' request comment regarding the need for sufficient refuse storage areas, which is mentioned in the Residential Design section.	It is considered that the Urban Design Guide adequately addresses the need for appropriate refuse storage. 7d states that development proposals must appropriate provision for the sustainable management and discharge of waste and that where possible they should: - incorporate facilities for segregation, storage and collection of recyclable waste such as paper, glass, metal and bio-degradable material; and - ensure that facilities such as recycling bins, refuse storage and collection areas and composters are integrated into the design of areas and buildings in a non-intrusive and attractive manner.  Notwithstanding the above greater emphasis is to be made to the need for recycling and cycle storage within the Residential Design Guide on pg 39.	Amend the Urban Design Guide as follows: - Pg 16/4c//6 <sup>th</sup> bullet point – "secure <u>and convenient</u> cycle parking".  Amend Pg 39 of the Residential Design Guide as follows:  Reword the first bullet point to read "bin and <u>recycling</u> facilities".  Add headline – " <u>Bicycle storage: It is important to ensure that storage facilities are secure and also conveniently located for the use of residents.</u> "

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		644/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/005	<b>Public Realm Design Guide:</b> Pleased that sections 4 & 5 address traffic management issues.	Noted	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		644/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/006	<p><b>Public Realm Design Guide:</b> At the end of section 5 on public consultation, it is unclear when public consultation is mandatory or when work can be carried out without consultation.</p>	<p>Engagement with the local community is not mandatory however it is encouraged. Consultation as early as possible with the design and planning process is very important. Encouraging developers to undertake pre-submission community involvement also accords with OMBC's and RMBC's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Oldham Council's SCI states "<i>Where the Council considers a proposal to be of a scale and/or nature that is likely to generate significant levels of public interest, the prospective developer will be encouraged to engage the local community and undertake wide consultation. The developer will be expected to submit a statement outlining the extent of the consultation completed with the planning application, and explain how the feedback from the consultation process has influenced the submitted scheme</i>".</p> <p>Rochdale Council's SCI states "<i>For significant development proposals, the Council would encourage applicants to consult with the local community before submitting their application</i>"</p>	No change required.
12	British Waterways	OMBC ref: 073/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 12/DG/001	Urban Design Guide / pg 4 / 1b: Should include reference to "canals". New developments should	It is agreed that new developments should ensure that access through to public natural and landscape features are enhanced or provided where	Add an additional bullet point to 1b of the Urban Design Guide to read:  "Where the development site is

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
			ensure that access through to public natural and landscape features are enhanced or provided where possible. The impact of development on the visual amenity of waterway users also needs to be considered.	possible, and that the impact of development on the visual amenity of the water should be considered. It is proposed to amend references to canals where appropriate to emphasise the importance of access and visual amenity.	<p><u>adjacent to a canal or other watercourse, the development should enhance the setting of the waterway and present a positive frontage to it, and particular consideration should be given to enhancing the ecological value of the waterway and improving views for it's users.</u></p> <p><u>Developments should take opportunities to improve pedestrian (and, where appropriate, cycle) access to towpaths and footpaths adjoining waterways.</u></p> <p>Amend pg 8 of Residential Design Guide, under "Edge Conditions" to add additional bullet point "<u>Does a waterway run along the edge of the site?</u>"</p>
13	Highways Agency	OMBC ref: 005/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref; 13/DG/001	<b>Urban Design Guide:</b> Welcomes the principals, particularly sections 4b & 4c on the ease of movement.	Noted.	No change required.
		005/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/002	<b>Residential Design Guide:</b> Supports the principals, particularly on Integrating Sustainability.	Noted.	No change required.
		005/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/003	<b>Public Realm Design Guide:</b> Welcomes the aim to improve pedestrian experience.	Noted.	No change required.



