

### Appendix 3: Amendments and updates made to Design Guide SPD since the version seen at 9<sup>th</sup> November Cabinet and the version proposed to be taken to 25<sup>th</sup> November Full Council

Original	Change made	Commentary / implications
	Logo's added to front cover	No change to meaning or interpretation
	Contents page more detailed	No change to meaning or interpretation
	Section 2.3 moved so that it immediately follows section 2.2	No change to meaning or interpretation
	<p>Paragraph added to 2.3 as below:</p> <p>The photographs below figure 2 provide snapshots of the built and natural condition of each area. These are just to provide a flavour of local character and are not necessarily fully representative.</p>	<p>No commentary about the photographs was given in the previous version. The new text provides clarification about the photographs. No change in meaning or interpretation, just clarification where it previously didn't exist.</p>
	Landscape character areas map improved to be clearer to read	<p>It's the same map.</p> <p>No change to meaning or interpretation</p>
	Some landscape photos added to the built example photos – so two photos for each character area instead of 1 (figure numbers removed and so figure numbers change throughout the document).	Extra photos added showing landscape. Enrichment of information

		given, but no change to meaning or interpretation.
<p><b>Prince William of Gloucester Barracks vision:</b></p> <p><i>Redevelopment of Prince William of Gloucester Barracks (PWGB) seeks to deliver a <b>sustainable and viable new community</b> comprising 3500-4000 new homes and employment space centered around <b>parks, woodlands</b> and a <b>community hub</b>. It will be a distinctive scheme building on <b>Garden Village principles</b> and reflect the site's <b>military history</b>. It will be well connected to Grantham town centre and Spitalgate Heath through <b>new cycling and walking routes</b> and woodland corridors, while also integrating with the surrounding countryside and existing communities.</i></p> <p><i>The masterplan will promote <b>physical health and mental well being</b>, supporting a diverse community and <b>lifetime neighbourhoods</b> focused around <b>high quality modern homes</b>, local facilities and schools. A focus on natural landscapes will help to deliver an overall <b>biodiversity net gain</b>. <b>Innovation</b> will be embedded through the design, delivery models and construction processes. <b>Smart technology</b> will be used to support sustainable <b>low carbon</b> lifestyles and underpin a strong community.</i></p>	<p><b>Section 3.3</b> Vision example changed to a more generic one:</p> <p>New example:</p> <p><b>DESIGN VISION</b></p> <p><i>The site will house a <b>compact neighbourhood</b> in a <b>parkland setting</b>. The neighbourhood will <b>expand holistically</b> from the existing service housing with redevelopment focussing on the <b>brownfield land</b>. This will <b>increase permeability</b> to the parkland to the north. Some <b>interventions</b> will be made to upgrade the site frontage and create an <b>outward-facing</b> development with <b>well-defined</b> public spaces and private plots.</i></p> <p><i><b>Community</b> facilities and services that were previously on site will be <b>retained</b> in some form and disused buildings could be <b>re-purposed</b> to house these in amongst a <b>high-quality housing</b> offer.</i></p> <p><i>The <b>architecture</b> will be clearly of its time and yet <b>distinctively local</b> by making the best of the latest building technology to minimise resource use and making a positive addition to <b>local character</b>. The area will have a very <b>legible</b> plan with direct, convenient walking routes to the <b>local centre</b> which will be formed around an <b>attractive public realm</b>, together acting as a focus for the <b>identity</b> of this neighbourhood which forms a part of the wider former village suburb.</i></p> <p><i>The site will be <b>integrated</b> closely with the wider area by walking routes, across the common (which itself will be retained as a <b>landscape corridor</b> for wildlife) and via the canal tow-path to the north. A new <b>railway halt</b> will be provided alongside an <b>electric bus</b> service that will link residents with the schools and centres of the surrounding towns.</i></p>	<p>The vision changed to be more generic, rather than focusing on a specific site for which the vision may change slightly over time.</p> <p>This is just an example and not specific advice, the accompanying text sets out the advice about producing a vision and this remains unchanged.</p> <p>Changing the example doesn't change the meaning or interpretation of the advice in the text. There are comparable elements within the old and new example visions. The text states that visions should be locally specific, therefore this is the overriding factor.</p>

