

Independent Appraisal of Chilton Woods Draft Design Code Babergh District Council

Final report
Prepared by LUC
March 2021



**Independent Appraisal of Chilton Woods Draft
Design Code**
Babergh District Council

Version	Status	Prepared	Checked	Approved	Date
1.	Draft report	R Hammonds M Fisk K Ahern R Brady H Kent	H Kent	H Kent	28.01.2021
2.	Final report	R Hammonds R Brady	H Kent	H Kent	01.03.2021

Introduction

1.1 This report is the output from an independent appraisal of the Chilton Woods Draft Design Code (the Design Code) carried out by LUC on behalf of Babergh District Council. This included a helpful presentation from the Chilton Woods design team on 18th January which explained the Design Code, its preparation, and how it has responded to stakeholder engagement, with an opportunity for LUC to ask questions. LUC then held an internal workshop to discuss the Design Code, and this report is based on the notes taken at the workshop and subsequent review.

1.2 We used the development principles set out on page 12 of the Design Code to frame our appraisal. Our focus is on character and place-making, reflecting the purpose of design codes. We also provide comments on the other development principles, and some suggestions in relation to the detail and presentation of the Design Code document.

Summary and conclusions

1.3 The structure of the Design Code is generally clear and logical. It is helpful for the reader to begin at the site-wide scale before moving down to the building-scale. The Design Code's introductory chapter clearly sets out the planning context of the site and the process behind the development of the document. A considerable amount of background work has been done prior to the production of the Design Code, most notably the Chilton Woods Study of Local Character report which was used within the public consultation. There is some evidence of the findings of this report being reflected throughout the Design Code, for example in the use of colourways and materials.

1.4 Engagement has been carried out with stakeholders and the Design Code has responded to this feedback. Following LUC's review of the comments provided by Chilton Parish Council and the Suffolk Preservation Society, it is clear that the Design Code has been amended to respond to the points raised by the groups. The inclusion of Chapter 4.0 'The Landscape Led Approach' highlights the importance of green space within the development in delivering both recreation and ecosystem services. More now needs to be done to reinforce the role of the landscape in shaping the character of the site.

1.5 LUC have identified a series of recommendations which will enable the Design Code to achieve its full potential in delivering a cohesive and sustainable development which is reflective of its surrounding context and character. The headline recommendations are set out here, and more detail is provided in the following sections:

- The Design Code should demonstrate more clearly how previous studies, including the LVIA and the Chilton Woods Study of Local Character, have informed the standards within the Code. This should take the reader from the strategic landscape context right down to material choice.
- The character areas should be extended to incorporate the landscape and spaces between the residential areas. This will help to achieve the common objectives of the Design Code and create a stronger cohesion and sense of place.
- The character area of 'Residential Neighbourhood' is too generic and could be refined into sub-character areas. Greater conviction and clarity is needed in communicating the design objective for this character area (and any sub areas). As currently drafted the influence of context and the design objectives are unclear, and this risks diluting the purpose and character of each area.
- Spaces need to be assigned a function before design work can go ahead, particularly for green infrastructure and green space. As it is, the Design Code runs the risk of the landscape being 'left over' at the end of the development and therefore underused and underperforming.
- Some of the precedent images and section elevations are confusing as they show different things with conflicting messages of style within the same character area. Some precedent images show poor design and should be removed or highlighted as a poor example.

Character and place-making

Strategic context

1.6 The Design Code should demonstrate greater understanding of the landscape context in relation to Sudbury, geology, topography, landform, views, key landscape / heritage features and assets, and how these have been used to inform the Code (using information from the DAS, LVIA and Chilton Woods Study of Local Character). For example, it would be useful to understand how the development form and building heights take account of the topography of the site e.g. the sloping down to meet the valley in which Sudbury sits in? We would expect to see one or more context figures.

1.7 More direct referencing to the LVIA work which has previously been carried out is needed. How does the development recognise and enhance the key views identified within the LVIA? For example, in Figure 14 (page 40), are these views (Key Outward Views and Key Strategic Views) from the LVIA?

1.8 The Design Code should demonstrate greater understanding of connectivity and access in relation to context (not just within the site), including the relationship to key pedestrian routes crossing the A134 and rights of way into the wider countryside. This is essential to ensure footpaths and cycle routes within the development are well connected to local facilities, and to show how the site will promote walking and cycling in line with the Vision.