	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		005/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/004	<b>Design and Planning Process:</b> Page 12 – replace questions with “what transport is available? Are improvements required to existing roads, public transport services or facilities to aid pedestrian and cycle movement?” This would be more consistent with the Good Practice Guide and the new guidance on Transport Assessments and PPG13.	Page 12 of the Design and Planning Process document to be amended.	Amend wording as requested on page 12 of Design and Planning Process document: <u>“What transport is available? Are improvements required to existing roads, public transport services or facilities to aid pedestrian and cycle movement?”</u>
		005/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/005	<b>Design and Planning Process:</b> Page 13 – Reword the transport bullet point to: “What forms of transport will people use? Are there bus routes close to the site? Is there sufficient public transport capacity? Are improvements to provision of public transport services required? What cycle and pedestrian facilities exist? Are any improvements required?”	Page 13 of the Design and Planning Process document to be amended.	Amend wording as requested on page 13 of Design and Planning Process document: <u>“What forms of transport will people use? Are there bus routes close to the site? Is there sufficient public transport capacity? Are improvements to provision of public transport services required? What cycle and pedestrian facilities exist? Are any improvements required?”</u>
		005/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/006	<b>Design and Planning Process:</b> Page 13 – Request to include “What level of car parking should be provided?” in the Traffic bullet point rather than the transport bullet point.	Page 13 of the Design and Planning Process document to be amended .	Move “ <i>What level of car parking should be provided?</i> ” to the traffic bullet point on page 13 of the Design and Planning Process document.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		005/UDG/007/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/007	<b>Design and Planning Process:</b> Page 22 – Should include advice to encourage developers to consult with the Agency at the earliest possible stage where their development is likely to have an impact on a motorway or trunk road.	Page 22 provides some examples of the type of organisations it may be appropriate to consult with for specialist advice. It would be inappropriate to add more examples at the risk this could be taken as a complete list.	No change required.
14	Taylor Young	699/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/001	<b>General:</b> Commends the layout and presentation of the documents and the glossary.	Noted.	No change required.
		699/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/002	<b>General:</b> An index would be helpful on the issues/ sections.	Consideration has been given to the inclusion of an index of topics to the SPD however it is considered to be impracticable. The contents pages to the SPD will be made as detailed and clear as possible.	No change required.
		699/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/003	<b>General:</b> Appearance of the front covers and overall graphic design could be strengthened and the same page layout (either landscape or portrait) be used for all four documents.	The different page layouts were intentional at consultation stage, to see if people had any particular preference. On reflection all documents are to be made portrait, as it is considered the documents will be easier to view electronically. The front covers are also to be made consistent with one another.	All documents are to be made portrait. Front covers are to be made consistent with one another.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		699/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/004	<b>General:</b> The principals contain six out of seven of the design objectives from 'By Design' (CABE, 2000) as well as four principles, which reflect contemporary government policy. Using the same chapter headings as the above guidance makes the document easier to read.	Noted.	No change required.
		699/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref; 14/DG/005	<p><b>General:</b> Guidance on character could be improved by referring to local context e.g. outlining the materials used in the Boroughs.</p> <p>The Design Guide is an opportunity to promote local distinctiveness and should emphasise the ways in which Oldham and Rochdale should differ from elsewhere. Guidance could express how the urban form and vernacular of the Pennine towns differ from that of Oldham and Rochdale towns; spatial context plans and photographs could be used to support this. This could be provided in a separate document as a study of local character and referred to in the character section of the Urban Design Guide.</p>	<p>The need to take account of and reflect local character and distinctiveness is emphasised throughout the SPD. More local images have also been added to the SPD to further reflect the local character of the two boroughs.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to produce a separate document providing a study of local character.</p>	Add more local images relating to Oldham and Rochdale.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		699/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/006	<b>General:</b> Concerns following the publication of 'Manual for Streets' that considering residential design separately from street design may perpetrate poor practice.	It is not the intention that residential design be considered separately from street design. The SPD provides guidance on how to create places and provides the relevant cross-references where necessary.	No change required.
