| ID | | Section/Para | Theme | Consultation Responses | Decision | Reccomended Responses | Amendments to the responses |
|-----|---------------------------|--|-----------------|--|----------|---|-----------------------------|
| | ent Natural England | | Support | Natural England is generally supportive of the East Village Design Codes, and the opportunities that it provides for enhancing local green spaces and biodiversity assets in the High Town area, whilst ensuring development is undertaken sustainably. In particular we support the concept of the East Village Streetscape Strategy, and the delivery of this strategy through Area Wide Design Code 7. We are also supportive of the objectives for sustainability embedded within Design Codes 9-14. | Noted | | |
| 1.2 | Natural England | Part A 2.4.6 Living Streetscape. Page 21 | Streetscap e | In discussing the development mix and quantum (page 21) it would be useful provide some contextual information regarding the need for green infrastructure and how this is being addressed, with reference to standards such as Natural England's "Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards" (ANGSt). | Accepted | Add paragraph at 1.4 Local Amenities and wider Accessibility (page 9): "The creation of the East Village will help the Council in increasing the number of houses in the Borough which satisfy the "Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards" (ANGST) set by Natural England to ensure that households have access to public green spaces within certain distances from home. In particular residents of the East Village will benefit from an accessible natural greenspace of 5.6 hectares no more than 5 minutes walk away from the site:People's Park and Pope's Meadow (above the ANGST benchmark of 2 hectares), from the presence of Stopsely Common and Bradgers Hill (20 hectares) within 2 km of the site and from Stockwood Park, almost 100 hectares within 5 km of the site. (Distances have been calculated from the centre of the site, and not on individual plots at this stage). | |

| ID | Respond ent | Section/Para graph | Theme | Consultation Responses | Decision | Reccomended Responses | Amendments to the responses |
|-----|---------------------|--------------------|----------|--|----------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1.3 | Natural England | | | Building Design Codes should include additional advice on "designing for biodiversity". By incorporating ecologically sensitive design and features for biodiversity early on within a development scheme, significant improvements for biodiversity can be achieved, along with easier integration with wider environmental, design and planning aspects. For example designing for biodiversity can include the retention of sensitive or valuable habitats present, or enhancements for protected species that may be present, whilst integrating other development design requirements such as drainage and engineering. By addressing ecological aspects early on, design aspects such as site layout can be tailored to provide enhancements and improvements for biodiversity that may not be possible later on within the design process. Such measures could include requirements for the provision of features such as swift bricks and other bird nesting features, bat roosting features, and green walls and roofs. | Accepted | There are no protected nor valuable species within the boundary of the East Village, which currently is mostly covered in tarmac. The introduction of public green areas and private garden will dramatically increase the biodiversity in the area. The suggestions made to introduce features in the building themselves that could attract particular species are welcome. Add wording to next to last bullet point (Variety of roof types and shapes)"Developers are required to include features such as swift bricks and other bird nesting and bat roosting features to increase the level of biodiversity in the area to each house." | |
| 2 | English Heritage | | movement | While the Movement and Layout plan replicates the existing street grid and provides good levels of permeability, there is scope to add a pedestrian route from the northern end of the pedestrian bridge from the railway station linking through to the new High Town Square. This route would be parallel with the existing High Town Road but set behind the rear of the existing buildings facing on to High Town Road, and passing the new 1- storey high mews style properties in this area. There may also be a scope to create a small pedestrian square leading into this route opposite the end of the bridge from the station. | | The courtyard and the mews will be accessible by High Town Road only. The rationale of this being the concentration of the footfall on High Town Road. Visual permeability could still be ensured towards the High Town Green, through the use of railings. | |

| ID | Respond ent | Section/Para graph | Theme | Consultation Responses | Decision | | Amendments to the responses |
|-----|---------------------|--|-----------------------|--|----------|---|-----------------------------|
| | English Heritage | Part A Section 2.4.3. Parking Plan | | The masterplan provides for either a hotel or sheltered housing on the south side of the new High Town Square. In the event that this site is developed for a hotel, it is not clear how the additional parking would be provided (eg, would it require undercroft parking?) | Noted | The Hotel (if brought forward) could benefit from some of the parking spaces within the courtyard and also negotiate with the Multistorey Car park currently being build on Midland Road. | |
| 2.2 | English Heritage | | Building Heights | We are concerned that the 4 storey block height indicated for the most westerly block fronting on to Midland Road will overpower the existing buildings within the High Town Conservation Area (that lie immediately to the west) and this area of the Design Code should be reviewed. It may be that this is designated a 'Special Place' and given a site specific code. | Accepted | Change the building line 4 with building line 5 (Interface with the Conservation Area) Change blocks allowed into "e" and "f" and delete "h", to half of the block (immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area). Change Building Line 5 to forbid set backs. Also cancel building type "c" from blocks ruled by building line 5 | |
| 2.3 | English Heritage | | Conservati on Area | While we support the use of high quality materials, we have concerns over the use of salvaged brickwork. Brickworks acquires a patina of staining over time and new structrues built of salvaged brickwork rarely look satisfactory, since the darker stained bricks are frequently placed out of context. | Accepted | Change last paragraph of page 38 (Appereance) into "The use of locally used materials should be promoted, especially in the interface within the conservation area and in corner buildings. Materials could include Grey, Red, Brown and Green Glazed bricks to match bricks in the High Town Road Conservation Area." Change third bullet point of page 54 (Conservation Area Interface) to "Use materials that complement those in the conservation area. Use of high quality brick of muted tones with recessed mortar joint of complementary colour are recommended. Red or grey tones are particularly appropriate." | |

