



**PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004  
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND)  
REGULATIONS 2012, REGULATION 14**

**Supplementary Planning Document: High Peak Design Guide  
Consultation Statement**

This Statement has been prepared in accordance with regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local development) (England) regulations 2012. The High Peak Design Guide SPD was prepared following public consultation that consisted of consultation with the following groups:

- Local Architects and Planning Agents
- Local amenity groups, Parish Councils and special interest groups
- Ward Councillors
- Key Council Officers
- OPUN – Architecture and Design Centre

A copy of the draft Design Guide was placed on the Council's web site and a hard copy was made available to view at local Council offices and libraries. Consultation ran from 29<sup>th</sup> February – 29<sup>th</sup> March 2016. 12 responses were received to the consultation. Following consideration of the responses by full Council at its meeting on the 20th February 2018, the document was amended.

Appendix 1 summarises the main issues raised in the representation and how these have been addressed in the SPD.

## Appendix 1 – High Peak Design Guide – Public Consultation responses

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

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Officer recommendation</b>
Response 4	<p>General comments on highlighting the need for inclusive, adaptable and accessible space and buildings with particular reference to sections 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9.</p> <p>Identified some incorrect annotation of photographs</p> <p>Additional hyperlinks required to document published by Historic England: <i>Easy Access to Historic Buildings</i></p> <p>Section 2 - should also reference visitors to High Peak</p>	Comments noted	These are minor changes of a technical nature - agree to amend text where required.
Response 5	Reference should be made to Landscape Character SPD in Section 11 and HPBC Tree Policy in appendix 1	Comments noted	These are minor changes of a technical nature- agree to amend text where required
Response 6	Section 12 - Reference to statutory protection for wildlife and link to Derbyshire Wildlife Trust in Appendices.	Comments noted	These are minor changes of a technical nature- agree to amend text where required

Response 7	<p>General comments on Sustainability Section 6 – Reference NPPF and HPBC adopted Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Insert a sub heading dealing with sustainable transport.</p> <p>Some concern expressed about use of natural materials and viability</p>	Chapter 6 relating to sustainable design has been omitted and sustainability has now been threaded through the whole document	Text amendments made where appropriate.
Response 8	<p>General comments on setting high standards for sustainable building and development.</p> <p>Support Section 12 – Wildlife</p> <p>Future development should fit into context and resist piecemeal development.</p>	<p>Sustainable design comments reflect standards responding to national and local planning policies.</p> <p>Wildlife section now incorporated in section 4</p> <p>The importance of designing in context is dealt with in Section 3.</p>	<p>No text amendments required.</p> <p>No text amendments required.</p> <p>No text amendments required.</p>
Response 9	<p><i>This was the most detailed and comprehensive set of comments the extent of which cannot be reproduced in their entirety, but can be summarised as follows:</i></p> <p>Design Guide is not in accord with paras 59 and 60 of the NPPF</p>	The Design Guide does respond to these paragraphs but officers recommend additional text in para 1.2 to be more positive about new development of a	To amend para 1.2.

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

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

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

	<p><b>Section 6</b> Sustainable Design should not necessarily be seen as a stand-alone chapter but a thread throughout the whole document.</p> <p><b>Section 7 and 8</b> The guidance does not mention the acceptability of extending buildings by making a clear distinction between old and new. The guidance is too restrictive on conversions.</p> <p><b>Section 10</b> More flexibility is required in this section as guidance on detailing is too restrictive.</p> <p><b>Section 11</b> This section should be more realistic about external materials.</p>	<p>Officers agree and this section has been removed.</p> <p>Officers agree and redrafted paras in section 7 and 8 (now section 5) to reflect the points made.</p> <p>Officers agree to make guidance less prescriptive by amending wording to allow more flexibility.</p> <p>The section (now section 4) is not unrealistic and advocates the use of top dressed tarmac.</p>	<p>Where relevant sustainability issues are highlighted at the end of each section.</p> <p>Para 5.6 amended. Para 5.15 amended.</p> <p>Amend para 10.2 (now 7.3)</p> <p>No amendments required.</p>
Response 10	<p>Support and concur with all comments made by J Poulter.</p> <p>Welcomes Design Guide but concerned about the amount referenced to the Peak Park.</p>	<p>See above responses</p> <p>High Peak contains landscape and settlement areas within the Peak Park and there</p>	<p>See above recommendations</p> <p>As per OPUN comments document redrafted and less emphasis is given to Peak park.</p>

	<p>Draft guide ignores reference to NPPF paras 59 and 60 and guidance from Landmark Trust and Historic England (HE).</p> <p>The guide ignores modern materials and use of brick.</p> <p>General comment regarding the validity of the Design Review Panel (DRP) and lack of qualified architect retained by HPBC</p>	<p>are strong similarities within the built and natural environment. Given this the Peak Park Design Guide proved a useful reference point.</p> <p>The Design Guide references paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Paras 59 and 60 are dealt with in the body of the design document. Reference to guidance from HE</p> <p>See above responses under J Poulter</p> <p>Officer note this comment but the mechanism of the DRP and staffing resources do not form part of the Design Guide.</p>	<p>No amendments required</p> <p>See above recommendations.</p> <p>No amendments required</p>
Response 11	<p>Support and concur with all comments made by J Poulter</p> <p>Main concern with overall tone that comes from a 'conservation' point of view and not</p>	<p>See above responses</p> <p>Officers agree with and suggest an amendment</p>	<p>See above recommendations</p> <p>Paras 2.8 – 2.11 and section 3 more positive take on new</p>