		699/UDG/007/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/007	<b>General:</b> There are duplications between the three documents. The additional design guides should only contain information too specific for the main design guide.	The Residential Design Guide and Public Realm guide build on the principles set out within the Urban Design Guide.  The documents have been prepared so that they can be read individually.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		699/UDG/008/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/008	<b>Design and Planning Process:</b> Supports the handbook. Could be improved by tying it better with the design guidance, referring to the ten principals and including 'refer to design guidance on these principals' where appropriate.	The introduction to the Design and Planning Process document shall be amended to cross-refer to the SPD documents as appropriate.	Amend second paragraph on the inside cover of the Design and Planning Process Guide to be replaced with the following: <u>"This Design and Planning Process: A Guide to Good Practice aims to assist all those involved in the process of designing and constructing buildings, streets and spaces to create good quality places, and compliments the series of design guides which have been produced jointly by Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council, Rochdale Metropolitan Borough, and the Oldham Rochdale Partners in Action Housing Market Renewal. These guides, which are informed by planning policies in the two Borough's Unitary Development Plans (UDPs), include an overall Design Guide that provides guidance for all forms of development throughout the two Boroughs."</u>
		699/UDG/009/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/009	<b>Urban Design Guide / Chapter 5:</b> could define 'legible environment' and link legibility to townscape and landscape.	An explanation of "legibility" is provided on pg 18 of the Urban Design Guide.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		699/UDG/010/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/010	<b>Urban Design Guide / Chapter 5 / Pg 19:</b> The graphic on legibility suggests that development should be large and positioned to interfere with views towards landmarks. Such small images and images in the character section illustrating character types need to be explored.	Transpose line drawings.	Transpose line drawings.
		699/UDG/011/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/011	<b>Urban Design Guide / Chapter 3:</b> In the diversity chapter, guidance on open space does not relate much to diversity and would be better located in the 'good streets and spaces' chapter. The chapters on diversity and adaptability could be consecutive as the two concepts are closely related.	The guidance provided on open space within the "Diversity" section relates to the need for development to support variety, choice and accessibility in the public realm for all members of the local community, recognising the role that open space has in encouraging interaction.	No change required.
		699/UDG/012/SPD RMBC ref; 14/DG/012	<b>Urban Design Guide / Pg 38:</b> Replace reference to 'Ecohomes' with the new 'Code for Sustainable Homes' and determine an appropriate score.	Reference to "Ecohomes" to be replaced by "Code for Sustainable Homes".	Reference to "Ecohomes" Very Good to be replaced by "Code for Sustainable Homes" Level 3.
		699/UDG/013/SPD RMBC ref; 14/DG/013	<b>Urban Design Guide / Pg vi:</b> Add design review and pre-application discussion to the box on 'processes supporting good urban design'.	Design review and pre-application discussion would form part of the "design solutions" and "applications and approvals". It is not considered necessary to add any additional processes.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
15	Environment Agency	OMBC ref: 003/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 15/DG/001	Supports the documents and finds them clear in what they are aiming to achieve.	Noted.	No change required.
		003/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref; 15/DG/002	Developments that are at risk of flooding or will increase the risk of flooding will have to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) in accordance with PPS25 Annex E.  The Design and Planning Process does not mention a FRA. There is now a requirement for any development over 1ha to contain a FRA.	The issue of flood risk would be considered as part of a planning application and is reflected within both borough's UDPs. Page 27 provides examples of the types of assessments that may be submitted and states that "developers should discuss drawings and documents they proposes submitting with planning officers before making a planning application."	No change required.
		003/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref; 15/DG/003	<b>Urban Design Guide / Chapter 7:</b> 7c refers to designing development to incorporate flood prevention. Would like to see reference to locating development away from areas of flood risk in addition to reducing surface water run off. The risk based sequential test should be applied. It is essential that this is taken into account when considering the design of new development.	Flood risk will be considered as part of the planning application process, where the principle of development on a site would be considered taking account and balancing the various constraints. The SPD provides guidance on how development can incorporate measures for flood prevention through design.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		003/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 15/DG/004	The importance of watercourses should be recognised for the valuable ecological habitats they provide. The guides refer to enhancement of biodiversity. Reference should be made to retaining and integrating watercourse where feasible.	Reference to be made to retaining and integrating watercourses will be added as appropriate.	Amend 7e on pg28 of the Urban Design Guide to read: "sensitively integrate existing open space and landscape features ( <u>including watercourses</u> ) into the proposed development, <u>including the opening up of culverted watercourses where feasible.</u> "
		003/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 15/DG/005	<b>General:</b> Where development encroaches a main river 8m should be left clear and unobstructed. Within this margin land drainage consent will be required from the EA.	Consultation would take place with the Environment Agency with regards to the appropriate planning applications. It is not considered necessary to make reference to such detailed requirements within the SPD.	No change required.
