

High Quality Places

Ref:
(For official use only)

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Draft Stage Representation Form

Name of the document this relates to:

High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Please return to: Head of Strategic Planning,
Winchester City Council,
City Offices, Colebrook Street,
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 9LJ
or by email to designspd@winchester.gov.uk

no later than 5pm on Friday 5 December 2014.

This form has two parts –
Part A – Personal Details

Part B – Your representation(s). **Please fill in a separate Part B for each representation you wish to make.**

Part A

1. Personal Details*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

**If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

Title	<input type="text" value="MR"/>	<input type="text"/>
First Name	<input type="text" value="NEIL"/>	<input type="text"/>
Last Name	<input type="text" value="HOLMES"/>	<input type="text"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation (where relevant)	<input type="text" value="QUAYSIDE ARCHITECTS"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="141 BURGESS ROAD"/> <input type="text" value="SOUTHAMPTON"/>	<input type="text"/>
Post Code	<input type="text" value="SO16 7AA"/>	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

E-mail Address
(This will enable us to
contact you regarding
future stages of the SPD)

mail@quaysidearchitects.com

Our representation is attached.

Data Protection

The information collected will be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The forms will be stored electronically. All representations received will be made available for public inspection, and therefore cannot be treated as confidential. They will be posted on the Council's website and will be available, on request, for public inspection: signatures, email addresses and phone numbers will be redacted.

COMMENTS ON HIGH QUALITY PLACES SPD

1. **The High Quality Places SPD** (HQP.SPD) is 94 pages long. It is at least three times longer than necessary. Its failings are numerous. I have listed a few below.
2. **The HQP.SPD** makes reference (p.2) to JCS Policy CP13 which states that:
*"New development will be expected to **meet the highest standards of design**".*
3. **The examples shown** in the SPD are not *"the highest standards of design"* - many strive to attain an acceptable standard of design.
4. **The majority of photographs** in the SPD are superfluous. Photographs of Gothenburg (p. 21 & 45), Oslo (p.24), Copenhagen (p.31), San Francisco (p.55) are gratuitous and should be removed. Photographs of Poundbury (p.21, 31 & 42) are of little relevance to development in Winchester and are, presumably, included because there are few examples of good quality design (or simply to pad out the document).
5. **Paragraph 1.31** states that: *"It is not intended to override specific advice from expert consultees in relation to technical disciplines"*.

This infers that it is intended to override specific advice from **expert design consultees** - such as architects.
6. **The Authors of the SPD** and their qualifications are not listed. Given that its intention is to override expert design consultees, we might reasonably question the qualifications and expertise of its Authors.
7. **Part 2 of the SPD** seeks to instruct designers how to arrive at *"design solutions"*. It is a matter of fact that a good design solution does not require an audit trail and a bad design solution is not made better by an audit trail.

The bureaucratic approach to design advocated is no guarantee of success. Most of the advice is superfluous, banal and appropriate for First Year Urban Design Course. Para 3.12 for example informs the reader that: *The grain is essentially the pattern and arrangement of built form and the spaces between.* It is not clear who this level of advice is aimed at. (ref. (f) to (q) on pages 15- for further examples).
8. **The document does not give guidance on the Authorities design priorities** for instance what is the Authorities preference when Para 4.31 advice on orientation conflicts with its para. 4.36 advice on orientation and its adopted Policy CP11.