	<p>'regeneration'. Document is not progressive or forward thinking enough and lacks good contemporary examples within a conservation context.</p> <p>Importance of context is correct but document does not reflect the differing contexts within High Peak.</p> <p>Character assessments by developers should demonstrate understanding of individual sites and guide appropriate development.</p> <p>Developments should take into account position and aspect.</p> <p>Document does not reflect aspirations and requirements of today's society and how this impacts on design. Lack of opportunity to produce anything different.</p> <p>High Peak has evolved over a long period of time and is a product of different eras which gives visual interest and should continue to do so.</p> <p>More modern materials such as render and timber are dismissed in document.</p>	<p>to be more positive on the integration of new buildings in a traditional context.</p> <p>Comment noted but feel that this point is reflected in Section 3.</p> <p>Character assessments are welcomed to guide appropriate development</p> <p>Comment noted but this point is already referenced in Section 6 on Sustainability.</p> <p>Comment noted and para 2.3 amended to reflect demands of today's lifestyles.</p> <p>Comment noted and para 2.8 amended to reflect this point.</p> <p>Officers note this comment and agree to amend section 4 (now section7) to be flexible</p>	<p>development.</p> <p>No amendments necessary.</p> <p>Para 3.11(now 3.7) amended to reflect this point.</p> <p>Section 6 now omitted but comment incorporated into para 3.17.</p> <p>Para 2.3 (now 2.2) amended.</p> <p>To amend Para 2.8 (now 2.7).</p> <p>Amend wording of Section 4 (now section 7).</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>The document does not deal with how modern developments and amenity requirements can be balanced with a more traditional village layout.</p> <p>Concern over restrictions regarding conversion and extension to converted buildings.</p> <p>Design Guide would benefit from photographs to inspire new development.</p> <p>Design Review board needs to be independent with members qualified in building design and architecture.</p>	<p>over the use of modern materials where appropriate including render. Timber however is not a traditional material in High Peak.</p> <p>Officers note this comment but feel that this is an issue and topic area that would be presented as one of the future technical guidance notes.</p> <p>Officers note these comments and agree to amend para 8.4 to allow extensions and alterations where necessary and where approached carefully.</p> <p>Officer agree with this point and the final document will require some additional photographs especially in Section 6.</p> <p>See response to R Hubble above</p>	<p>No amendments required.</p> <p>Amend para 8.4 (now 5.15)</p> <p>Section 6 has now been omitted. Photographs have been added to final document and good examples can continually be uploaded.</p> <p>See recommendation to R Hubble above.</p>
--	---	---	--

Response 12	<p>The concept of the document is to be applauded but there are omissions and generalisations that do not encourage good design.</p> <p>Difficult to find any real guidance.</p> <p>The document gives the impression of not encouraging new building materials, technology or design.</p> <p>Very negative attitude to modern architecture in Section 2.</p> <p>No acknowledgement in the draft document of the 20<sup>th</sup> or 21<sup>st</sup> century influences in design.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>The Design Guide is intended to set out high level design principles and many more of the detailed guidance will follow in technical appendices.</p> <p>See response to J Poulter above</p> <p>Officers suggest amendments to Sections 2 and 3 to be more positive on the role of new buildings in traditional context.</p> <p>One of the defining characteristics of High Peak is the prevalence of 19<sup>th</sup> century vernacular architecture. There are few examples of latter architectural</p>	<p>No amendments required</p> <p>No amendments required.</p> <p>See recommendations to J Poulter above.</p> <p>Paras 2.8 – 2.11 and section 3 more positive take on new development.</p> <p>No amendments required.</p>

	<p>Much of the document is personal taste rather than design principles. The 3 main design criteria in section 3 result in a homogenous mass of pastiche buildings trying to imitate traditional buildings and no recognition of present day living.</p> <p>Contrasts in scale and use of sustainable materials would break the monotony of new buildings.</p> <p>The draft document should look at the guidance given by Historic England and their attitude to extending listed buildings using modern materials and designs.</p> <p>No comment has been made on housing size.</p>	<p>styles that would warrant inclusion with the Design Guide.</p> <p>Comment noted and officers suggest a redraft of paras 3.12 – 3.25.</p> <p>Officers note these comments and propose to add an additional para 3.12 (now 3.8) regarding scale. The use of new and sustainable materials is referenced in section 4 (now 7)</p> <p>Comments noted and para 7.7 amended to reflect guidance in HE document.</p> <p>This level of guidance would fall in further technical appendices that would need to</p>	<p>Paras 3.12 – 3.25 (now 3.8 – 3.17) amended to address scale, materials, proportions, detailing and form.</p> <p>Amendments to text already proposed to cover these points</p> <p>Amend para 7.7 (now para 5.6)</p> <p>No amendments required.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>The draft guidance focuses mainly on housing but no mention of larger buildings and how use will dictate form and appearance. The example of Buxton Water is welcome in the document.</p> <p>Several issues in the sustainability section that need addressing such as cars and how we plan for them; is stone sustainable? The use and cost of modern materials.</p> <p>Planners need to consider the use of external advisors to advise and support design decisions.</p>	<p>reflect policy H3 of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>There is a section on large buildings (para 3.9).</p> <p>Section 6 now omitted from document. There is already a sub-section on sustainable materials. The successful integration of cars into new developments is likely to be a topic for future technical guidance.</p> <p>See response to R Hubble above</p>	<p>Additional text to supplement para 3.9 (now 3.6) to respond to comment.</p> <p>No amendments required.</p> <p>See recommendations to R Hubble above</p>
--	--	---	--