		003/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 15/DG/006	<b>General:</b> Pleased to see sustainability topics such as waste, renewable energy, water resources and SUDs included.	Noted.	No change required.
16	GMPTE	119/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/001	<b>Design and Planning Process / Pg 9:</b> Include potential public transport links in addition to vehicle access and possibilities for cyclists and pedestrians to improve access.	Pg 9 of the Design and Planning Process is looking at analysis of the site. The need to consider public transport links is appropriately recognised elsewhere in the document when looking at the wider context (i.e. pg 13).	No change required.



	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		119/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/002	<b>Design and Planning Process / Pg 10:</b> In the list of local destinations public transport should be included as a desired destination. Public transport facilities could be improved through developer contribution in addition to community facilities	Reference to bus stops to be added to pg 10 of the Design and Planning Process document.	Amend first bullet point on pg 10 to include " <u>bus stops</u> " as a destination.
		119/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/003	<b>Design and Planning Process / Pg 13:</b> Welcomes transport being considered as a key technical issue. Would like to see frequency of services, the location of bus stops, railway stations and Metrolink stops, and the possibility of public transport improvements also considered.	Reference to be made to frequency of services, railway station and Metrolink stops to be added as suggested.	Amend "Transport" to read: " <u>What forms of transport will people use? Are there bus routes/stops, railway stations or Metrolink stops close to the site? How frequent are public transport services in the area?</u> "
		119/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/004	<b>Design and Planning Process / Pg 15:</b> GMPTE have produced 'Land Use Planning & Public Transport' guidance. This could be considered as an important local policy document to improve the urban design of new development.	There are a number of documents of this sort of relevance and it would be inappropriate in this context to try and list them all.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		119/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/005	<b>Design and Planning Process / Pg 22/23:</b> GMPTE should be consulted early on planning applications, preferably at pre-application stage. Request to be mentioned as an important consultee, and listed under the section 'With other agencies and bodies'.	Page 22 of the Design and Planning Process provides some examples of the type of organisations it may be appropriate to consult with for specialist advice. It would be inappropriate to add more examples at the risk this could be taken as a complete list.	No change required.
		119/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/006	<b>Design and Planning Process / Pg 27:</b> As part of outline or full planning applications an interim of final travel plan should be submitted, either forming part of the Transport Assessment or being submitted separately. The Travel Plan should be listed within the above section alongside other required information or within the Transport Assessment paragraph. Travel plans can have a number of benefits to new development, contributing to the access and sustainability issues of urban design.	Page 27 provides examples of the types of assessments that may be submitted and states that "developers should discuss drawings and documents they proposes submitting with planning officers before making a planning application."	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		119/UDG/007/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/007	<b>Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 3:</b> List of principals should include 'Accessibility'. 'Ease of Movement' covers some accessibility issues but a new section could place more emphasis on accessibility to essential local services and employment areas by sustainable transport.	It is considered that accessibility is adequately covered throughout the SPD and that a separate section on "accessibility" is not required.	No change required.
		119/UDG/008/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/008	<b>Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 9:</b> Important to emphasise the benefits of incorporating sustainable modes of transport into the design of a development in addition to ensuring a sustainable development and a sustainable community.	Page 9 is not considered to be an appropriate place to address transport matters. This matter is addressed in the Urban Design Guide.	No change required.