1.9 Overall, the Design Code needs a clearer narrative on the sense of place that is being created, and how this links back to the Vision.

Landscape-led approach

1.10 Chapter 4.0 'Landscape Led Masterplan' was added to the Design Code following consultation. However, the landscape still seems a bit of an afterthought, with greater clarity needed to inform the function and design of green infrastructure, green spaces, SuDS, the community woodland and play spaces. This should be accompanied by a greater consideration of the various green spaces' relationship to the context.

1.11 Guidance should be provided on the boundary treatment of green infrastructure and the interaction between built form and green space as this can have a significant impact on the character, functionality and feel of an area. Discussions of edges need to be supported by more illustrative detail, including sketch sections, so the Code shows how the text descriptions could lead to a potential solution.

1.12 The Design Code should ensure that the design, access and management of the Community Woodland is deliverable as the key landscape element of the scheme, and that it is integrated with the landscape within the more developed site. This is of particular importance as the Taylor Wimpey acquisition does not include all of the Community Woodland, which sits across two ownerships. This would benefit from greater cross-referencing with the LEMP.

1.13 The early implementation and management of the landscape is an important consideration, particularly the Community Woodland which will create a foundation for much of the site's character, reflecting its name. This needs to be planted as soon as possible to allow establishment prior to the building of dwellings, and this should be highlighted in the Design Code, LEMP and Phasing Plan.

1.14 Greater cross reference between the Design Code and emerging LEMP would also be useful to ensure the longevity and successful implementation of landscape features, particularly the Community Woodland and County Wildlife Site (even though not technically part of the TW site). There is mention of a 'rich mosaic of habitats' being delivered across the site, however greater clarity of what is expected would be useful. For example, a reference could be provided within the landscape character and design principles for each character area.

1.15 The Sustainable Drainage (SuDS) strategy plan should be provided within the Design Code. This should be accompanied by information on the different types of SuDS and where these will be delivered, for example open swales along roads, detention basins in open space etc. How will these SuDS be treated on their edges? How do the SuDS lead into the street design? Current images included are quite generic and don't offer much design guidance. This section should be used to inform the detailed technical design of SuDS which will be covered in the reserved matters applications.

Character areas

1.16 The Design Code provides an opportunity to further develop the character areas from the DAS (condition 8 invites it to respond to them) and provide clearer guidance on the character and design which is expected for each.

1.17 Character areas of Woodland Edge, Village Centre, Residential Neighbourhood and Acton Lane seem too simplified to achieve a cohesive development. The Residential Neighbourhood character area in particular needs greater thought, clear reference to how it has been informed by the context, and clearer design objectives, perhaps splitting it into sub-character areas.

1.18 The character areas only cover the residential / built areas, however the landscape which surrounds them is just as important in creating a sense of place than the built form. It will be important to provide guidance on how these character areas will meet. As with the transition between urban / green spaces, the transition between character areas also needs to be considered and how this will shape the experience of the area.

1.19 The phasing plan should show which areas of landscape and other infrastructure will be delivered in each phase to ensure sufficient recreation opportunities, active travel corridors and green space is provided for residents from the first phase, and as the site develops.

1.20 The Market Square and Village Green typologies don't tend to go hand-in-hand, with market squares being more typical of towns with higher density, more tightly grained commercial / residential mix building forms surrounding them, whereas village greens are typically surrounded by smaller scale residential / agricultural units. We suggest greater clarity should be provided on the character for each space, with images chosen to reflect expectations, as well as its purpose and how it will function. For example, omitting images of town market squares if this is not the aesthetic / density that is envisaged (page 74), in favour of images or sketches matching the expectation for this development.

Local and architectural context

1.21 Chilton Woods Study of Local Character was carried out before the Design Code was written; however, we don't see enough evidence of its findings being pulled across into and informing the Code.

1.22 Greater clarity is needed on the character which is to be achieved. Some of the precedent images and section elevations are unhelpful in displaying the desired character and feel of a place, for example figures on Page 50 (Secondary Streets). Some character areas have a confusing set of images which portray different styles, for example Page 69 and 70 (Woodland Edge). Some architectural features highlighted in the section elevations need greater thought and reasoning behind their inclusion, for example Page 71 (Woodland Edge – Character) 'occasional chimneys in key locations' and 'occasional gable features' (see below).

