

## Sustainable Construction SPD Public Consultation Comments and Responses

Respondent	Comment IDs	Relevant Part of SPD	Summarised Comments	MKC Response
Philip Murphy, Fred Roche Foundation	1	5.2, page 25	<p>You are proposing that all applications involving demolition of existing buildings must demonstrate that the buildings cannot be repurposed, however unsuitable that they may be in terms of conversion. This adds to current problems being caused by permitted development rights and the conversion of offices, soon to be retail as well, into poor quality housing. I'm sure that this is not the intent but could be an unintended consequence. We believe that this needs clarification.</p>	<p>Currently Part B of Policy SC1 in Plan:MK states land and buildings should be reused wherever feasible and consistent with maintaining and enhancing local character and distinctiveness. This policy requirement cannot be changed until the next version of the Local Plan is adopted.</p> <p>Section 5.2 of the pre-consultation draft version SPD goes into more detail on this point. This requirement is paraphrased as 'adaptive reuse' which is considered accurate. It also states developers should consider the following when assessing if a building is suitable for adaptive reuse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building condition</li> <li>• Market demand for new function</li> <li>• Current building regulations</li> <li>• Functional and technical feasibility</li> <li>• Efficient redesign</li> <li>• Financial feasibility</li> </ul>

<p>Philip Murphy, Fred Roche Foundation</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>5.2, page 25</p>	<p>It also states the proposal should compare the embodied and operational carbon emissions of adaptive reuse of the building versus demolition and rebuild.</p> <p>Upon reflection, some of these (market demand for new function, building regs, financial feasibility) are not material planning considerations and should be removed as requirements. Comparing carbon emissions also exceeds the requirements of Part B of SC1 and should be removed (as this doesn't relate to feasibility or character).</p> <p>The importance of existing building character should also be emphasised in section 5.2, as a consideration that determines whether we would push for a building to be retained. Obviously, the more positive a contribution a building has for the local area character (e.g. if it has architectural merit, is listed or is in a Conservation Area and makes a positive contribution), the more we'd push for adaptive reuse. We should also make clear that if a building has no/little merit, we will afford less weight to retention, particularly</p>
---	----------	-------------------------	---

Philip Murphy, Fred Roche Foundation	1	5.2, page 25		<p>if a rebuild development would improve the character of the area and provide more suitable spaces for the proposed use(s).</p> <p>These changes should mitigate concerns that this section could be too onerous for applicants.</p>
Philip Murphy, Fred Roche Foundation	2	5.5, page 32	<p>You are encouraging more use of green roofs and walls. As good as these measures are in terms of biodiversity and water attenuation, we understand that they are now considered as fire risks and in summer conditions can assist in the spread of flame, following a number of recent fires in apartment blocks. This section may need to be reviewed.</p>	<p>Part E of Policy SC1 states that developments should incorporate green roofs/walls into the structure of buildings where technically feasible, to improve water management, provide for biodiversity and aid resilience and adaptation to climate change.</p> <p>It is important to note that fire safety of building materials is primarily a building regulations, rather than planning, consideration. However, to avoid encouraging developments which may subsequently be deemed unsafe, a review of Section 5.5 has taken place.</p> <p>In reviewing this section, the views of MKC Building Control colleagues and the MK Fire Safety Team at Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service have been sought and</p>

Philip Murphy, Fred Roche Foundation	2	5.5, page 32	<p>responses received. Section 5.5. will be updated to reflect these comments, to highlight the building regulations considerations for green walls and roofs. In short, we will advise that for buildings that are 18 metres or more, and/or 7 storeys or more, in height, green walls should not be used. This is to reflect tighter building regulations standards post-Grenfell which require walls/external cladding materials on buildings 18+ metres and/or 7+ storeys high must be non-combustible. This would almost certainly rule out use of green walls which tend to be of limited combustibility.</p> <p>For buildings below 18 metres and/or 7 storeys high featuring green walls, and when proposing green roofs on buildings above 18 metres and/or 7 storeys high, developers will be expected to strictly follow guidance in DCLG's <i>Fire Performance in Green Roofs and Walls</i> (2013) and to take into account, when proposing green roofs, guidance in the Green Roof Organisation's <i>GRO fire risk guidance document</i> and it's <i>The GRO Green Roof Code</i> (2021). We will also advise developers to take account of the fire risk</p>
---	---	-----------------	---