		119/UDG/009/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/009	<b>Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 12:</b> Important that measures to restrict vehicle speeds does not have negative impacts on buses and other sustainable modes of transport.	Pg 12 of the Public Realm Design Guide shall be amended to highlight the need to ensure that measures to restrict vehicle speed do not have negative impacts on buses and other sustainable transport modes as suggested.	Amend first paragraph, second sentence as follows: " <u>Streets should be designed to keep speeds to 20mph or less by making exceeding these speeds different for the driver, whilst maintaining access for public transport and emergency vehicles.</u> "

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		119/UDG/010/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/010	<b>Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 26:</b> Arterial roads have the potential to serve as bus prioritised routes. The inclusion of high quality public transport waiting facilities can add character and provide security for public transport users.	Amend the second bullet point on page 27 of the Public Realm Design Guide to refer to the provision of quality public transport waiting facilities.	Second bullet point to be amended to read "they need to become places that are more welcoming for pedestrians, for example, by providing defined, safe crossing points at locations convenient for those on foot <u>and by providing quality public transport waiting facilities.</u> "
		119/UDG/011/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/011	<b>Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 27:</b> Traffic calming measures along local distributor roads should not impact negatively on public transport. Busy routes have potential for bus priority measures with the provision of waiting facilities that enhance security and aesthetics.	Pg 27 recognises the differing design issues for arterial roads whilst maintaining their role as major traffic routes.	See above.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		119/UDG/012/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/012	<b>Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 34:</b> Welcomes that street scene investment should be planned alongside highway investment, as required when designing gateways and corridors particularly in town centres and along Quality Bus Corridors. Therefore recommendations for pages 26 & 27 should be taken into account. <b>Would welcome the suggestion that opportunities should be taken to develop new interchanges, including Metrolink stops.</b>	See responses above to representations received regarding pg 26 and pg 27 of the Public Realm Design Guide.  Reference to interchanges is a strategic matter rather than a design principle.	See above.
		119/UDG/013/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/013	<b>Residential Design Guide / Pg 3:</b> 'Accessibility' should be included as a principal concept with a new section.	It is considered that accessibility is adequately covered throughout the SPD and that a separate section on "accessibility" is not required.	No change required.
		119/UDG/014/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/014	<b>Residential Design Guide / Pg 8:</b> Access considerations should include the locality of public transport facilities, and existing transport routes through and near a site highlighting any required improvements.	Amend pg8 of the Residential Design Guide to refer to the need to take into account the locality of public transport facilities and existing transport routes as suggested.	Amend "Access" on Pg 8 of the Residential Design Guide to include the following: " <u>Where are public transport facilities located in relation to the site? Are there existing public transport routes through or near the site? Are improvements required?</u> "

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		119/UDG/015/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/015	<b>Residential Design Guide / Pg 13:</b> Important to consider direct routes through a site, which takes into account public transport and improves accessibility, can reduce the need for the private car. This should be mentioned in the above section and listed as one of the bullet points.	Amend pg13 of the Residential Design Guide to refer to the connection of pedestrian routes within the site to areas beyond.	Amend third bullet point on Pg 13 of the Residential Design Guide to read " <u>Pedestrian routes within the site should connect with the places that people want to go to outside of the site area, for example schools, shops, open spaces, places of worship and public transport facilities.</u> "
		119/UDG/016/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/016	<b>Residential Design Guide / Pg 17:</b> Encouraging that the document promotes connecting to the wider areas through public transport, walking and cycling.	Noted.	No change required.
		119/UDG/017/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/017	<b>Urban Design Guide / Pg 3:</b> 'Accessibility' should be included as a principal concept within the contents with a new section.	It is considered that accessibility is adequately covered throughout the SPD and that a separate section on "accessibility" is not required.	No change required.
		119/UDG/018/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/018	<b>Urban Design Guide / Pg 15/16:</b> Ease of Movement Table 4b & 4c: welcomes the comments in the tables concerning public transport and cycling & walking.	Noted.	No change required.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		119/UDG/019/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/019	<b>Urban Design Guide / Chapter 7:</b> Like the "Ease of Movement" chapter, this should promote sustainable modes of transport and ensures that it is a consideration within urban design for new developments.	It is considered that the promotion of sustainable modes of transport is adequately covered elsewhere within the SPD (see Ease of Movement section).	No change required.