1.23 There seems to be a diverse variety of building styles making up each character area, therefore diluting the purpose and character of the area. There needs to be clearer rules and parameters set for the form and design of buildings, where they will be used and why – drawing on the work already done in assessing local character, which looked at morphology as well as architectural detailing. For example, page 71 states that there will be variations in height, density, building typology and roofscape, but does not explain what these variations will be or how they will be applied in different areas. This leads to examples such as figure 49, where there is a 3-storey 'town house' style building next to smaller terraces / semi-detached style houses next to small cottages, which neither reflects historic precedent nor creates a strongly identifiable, definable character. Similarly, the choice of photographs of existing developments as an example / precedent does not give a clear indication of character – page 69, for example, where there are contemporary designs, a 20th century style suburb and large 'Georgian' villas, all of which have completely different aesthetics. This is especially true of section 6.5 on the village centre, which has examples of high and low density development, broad and narrow plot widths, traditional and contemporary aesthetics etc. that does not give a clear idea of what exactly is envisaged here.

1.24 Likewise, the suggestions for the application of historic detailing and form gives no clear rules and the examples given are poor and add to the confusion. Figure 38, for example, again shows a mix of historically-inspired building types, but all of which have the same windows, eaves line, floor to ceiling heights etc. and have 'occasional' features that are randomly applied. The gable detailing on the vernacular building, for example, which hints at the timber framing tradition of the area but does not accurately imitate the function, proportions or appearance of timber framing nor seem to be an integral part or a contemporary structure or design, or the chimney that appears to descend through a room and the principal entrance hall. This application of historic detailing to a standard modern building form – rather than the placement of features being informed by the function,

layout and design of the buildings – undermines the quality of the scheme and does not help developers or designers in narrowing down what the character is and the design standards that are expected.

1.25 Having had sight of the comments received by the Suffolk Preservation Society (SPS), this reinforces the need for a stronger context and character being reflected through the development. The SPS also want to see bolder action and design.

1.26 We suggest that there are too many 'focal points' in some areas of the masterplan (for example in the west). This could dilute the purpose of their presence in aiding wayfinding. Greater clarity is needed within the Design Code about what these focal points and landmarks will be, which are the most important, and what they would look like (this was covered in greater detail in the presentation, e.g. the use of feature gables, feature windows, coloured buildings, taller buildings and landscape features or trees). Furthermore, what is the purpose of the different 'gateways' within the various character areas, and what are they going to look like?

1.27 More guidance is needed on what the character of the play spaces will be, including whether these will change between the character areas or depending on the scale / location of the play space. The spaces could reflect the historic features of the area or relate to nearby blue infrastructure. Relating them back to the context of the development will help to cement them better into the design.

1.28 Consideration will need to be given to the historic assets and features on or adjacent to the site should development be proposed that would affect those assets or features, either physically or through changes to their setting. For example, on the illustrative masterplan (from the outline application) a footpath is shown to run directly through the scheduled monument to the south. Although it is understood that there is no proposal to provide such a footpath at this time, such changes would require clear and convincing justification, as well as a separate application to Historic England for scheduled monument consent.

1.29 Photographs to illustrate local precedents in the area or as an example of material quality / finish are helpful, but using the form and appearance of developments from elsewhere in the country (Surrey, Wokingham, Broadhempston etc.) gives the impression that this is the kind of development envisaged here, encouraging people to adopt that character rather than the local character for this development.

1.30 In such circumstances, there is no right or wrong answer when it comes to either choosing to take a contemporary approach or aiming for a more traditional look, but it needs to be done with conviction either way. A half-way house that uses modern development patterns, layouts, building dimensions and planforms and just applies historical detailing to the facades results in a confused and unconvincing character and sense of place. There needs to be a stronger idea of what the guiding principles are behind the design approach, and this needs to be carried through from the macro to the micro.

1.31 The research done into the region's character is reflected well within the choices of dark and light colourways and materials, found on page 68. It would be useful to gain a better understanding of why and how the various colour tones have been applied to the different character areas. Within the text it states that the light tones will predominantly be applied to the Residential Neighbourhood areas, however the adjacent plan does not appear to reflect this.

Function of green spaces

1.32 There is a large amount of open green space within the development, however, greater definition as to its intended function is needed. This is essential to avoiding the perception of 'left-over' green space at the end of the development. All the open spaces should have defined recreational, drainage and habitat objectives, these will inform the character and architectural language of adjacent development areas. The interface between development areas and open space should be further explored to establish rules that ensure this important boundary is not compromised.