	<p><b>Section 3.3</b> under Design development section – some extra text added to end of last paragraph:</p> <p>It could also include a series of simple themed strategies, such as a biodiversity strategy, landscape and SuDS strategy, tree strategy, movement strategy, key spaces strategy, play strategy – focussing in on these important elements individually ensures that they are comprehensively addressed and considered strategically in order to guide the detailed design work.</p>	<p>This section was already talking about a ‘broad structure of layout’ and ‘structural elements’ and on a series of themes. The new text simply provides some examples of themed plans/strategies.</p> <p>The word ‘could’ is used and therefore non-compulsory.</p> <p>No change to meaning or interpretation.</p>
	<p>Section 4 cover photo changed</p>	<p>No change to meaning or interpretation.</p>
<p><b>4.4. Building for a Healthy Life</b>  Building for a Healthy Life (BHL) is the new (2020) name for Building for Life, the government-endorsed industry standard for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods. The new name reflects the crucial role that the built environment has in promoting wellbeing.</p> <p>The BHL toolkit, which is relevant to developments of 10 dwellings or more, sets out 12 questions to help guide discussions on planning applications and to help local planning authorities to assess the quality of proposed (and completed) developments, but can also provide useful</p>	<p><b>Section 4.4</b> – end of section text cut off and now in:</p> <p><b>4.4. Building for a Healthy Life</b>  Building for a Healthy Life (BHL) is the new (2020) name for Building for Life, the government-endorsed industry standard for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods. The new name reflects the crucial role that the built environment has in promoting wellbeing.</p> <p>The BHL toolkit, which is relevant to developments of 10 dwellings or more, sets out 12 questions to help guide discussions on planning applications and to help local planning authorities to assess the quality of proposed (and completed) developments, but can also provide useful prompts and questions for planning applicants to consider during the different stages of the design process.</p> <p>Both Rutland and South Kesteven Local Plans expect new residential development to perform positively against the BHL criteria and performance is monitored.</p>	<p>The end of the paragraph just completes the sentence. It states national policy. The reference to Local Plans is a statement of fact and does not change meaning or interpretation.</p>

<p>Paragraph 131 of the NPPF encourages applicants and local planning authorities to <i>“work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users.”</i></p>	<p><b>5F – quote of NPPF lengthened to include:</b></p> <p>Paragraph 131 of the NPPF says that “planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined” and encourages applicants and local planning authorities to <i>“work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users.</i></p>	<p>This simply lengthens the quote of paragraph 131 of the NPPF. It is quoting national policy and therefore no change in meaning or interpretation.</p>
	<p><b>5G – some photo examples switched with better ones</b></p>	<p>No change to meaning or interpretation.</p>
<p>Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) cover a range of approaches to managing surface water to reduce flood risk whilst improving water quality and amenity.</p> <p>The best approach is to collect and re-use water but, if this is not possible, infiltration and attenuation/controlled release should be used as well unless it can be proved that it will not work for locally-specific reasons.</p> <p>In general, the aim should be to discharge surface run-off as high up the hierarchy of sustainable drainage options as reasonably practicable, with priority given to: infiltration into the ground first; then to a surface water body; then to a surface water sewer, highway drain or another drainage system; or finally, to a combined sewer.</p> <p>It should be integrated with green infrastructure and corridors and planned in from the earliest stage to make sure that enough space is made available in the right places.</p>	<p><b>5G</b></p> <p>Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) cover a range of approaches to managing surface water to reduce flood risk whilst improving water quality, amenity <b>and biodiversity</b></p> <p>The best approach is to collect and re-use water but, if this is not possible <b>for all water</b>, infiltration and attenuation/controlled release should be used as well unless it can be proved that it will not work for locally-specific reasons.</p> <p>In general, the aim should be to <b>infiltrate water into the ground, thus mimicking what nature does</b>. So, priority should be given to: infiltration into the ground first; then to a surface water body; then to a surface water sewer, highway drain or another drainage system; or finally, to a combined sewer.</p> <p>It should be integrated with green <b>and blue</b> infrastructure and planned in from the earliest stage to make sure that enough space is made available in the right places.</p>	<p>The text amends simply add emphasis to previously covered advice and make statements clearer.</p> <p>No change to meaning or interpretation.</p>
	<p><b>5H – diagram amended to not have shared pavement and cycleways and to have shared carriageways/cycleways instead</b></p>	<p>The diagram is labelled as being ‘indicative’. Although this is a change in where cycle lanes are located, the</p>