17	Littleborough Historical and Archaeological Society	OMBC ref: 700/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref; 17/DG/001	General – what happens outside Littleborough is not within the Society's remit. Our views on Littleborough are well covered in the Town Design Statement and accompanying Heritage Statement.	The new Guidance sets out key design principles and emphasises the need for development to have regard to local context and character. The Town Design Statement sets out what this character is, and thus the documents and the Design Statement will work in a complementary manner.	No change required.
18	Rochdale Development Agency	701/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref; 18/DG/001	(1) <b>Urban Design Guide:</b> Concern that the principles could apply anywhere and not specifically to Oldham and Rochdale. There are too few visual examples.	The need to take account of and reflect local character and distinctiveness is emphasised throughout the SPD. More local images have also been added to the SPD to further reflect the local character of the two boroughs.	Add more local images relating to Oldham and Rochdale.
		701/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref:18/DG/002	(2) <b>Urban Design Guide / pg 44:</b> There are two 10bs.	Last box to re-labelled box '10c'.	Re-label last box'10c'.
		701/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 18/DG/003	(3) <b>General:</b> Documents should refer to the Manual for Streets.	Document to be amended to refer to Manual for Streets.	Amend the document to refer to Manual for Streets rather than Design Bulletin 32 as follows: - Pg 15 of the Public Realm Design Guide; and - Pg 23 of the Residential Design Guide.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		701/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 18/DG/004	<p>(4) <b>Public Realm Design Guide / pg 38-39:</b> Concerned that this section is at odds with principles developed for the Public Realm Handbook. Particular points raised regarding the furniture zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPD should offer guidance about how wide the footway needs to be to accommodate such a zone;</li> <li>- Street furniture needs to co-ordinated within wider-geographical areas, rather than on a street by street basis;</li> <li>- Appreciate the need to prioritise corridors however the principle of reducing clutter should be adopted throughout the Borough.</li> </ul>	<p>The diagram on pg 39 of the Public Realm Design Guide provides an indication of how wide a footpath would be expected to be to accommodate a 'furniture zone'.</p> <p>The fifth bullet point on pg 38 of the Public Realm Design Guide should be amended to refer to the wider areas as appropriate.</p> <p>Whilst the 'Reducing Clutter' section highlights major corridors it also recognises that the principles can be applied to all streets.</p>	<p>Amend reducing clutter section as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- pg 38/fifth bullet point – add <i>“and wider area as appropriate”</i>;</li> <li>and</li> <li>- pg 39 - 'Furniture zone' to be shown to the rear of the footway.</li> </ul> <p>Amend pg 52 of the Public Realm Guide and pg 23 of the Residential Design Guide to refer to the RDA's "Public Realm Handbook".</p>



	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
19	Rochdale Environmental Management	OMBC ref: 702/UDG/001/SPD  RMBC ref: 19/DG/001	Urban Design Guide: Needs positive advice re: canal frontage of developments, it isn't clear how they should be designed.	Agree that more needs to be included in respect of development adjacent to canals and other watercourses.	Add an additional bullet point to 1b of the Urban Design Guide to read:  <u>"Where the development site is adjacent to a canal or other watercourse, the development should enhance the setting of the waterway and present a positive frontage to it, and particular consideration should be given to enhancing the ecological value of the waterway and improving views for it's users. Developments should take opportunities to improve pedestrian (and, where appropriate, cycle) access to towpaths and footpaths adjoining waterways."</u>
		OMBC ref: 702/UDG/002/SPD  RMBC ref: 19/DG/002	Public Realm Guide page 9: Include other water features including the canal, rivers in features to be incorporated into sustainable development and contribute to sustainability of place.	Agree that guidance in respect of water features on sites should be expanded.	Amend fourth bullet point on pg 9 of the Public Realm Design Guide to read " <u>incorporate existing water features and also....etc.</u> "
		OMBC ref: 702/UDG/003/SPD  RMBC ref: 19/DG/003	Public Realm Guide page 25: Could use canal example here.	Agree that photograph of canal should be on this page.	Photograph of canal to be sourced for pg 25 of the Public Realm Guide and first bullet point to be amended to read as follows <u>"retaining existing vegetation and water features where possible."</u>
		OMBC REF: 702/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 19/DG/004	(4) <b>Public Realm Design Guide page 42:</b> why is this separate from the section on page 31	Page 31 refers to the problems of green spaces and page 42 how to improve them. However, this should be made clearer	Amend title on pg 42 of the Public Realm Design Guide to read <u>"Improving Green Spaces"</u> .