Village Centre

1.33 Function of the Village Green needs greater clarity. We realise play opportunities have been moved north of the village centre, however the Village Green provides excellent space for some play features with its location adjacent to the school. Is the Village Green planned to serve a purpose e.g. used for community events, people sitting out on etc. or will it just be a feature to give the impression of a traditional village hub (we note the reference to traditional Suffolk village greens and their triangular shape)? It may be better to consider reviewing the location of the road which currently bisects the green and the market square, and perhaps combining the green and market square to form a more cohesive community space at the heart of the scheme. It will also be important to ensure sufficient space is created outside the local amenities for sitting out without too much excess shading from buildings, although dappled shade from trees would be needed.

1.34 The buildings arranged in figure 42 suggest forming a perimeter to what looks to be parking areas. Large gaps are present between the buildings with infill planting. Linked to previous comments, a clearer indication for the intent for this boundary is needed to properly define and energise the neighbouring parkland.

1.35 The development would benefit from a neighbourhood park bordering the woodland, sitting alongside the destination play space, giving the space a greater function and increasing its use. We think the location of the play area needs further exploring to ensure it remains integral to the development and does not feel remote. How visitors access the play area should be considered, with consideration given to those with disabilities, including any need for parking. A clearer sense of the character and definition of this space linked to the design of the woodland is needed to complement the village centre and create a destination space for all.

Community and homes

1.36 Expectations for locating homes and the types of accommodation to be provided would be helpful, for example, locating homes for older people close to the village centre and shop, etc. Signposting to the principles of Building for a Healthy Life (e.g. with a symbol) at relevant points in the Design Code could helpfully illustrate expectations for compliance (7.3 Quality Control).

1.37 Landscape phasing should be added to the phasing masterplan. It is important to ensure that facilities for active travel, recreation and play are delivered from phase one alongside the new homes.

1.38 Natural surveillance and the 'Secured by Design' guidance is described as an important feature of the development. Is enough surveillance given to the destination play space to the north west of the Village Centre?

1.39 The creation of 0.9ha of allotments will create some provision for local food growth, however guidance should be provided on how community food growth will be integrated throughout the development, not just within the eastern corner. This could include smaller-scale community gardens within some of the landscape surrounding residential neighbourhoods. These community spaces are important for enhancing social interactions and community cohesion.

Access and connectivity

1.40 The Design Code should illustrate the site linkages and connectivity beyond the red line boundary, for example how do residents of Chilton Woods get to the train station by foot or bike? How do the public footpaths in the development link with the public footpaths outside the development and footbridges which cross the A134? How are landscape and habitat corridors extended past the red line boundary?

1.41 Access into the County Wildlife Site will need early management to ensure it does not just become a dog walking field. How will this be delivered alongside the phasing of the development? Again, this ties into the need for landscape phasing to be delivered in Phase 1.

1.42 More consideration is required to the cycle network and how this will relate to the layout of the streets and street types. For example, some of the proposed paths for cycling and walking (shown on page 54) are fragmented and don't offer direct enough active travel routes to achieve a 'walkable' neighbourhood. Could some fully connected dedicated cycling routes be provided (accepting these will need to cross some roads)?

1.43 The street type section should be expanded to discuss the integration of green and blue infrastructure. The opportunity exists for swales and other drainage features to be provided that can feed the main SuDs network. The streets are also lacking any detail on how street trees and lighting might be integrated. We would suggest the primary and secondary streets should look to integrate some street tree planting to ensure the development is not reliant on trees in private gardens.

1.44 Pedestrianising part of Acton Lane is a great idea, but again it would be useful to see how this will look through a street level sketch or section.

Climate and sustainability

1.45 The Sustainable Design and Construction section (page 60) could go further to ensure the highest levels of climate resilience and sustainability is achieved throughout the development. At present, there are limited prescriptive measures or standards, more of a list which includes some basic ingredients for a sustainable development. Tightening up the wording from

'Some of the key measures that can help ensure a sustainable community include:' to 'Key measures which will be achieved within the development include:' will help to give greater clarity to what should be achieved as standard.

1.46 Being more precise on what will be achieved is useful, for example there is a clear strategy for EV charging. This degree of clarity should be given to other features such as PV and solar thermal, air source heat pumps etc.

1.47 There is no reference within the Design Code to how shading and cooling will be achieved through tree planting. This should be an integral part of the street, landscape and Village Centre design.