| ID | Respond ent | Section/Para graph | Theme | Consultation Responses | Decision | Reccomended Responses | Amendments to the responses |
|-----|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|----------|--|-----------------------------|
| 2.4 | English Heritage | | Conservati on Area | When recommending the use of chimneys it is also important to provide guidance on their location, i.e. chimneys should be located on ridges to roofs and/pr centrally on gables | Accepted | Change 4th bullet point at page 54 Conservation Area Interface. After "Upright chimneys or other features may punctuate the skyline" add " preferably located on ridges to roofs and/or centrally on gables" | |
| 2.5 | English Heritage | | Conservati | Finally in this section we would recommend that any signage to buildings on the interface with conservation areas in not internally illuminated | Accepted | Add sentence to last bullet point of Conservation Area Interface, page 54, "No internally illuminated signage will be allowed" | |
| 3.1 | Thames Water | General Comments | | The importance of considering sewerage infrastructure provision in Local Development Frameworks is highilghted by paragraph 4.9 of the new PPS 12, which states that in preparing Local Development Documents: "LPAs should ensure that delivery of housing & other strategic and regional requirements is not compromised by unrealistic expectations about the future availability of infrastructure, transportation and resources. Annex B sets out further guidance on resources, utilities and infrastructure provision." Paragraphs B3 to B8 of PPS12 also place specific emphasis on the need to take account of infrastructure such as sewerage early on in preparing Local Development Documents. Paragraph B3 in particular states: "The provision of infrastructure is important in all major new developments. The capacity of existing infrastructure and the need for additional facilities should be taken into account in the preparation of all local development documents." | | | |

| ID | Respond ent | Section/Para | Theme | Consultation Responses | Decision | Reccomended Responses | Amendments to the responses |
|-----|----------------|------------------|------------------------------|--|----------|--|-----------------------------|
| 3.2 | | graph Part B AW8 | Utilities and Services | Further to our comments on the previous version of the SPD Thames Water supports the inclusion of the Utilities and Services (AW8) within the Area Wide Design Codes and in particular the requirement for developers to produce a utilities and services strategy is strongly supported. It is important to consider how the site/area will be served with respect to sewerage infrastructure. It is vital that any upgrades to the existing infrastructure, if necessary, are in place ahead of the development, failure to do so can lead to sewage flooding of properties and pollution of the wider environment. Developers utilities and services strategies should therefore be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure. | accepted | It is felt that sufficient insurance has been given through the SPD at point K - Infrastructure -Section 06 (Development Principles) which states that "planning permission will not be granted unless it can be demonstrated that the infrastructure provision either meets the needs of the development or will be provided in time to serve the development". | |

| ID | _ | Section/Para | Theme | Consultation Responses | Decision | Reccomended Responses | Amendments to the responses |
|-----|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---|----------|---|-----------------------------|
| | ent | graph | | | | | |
| 3.3 | Thames Water | Part B AW13 | Rersource Efficiency | TWUL supports the requirement for new homes to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 as a minimum, however in meeting this standard it is considered that they should achieve a full points score on the water conservation section. The requirement for proposals for new residential development to achieve at least Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and to include water efficiency measures should also be considered. | | The decision of setting a benchmark within the government standard and not above was a sort of premium for developers who will start investing in this period of not buoyant economy. Given the time span of this project and the current preference on building social housing it is likely that the majority of houses will comply with Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes anyway. Specific requirements for the introduction of water efficiency measures are stated at page 37 (AW13 Resource Efficiency). Insert new bullet point stating "Developers are required to achieve the full points core within the CfSH/BREEAM water conservation sections by providing the following water savings and run-off water reduction measures: grey water and rain water harvesting systems, low flush toilets, sprinkler basin taps". Change last bullet point of Table AW13 to "See Design Code Sheet AW13 for detailed requirements". And delete the picture showing solar panel from the sheet. | |
| 4.1 | Environm ent Agency | General Comments | Support | Generally we are supportive of the principles outlined in the Design Code. It is good to see some positive and challenging concepts applied that will help this area regenerate as a better place in the future | Noted | | |