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
20	Castleton Residents Association	OMBC ref: 703/UDG/001/SPD  RMBC ref; 20/DG/001	The involvement in consulting residents and local people must be a paramount consideration when major changes are proposed.	Agree that guide should emphasise the importance of local consultation.	Amend pg 23 of the Design and Planning Process document to read <u>"it is a good idea to speak to local people and local groups."</u>
21	CABE	080/UDG/001/SPD  RMBC ref: 21/DG/001	(1) <b>General:</b> Documents work well as a suite and provide guidance to achieving good quality urban design across the two borough's	Noted.	No change required.
		080/UDG/002/SPD  RMBC ref: 21/DG/002	(2) <b>General:</b> Suggest taking a step back and consider whether our objectives for each of the guides have been fully met. Welcome the preparation of locally specific guidance. Greater clarity regarding audience, purpose and scope will help planning applicants use the guides for their intended purpose.	Greater clarification should be provided regarding audience, purpose and scope of the document as suggested.	Amend documents to provide greater clarification regarding audience, purpose and scope through replacing the final sentence on, pgiii of the Urban Design Guide, pg2 of the Public Realm Design Guide and pg 2 of the Residential Design Guide with the following:  <u>"Its aim is to provide clear guidance to everyone in designing and constructing streets and space (including architects, designers, public and private sector developers, house builders and engineers) on the quality of design expected by both Boroughs. The Guide will also be used by local authority officers to help assess the quality of planning applications."</u>

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		080/UDG/003/SPD  RMBC ref; 21/DG/003	(3) <b>General:</b> There is an opportunity for the SPD to add more value, be a more useful practical tool and have wider influence by adding depth to the generic guidance through demonstrating more clearly how an analysis of local context should inform development proposals.	The need to take account of and reflect local character and distinctiveness is emphasised throughout the SPD. More local images have also been added to the SPD to further reflect the local character of the two boroughs.  Reference should be added to pg 15 of Design and Planning Process Guide to refer to the fact that there may be local characterisation studies/masterplans and development briefs of relevance.	Amend pg 15 of the Design and Planning Process Guide to read as follows:  "Are there <u>other</u> Supplementary Planning Documents, Area Action Plans, development briefs, <u>masterplans or related documents prepared by the Council</u> that affect the site and/or type of development proposed?"
		080/UDG/004/SPD  RMBC ref: 21/DG/004	(4). <b>General:</b> The guides would benefit from signposting generic guidance about good design.	References to be added throughout the documents to generic guidance about good design as appropriate.	Amend reference to Ecohomes on pg 40 of the Residential Design Guide to read:  "All new <u>dwelling</u> s will be encouraged to meet the <u>standards within the Code for Sustainable Homes</u> ( <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1506120">www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1506120</a> )".
		080/UDG/005/SPD  RMBC ref: 21/DG/005	(5). <b>General:</b> Locally specific context-setting information would be useful at start of the guides.	The need to take account of and reflect local character and distinctiveness is emphasised throughout the SPD. More local images have also been added to the SPD to further reflect the local character of the two boroughs.	Add more local images relating to Oldham and Rochdale.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		080/UDG/006/SPD  RMBC ref; 21/DG/006	(6). <b>General:</b> To add depth and rigour to the section on contextual analysis it may be helpful to refer to some other examples of local authority design guides.	Signposting has been added throughout the documents to generic guidance on good design as suggested. It is not however considered appropriate to refer to other local authority design guides.	No change required.