1.48 The Design Guide should discuss how local air quality objectives will be met, for example through enabling active travel, reducing the reliance on polluting modes of transport and using green infrastructure to absorb pollutants.

1.49 Greater clarity is needed over the development of the District Heating Network and any renewable / low carbon energy generation on-site.

Economy and employment

1.50 The concept plan of the Village Centre is difficult to understand and does not offer enough clarity on the proposed function of the spaces and buildings.

1.51 The function of the Market Square needs to be clear: the scale of the space means it won't be able to function as a traditional market square found in larger towns.

1.52 The mix of uses required in the Village Centre on page 74 does not refer to flexible workspace, or how this might be combined with other uses (we note some guidance is provided on page 77).

Design Code Document

1.53 The objectives and principles given at the beginning of the Design Code are important markers of the success of the guidance. They should be reiterated throughout the document and evidence should be given for how they have been achieved.

1.54 Greater cross-referencing between this document and the other supporting documents is needed, particularly the LEMP, LVIA, Chilton Woods Study of Local Character, DAS etc. to more clearly show how these documents have informed the Design Code, and / or how they will sit alongside (e.g. the LEMP).

1.55 Many of the images and precedents used are not helpful in displaying best practice design and character, for example Figure 38, 49 and 54. These figures demonstrate the confused character and poor architectural detailing. The street level sketches offer the most helpful contribution, for example Figure 24, 40, 43 and 51, and should therefore be used to focus the guidance. Annotations on these sketches highlighting the key features would be helpful. Annotations on the masterplan justifying the location of proposed features would also be helpful.

1.56 'Key Items' boxes are good for showing the requirements of the Design Code, but it should be made clearer whether these are mandatory. Will delivering the 'Key Items' be sufficient to deliver the Vision and Objectives?

1.57 Clarifications of terminology would be helpful with some tightening up of language, i.e. rules should be established through stating what 'must', 'should' and 'could' be delivered within key statements.

1.58 It would be useful to include image captions beneath precedent and example images to inform the designer what the Design Code expects. It can sometimes be useful to illustrate poor design examples as well as good ones to be clear about what won't be acceptable. If this is done, simple ticks and crosses on images to show what should and shouldn't be delivered are useful.

1.59 The sketch plans shown on page 57 of car parking scenarios are useful; more of these would help users of the Design Code understand what is required.

1.60 It would be helpful if the parameter plan keys were provided each time they are used (and the colours matched), with labels for clarity.

1.61 A strategy for wayfinding and public art may be a useful addition to help inform the wider landscape character and complement the movement strategy.

Appendix A - Questions

A.1 LUC developed a series of questions to assess the Design Code. Questions are split into five themes:

- Community and homes
- Economy and employment
- Character and place-making
- Access and connectivity
- Climate and sustainability

A.2 These reflect the overarching key objectives set out in the Design Code and Design and Access Statement. Questions within these themes are sourced from and intended to help determine whether the Design Code has achieved its Key Objectives and Design Principles (found on pages 11 and 12 of the Design Code). Some questions also relate to recognised best practice guidance and the National Design Guide.

Achieving what was set out in Condition 8 of the outline planning permission

1. Does the Design Code demonstrate a robust programme of public consultation and stakeholder engagement to inform the guidance? How does it do this?
2. Does the Design Guide demonstrate it has been informed by the character areas and interprets the principles identified on pages 48-54 of the D&A Statement?
3. Does the Design Code give enough consideration to the interrelationship between phases of the development? How does it do this and where can this be found?

Character and place-making

1. Does the Design Code pick up the character areas set out from page 48 of the DAS? How are the special qualities of the character areas portrayed in the DC?

Achieving Design Code Key Objectives and Design Principles

2. Does the Design Code offer enough guidance for creating a sympathetic green edge, therefore giving a sensitive transition between development and neighbouring countryside? How?
3. Does the Design Code give guidance on how to reflect the character of the existing landscape? E.g. Retaining the 'open' character of the former WW11 airfield.
4. Does the Design Code provide direction for creating gateways into the development? How do gateways differ between character areas?
5. Does the Design Code create a 'village' character? How does this fit with the character analysis carried out in the DAS?
6. Does the Design Code reflect Suffolk's traditional architecture with modern interpretations? How does it relate back to building design, form and materials set out in the Suffolk Design Guide? (<https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/planning-waste-and-environment/planning-and-development-advice/suffolk-design-guide-for-residential-areas/>)

Achieving a 'well-designed place' according to the National Design Guide

7. Does the Design Code use baseline studies of context and character as a starting point for design?
8. How does the Design Code integrate the development with its surroundings? Particularly in reference to local history, culture and heritage?