| ID | - | Section/Para | Theme | Consultation Responses | Decision | Reccomended Responses | Amendments to the responses |
|-----|----------|--------------|------------|--|----------|--|-----------------------------|
| | ent | graph | | | | | |
| 4.2 | Environm | | | Given the existing issues with surface water flooding in | | Add paragraph at page 10, Section | |
| | ent | | | Luton, it is important that the design codes require a | | 1.5 Ground Conditions "Developers | |
| | Agency | | | strong committment to the use of sustainable drainage | | are invited to establish baseline | |
| | | | | systems (SUDS) within the development area. Green | | information | |
| | | | | roofs were required to be looked at as part of the High | | covering the potential of infiltration | |
| | | | | Town SPD and it is important to carry this through into | | drainage measures at the same time | |
| | | | | the design codes. Our new green roof toolkit would be a | | as ground condition investigations. | |
| | | | | good starting point for generating some guidelines for | | Developers should acknowledge the | |
| | | | | green roof design. We feel that any building within this | | Design and Development Principles | |
| | | | | area with a flat roof or appropriate roof slope should | | set by the High Town SPD (Section | |
| | | | | incorporate a green roof. As well as green roofs, the | | 05-06) before submitting a planning | |
| | | | | use of swales, ponds, basins and soakaways should be | | application". | |
| | | | | promoted, as they can contribute to flood risk reduction, | | | |
| | | | | improvements in biodiversity and provide public amenity | | | |
| | | | | spaces. Infiltration drainage should be promoted | | | |
| | | | | wherever possible. This could be tied in with section 1.5 | | | |
| | | | | on ground conditions. The council should encourage the | | | |
| | | | | exploration of infiltration drainage potential at the same | | | |
| | | | | time as local ground conditions are determined. This | | | |
| | | | | would save time and money for developers and ensure | | | |
| 4.2 | Environm | | Surface | that surface water drainage was addressed early in the | | | |
| | ent | | Water and | design process. Promoting SUDS in this development | | | |
| | Agency | | Flood Risk | area would support the findings of the Thames | | | |
| | | | | Catchment Flood Management Plan policy unit for | | | |
| | | | | Luton as well as the Luton and South Beds Strategic | | | |
| | | | | Flood Risk Assessment | | | |

| ID | Respond ent | Section/Para graph | Theme | Consultation Responses | Decision | Reccomended Responses | Amendments to the responses |
|----|---------------------------|--------------------|--|--|----------|--|-----------------------------|
| | | Part A Sec 1.5 | er protection and contaminat ed land | Historically, much of this area was residential and is not likely to have much of a contamination legacy. However, the Inner Source Protection zone (SPZ1) for the Crescent Road Abstraction underlies this part of Luton and the geology above does not provide any natural protection from contamination at or near the surface. Our document; Groundwater Protection: Policies and Practice, Section 4 should be used to ensure that proposed developments are located in accordance with our policies for the protection of controlled waters. | | Add paragraph at 1.5 Ground Conditions at page 10 "Developers should refer to Section 4 of the 'Groundwater Protection: Policies and Practice' (Environment Agency, July 2008) to ensure that new developments don't have a detrimental impact on controlled waters. In addition, the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control - Annex 2: Development on Land affected by Contamination (ODPM, 2004), and CLR 11, The Model Procedures for the Management of Contaminated Land (Environment Agency, 2004) should be met. | |
| | Environm ent Agency | | | We would like to see a specific reference to the following documents as these will guide the production of contaminated land assessments that meet our requirements; Groundwater Protection: Policies and Practice, Environment Agency, July 2008, (GP3); Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control - Annex 2: Development on Land Affected by contamination. ODPM, 2004, (PPS23); CLR 11, The Model Procedures for the Management of Contaminated Land, Environment Agency Sept 2004. | Accepted | As above | |

| ID | - | Section/Para | Theme | Consultation Responses | Decision | Reccomended Responses | Amendments to the responses |
|-----|----------|--------------|------------|---|----------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | ent | graph | | | | | |
| 4.5 | Environm | | Water | Water efficiency measures must be included. Existing | Accepted | See changed accepted at point 3.3. | |
| | ent | | Efficiency | rates of water abstraction are considered to be causing | | Add paragraph to page 59 and 60 | |
| | Agency | | | unacceptable environmental impacts (for more | | (Special Places 5 & 6) stating: | |
| | | | | information see the Upper Lee CAMS document - | | "Design should integrate sustainable | |
| | | | | available from www.environment- | | urban drainage (SUDS) principles to | |
| | | | | agency.gov.uk/CAMS). Ensuring that residential homes | | attenuate storm water run-off and to | |
| | | | | meet a minimum Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable | | provide a reservoir for watering | |
| | | | | Homes will help to mitigate their impact on water | | green spaces" | |
| | | | | resources. Water butts should be provided for all | | | |
| | | | | houses, and communal rainwater harvesting for | | | |
| | | | | watering of communal parks and gardens. All | | | |
| | | | | commercial buildings will need to incorporate water | | | |
| | | | | saving measures (low flush toilets, sprinkler basin taps, | | | |
| | | | | grey water and rainwater harvesting systems). | | | |
| 5.1 | EEDA | | | No Comment | Noted | | |
| 6 | Highway | | Support | In principle a concentration of new housing and | Noted | | |
| | Agency | | | employment in a town centre location close to key | | | |
| | | | | facilities, rail station and bus services is worthy of | | | |
| | | | | support because this means it is then less likely to be | | | |
| | | | | built in fringe sites where there is inevitably more | | | |
| | | | | reliance on the car. | | | |