		080/UDG/007/SPD  RMBC ref: 21/DG/007	(7). <b>General:</b> Needs to be clearer how strong the policies on design from the Local Plans might be interpreted in practice and how, therefore, good quality development may be encouraged, recognised, assessed and approved. There is an opportunity to positively specify quality parameters (by for example making reference to established tools and standards such as Building for Life and Code for Sustainable Homes.	References to be added throughout the documents to generic guidance about good design as appropriate.	Amend reference to Ecohomes on pg 40 of the Residential Design Guide to read:  <u>"All new dwellings will be encouraged to meet the standards within the Code for Sustainable Homes (www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1506120)".</u>
		080/UDG/008/SPD  RMBC ref: 21/DG/008	(8). <b>General:</b> Need to be clearer about what is acceptable, beyond expressing ideal processes and what "should" or "could" be done.	Statements below images will be made clearer to identify which are examples of good and bad practice and a tick/cross system shall be introduced as appropriate throughout the document to identify examples of good and bad practice.	Statements below images will be made clearer to identify which are examples of good and bad practice.  Tick/crosses to be introduced in the following image:  Pg 15 of the Urban Design Guide – add a cross to the middle image and a tick to the bottom image.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		080/UDG/009/SPD  RMBC ref: 21/DG/009	<b>(9) Design and Planning Process:</b> Although the recommended approach to design is clear in the Process Guide, it may be oversimplified in places (for example consultation is an iterative process).	It is agreed that consultation is an iterative process and that showing it at one stage may not be appropriate. The arrows within the strap line should be removed to show design and planning as one continuous process rather than identifying particular stages.	Arrows to be removed from strap line in the guide which identifies what part of the process the guidance relates to.
		080/UDG/010/SPD  RMBC ref; 21/DG/010	<b>(10) Design and Planning Process:</b> Design and Access Statement section is welcomed however it repeats national guidance without further clarity about local issues, which should be addressed. It may also specify what information should be included within the application and what should go in the Statement,	Local issues may differ depending upon the application site and nature of the development proposed, it is therefore not felt to be appropriate to refer to specific requirements within the SPD.	No change required.
		080/UDG/011/SPD  RMBC ref: 21/DG/011	<b>(11) Design and Planning Process:</b> Should set out other sources of design guidance and advice (i.e. pre-application discussions, case studies, advice from regional and/o design review panels).	Agreed.	Page 25 of the Design and Planning Process guide to include paragraph advising that applicants discuss proposed applications with Local Planning Authorities first.

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		080/UDG/012/SPD  RMBC ref: 21/DG/012	(12) <b>Public Realm Design Guide:</b> Approach to open space needs strengthening.	Reference should be made to the need to link into a wider green space strategy.	Amend pg 24 of the Public Realm Design Guide as follows:  "High quality open space brings many benefits to residential environments. Good spaces: - function well for their intended use, which may include play, exercise and/or relaxation; - <u>fit into a wider green space strategy</u> ; - provide an area with a sense of identity and community; - are usually located at the heart of the development, rather than being a left over space on the edge; - <u>make the most of existing landscape features and assets</u> ; and - <u>take into consideration long-term funding and maintenance.</u> "
		080/UDG/013/SPD  RMBC ref: 21/DG/013	(13) <b>General:</b> Documents would benefit from a general review of terminology, that illustrations and captions are appropriate and clear, and to ensure that most recent national guidance is referred to.	Agreed.	Terminology/illustration/caption check of SPD.  Need to also make sure that the more recent national guidance is referred to.  Review illustration on: Residential Design Guide pg 27; and Public Realm Design Guide pg 44/45.
22	Middleton Environment Group	OMBC ref: 704/UDG/001/SPD	The documents are hard to understand and meaningless to 'Joe Public'. Suggest a simpler version	The production of a summarised version for consultation would be inappropriate, as all readers should have the opportunity to	Amend pg 52 of the Urban Design Guide to refer to the Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

	Individual/ Organisation	Reference Number	Comments Received	RMBC/OMBC's Response	Change / Comments
		RMBC ref; 22/DG/001	for comment in plain English with less use of acronyms.	view the whole document.	Amend pg 51 of the Public Realm Design Guide to refer to the Unitary Development Plan (UDP)  Amend pg 47 of the Residential Design Guide to refer to the Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

Changes have also been made to the SPD(s) and supporting documents for editorial and presentational reason, to clarify statements where appropriate and update the documents.