9. Does the Design Code ensure 'recognisable' streets, there achieving a navigable street network?
10. Does the Design Code provide guidance on delivering a hierarchy of public spaces?

Community and homes

Achieving Design Code Key Objectives and Design Principles

1. Does the Design Code offer sufficient guidance for the delivery of a mixed-use, multifunctional village centre? Where and how is this done within the document?
2. Does the Design Guide provide guidance for the delivery of:
 - Community woodland
 - A village green
 - Children's play areas
 - Walking and cycling routes
 - Sports provisions including football pitches, cricket oval, pavilion and parking
 - Allotments

Achieving best practice

3. Does the Design Code offer sufficient encouragement for the delivery of sustainable food growth, including allotments, community gardens and private gardens?
4. Does the Design Code offer sufficient guidance on the delivery of education facilities? How does it show this?

Achieving a 'well-designed place' according to the National Design Guide

5. How does the Design Code reinforce the importance of health and wellbeing within the new development?
6. How does the Design Code ensure social interaction and community cohesion is achieved?
7. Does the Design Code offer sufficient guidance in delivering homes for multiple generations, including assisted living, accessible living and multi-generational living? Where does it show this?

Accessibility and connectivity

Achieving Design Code Key Objectives and Design Principles

1. Does the Design Code facilitate the implementation of 'walkable neighbourhoods'? Is enough guidance provided to successfully deliver them? Are there standards for what should be provided within a 'walkable neighbourhood'?
2. Does the Design Code ensure the road layout directs traffic onto the main highway network, avoiding rural routes? How is this done?

Achieving best practice

3. Does the Design Code ensure standards are met in relation to accessibility to open space and play space e.g. 400m to local open space etc.?
4. Does the Design Code ensure streets are not dominated or cluttered by cars and parked vehicles? Is sufficient emphasis given to the discouragement of using personal vehicles?
5. Is enough guidance given for the successful implementation of walking and cycling routes? Where is this done in the DC?

Achieving a 'well-designed place' according to the National Design Guide

6. How does the Design Code ensure accessible local public transport, services and facilities? Is a sufficient choice of sustainable transport modes provided?
7. Is accessibility and inclusion considered as part of the movement network? How is consideration given to safety?
8. Is green infrastructure used as a method for softening car parking?

Climate and sustainability

Achieving Design Code Key Objectives and Design Principles

1. Does the Design Code provide sufficient guidance on how GI will be delivered to provide a multi-functional green space network (54% of total site area)?
2. Does the Design Code respond to local air quality objectives? How does it do this?
3. Does the Design Code provide guidance on the implementation of a District Heating Network and renewable / low-carbon energy generation?
4. Does the Design Code provide sufficient guidance on implementing SuDS into design in a manner which will offer climate resilience?
5. How does the Design Code provide guidance on designing homes and landscapes which provide natural cooling and shading?
6. Does the Design Code provide sufficient guidance on the type of habitats that should be delivered across the site, particularly in relation to the Country Wildlife Site? Is respect given to the setting of habitat? Are these appropriate choices for the area?

Achieving best practice

7. Does the Design Code provide sufficient guidance for incorporating sustainable practices into home design?
8. Does the Design Code include features for sustainable travel in design, including car charging points, car clubs, bike storage etc.
9. Does the Design Code offer sufficient consideration to the storage and management of waste?
10. Does the Design Code take future climate and weather into account, e.g. hotter, drier summers will require careful water management and provision of shade, whereas warmer wetter winters will require storm-resilient infrastructure?

Achieving a 'well-designed place' according to the National Design Guide

11. Are open spaces multifunctional and easy to access?
12. How is consideration given to the sustainable use of resources including materials, land, energy and water?
13. How does the Design Code prepare for an adaptable development over time to address changes in demand and use?
14. How does the Design Code prepare for future changes in technology?
15. Does the Design Code take long-term management and stewardship of both buildings and the landscape into account? Is any guidance given on management practices?

Economy and employment

Achieving Design Code Key Objectives and Design Principles

1. Does the Design Code offer guidance for flexible employment space / workspace in the Village Centre? How?

Does the Design Code meet the requirements of the National Design Guidance ten characteristics for well-designed place?



National Design Guide (Oct 2019) p.8