<p><b>Main Street</b> serves as a navigational point within the site and also a characterful feature.</p> <p>Key elements of a Main Street/Avenue could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street trees;</li> <li>• Wider pavements including roadside swales;</li> <li>• Segregated cycle routes;</li> </ul>	<p><b>New text:</b></p> <p><b>Main Street</b> serves as a navigational point within the site and also a characterful feature.</p> <p>Key elements of a Main Street/Avenue could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street trees;</li> <li>• Wider pavements including roadside swales;</li> <li>• Carriageway with segregated cycle lanes;</li> </ul>	<p>emphasis of this section is about the street hierarchy and the qualities that a main street has.</p> <p>The actual section that covers cycle infrastructure design is at 5P and this subject is therefore covered more comprehensively there. Reference is made to detailed national guidance LTN 1/20 at 5P also and therefore the amended diagram at 5H is not the only part of the document that states where cycle lanes could be located.</p> <p>The change was made to bring the diagram at 5H more in line with new national guidance LTN 1/20 referenced in 5P.</p> <p>No change to meaning or interpretation.</p>
	<p><b>5J – diagram improved</b></p>	<p>Diagram illustrating the same point.</p> <p>No change to meaning or interpretation.</p>
	<p><b>5K – pictures replaced and improved</b></p>	<p>No change to meaning or interpretation.</p>
<p>Paving materials should be permeable and complementary to the building design;</p>	<p><b>5Q – on plot section – 5<sup>th</sup> para</b></p> <p>Paving materials <b>could</b> be permeable and complementary to the building design;</p>	<p>This list of bullet points are ‘principles to consider’.</p>

		<p>Therefore the use of 'should' fell under the precursor of 'consider' making it not compulsory – changing to 'could' just makes it clearer that it is a 'principle to consider'</p> <p>No change to meaning or interpretation.</p>
	<p><b>6B - diagram removed</b>  <b>6F Diagram replaced with photo</b>  <b>6G – diagrams replaced with new ones</b>  <b>6H – diagram replaced with new ones</b></p>	<p>No change to meaning or interpretation.</p> <p>6B – the diagram was explaining the text but was poorly drawn – the text remains the key advice.</p> <p>6F – diagram and photo showing the same thing</p> <p>6G – diagrams in a different style but illustrating similar things – the text remains the key advice with the diagrams being examples.</p> <p>6H – the diagram replaced a similar previous one but in different style. The new label is similar to text in the guide and not new.</p>
	<p><b>ANNEX – whole RCC column changed to be in line with older adopted policies rather than the withdrawn LP</b></p>	<p>Change to all policy references for Rutland – referring to older adopted Core Strategy and Development Plan</p>

		<p>Documents instead of the withdrawn Local Plan.</p> <p>The policy references are different, although the essence of the table is the same in that these back up the guidance in the SPD.</p> <p>No change to meaning or interpretation.</p>
	<p><b>Some general typos and broken links throughout document</b></p>	<p>No change to meaning or interpretation.</p>