Cllr. John Bint	3	All	<p>On the whole, I support this SPD.</p> <p>Although the current draft SPD omits to set out what is an unacceptable level of sustainability, either in the form of a definition, or useful examples. It therefore provides much useful guidance for developers already keen to apply sustainability principles, but gives no objective requirements for the minimum that a reluctant developer must do, and MORE IMPORTANTLY it gives no clear objective requirements that officers and/or Members can use, when considering refusing planning permission for an unsustainably constructed development.</p> <p>This SPD should also help MK achieve more sustainable constructions by creating a solid basis for refusing unsustainable proposals.</p>	<p>requirements set out in the Planning Gateway 1 suite of reforms published in 2021.</p> <p>These comments are noted. However, as Policy SC1 is worded in a flexible manner, we cannot set specific standards on what is and isn't acceptable under Policy SC1, apart from the criteria in Parts A, K and L of SC1. To do so would set more stringent standards than what was tested by the Whole Plan Viability Study (2017) for Plan:MK. It would also run contrary to the Planning Practice Guidance which requires that supplementary planning documents (SPDs) cannot introduce new policies into the development plan.</p>
Suzanne Lindsey, Clerk to Whaddon Parish Council	4	All	<p>Although Whaddon lies in Buckinghamshire, this Council wishes to continue to participate in all MKC consultations that may impact on our community.</p> <p>Whilst fully supporting all forms of sustainable construction, WPC do not believe that they can usefully contribute to a subject that is principally</p>	<p>The comments are noted and we concur that it is important to involve neighbouring parish, town, district, county and unitary councils in the planning process and an ongoing process of cooperation. However, many of the comments made in the latter part of this response are not relevant to</p>

<p>Suzanne Lindsey, Clerk to Whaddon Parish Council</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>directed at MK developers, residents and Parish Councils.</p> <p>However, WPC would like to register its support for close cooperation between neighbouring areas where residents in new development in one area may be dependent on services in another. We also consider that planning contributions should serve not just one service e.g. health, but all local services, and refer to the SWMK plans as an example. We raise concerns about the Planning White Paper proposals for CIL development and how planning contributions may be retained within the district of the development.</p>	<p>sustainable construction. Therefore, we shall not comment on them further.</p>
<p>Lorraine Brooks, Planning Officer, Minerals Waste and Policy, Gloucestershire County Council</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>All of the details set out within this section are made by officers on behalf of Gloucestershire County Council in its capacity as the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA): -</p> <p>In relation to the Milton Keynes Draft Sustainable Construction SPD: officers of the County Council can confirm that this consultation request alongside previous correspondence between the two authorities is evidence of ongoing co-operation. This should be recognised as part of the wider evidence base to show that statutory Duty-to-Cooperate (DtC) requirements are being met.</p> <p>Regarding the content of consultation, officers of the County Council can also confirm they are broadly</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

			<p>supportive of the approach set out within the document and applaud the aspiration for Milton Keynes to become the greenest city in the world. In light of the current national lockdown, it is also acknowledged that Milton Keynes Council has chosen to embrace digital technology through the live Q&amp;A session and pre-programmed “bots” to assist with the availability of information and support the consultation process. This is a development in community engagement that will be keenly followed by the County Council.</p>	
Newport Pagnell Town Council	6	All	<p>The Committee agreed that The SPD was an aspirational document promoting environmental and green energy principles.</p> <p>Resolved to support the Draft Milton Keynes Sustainable Construction Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)”</p>	Support for SPD and comments noted.
Campbell Park Parish Council	7	All	<p>“The Planning, Infrastructure &amp; Transport Committee of Campbell Park Parish Council considered this consultation at its meeting on the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2020.</p> <p>Committee resolved to support the adoption of the Draft Milton Keynes Sustainable Construction Supplementary Planning Document.”</p>	Support for SPD and comments noted.

Respondent	Comment ID	Relevant Part of SPD	Summarised Comments	MKC Response
John Day, Urban Adviser, RSPB	8	All	<p>The target of 110ltr water/day/person should be set lower at 80ltr water/day/person.</p> <p>This is an achievable single person target. As with any target there will be 'upward creep', therefore it is better to set a higher bar. For example, exceedance to 90ltr/d/p would be better than 120ltr/d/p</p> <p>It was encouraging for the promotion of rain and grey water harvesting and explanation of pro's and con's clearly set out with regard also to their effective use.</p> <p>Other areas of relevant interest reviewed in this consultation were that on Energy and Climate (SC1 H to J). No additional comment other than to welcome the aims and objectives. In particular, the outlining of benefits and role played by landscape, including green roofs and walls in meeting the policy aims.</p> <p>Our (Natural England's) statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. The England Biodiversity Strategy</p>	<p>In relation to Comment No 3, we cannot set more stringent standards within the SPD than is contained within Policy SC1. However, when Plan:MK is reviewed, this will provide an opportunity to consider a more stringent standard.</p>
Ellen Satchwell, Sustainable Development Lead Advisor,	9	All		<p>These comments are noted and welcomed. Most of the responses are more relevant to our Biodiversity SPD and natural environment policies in Plan:MK. However, the external guidance document</p>



<p>Thames Solent Team, Natural England</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>(Defra) establishes principles for the consideration of biodiversity and the effects of climate change. The SPD could reflect some of these principles and identify how the development's effects on the natural environment will be influenced by climate change, and how ecological networks will be maintained. Soil is finite and fulfils many services (ecosystem services) for society; for instance, as a growing medium for crops, a carbon/water store, a biodiversity reservoir and a pollution buffer. Soil resources must be protected and used sustainably. The NPPF states that local planning authorities should plan 'positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure'. The Planning Practice Guidance on Green Infrastructure provides more detail on this. The SPD makes reference to the significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments providing extensive examples of how this can be achieved including: green roof systems and roof gardens as well as green walls to provide insulation or shading and cooling. Further information on GI is include within The Town and Country Planning Association's "Design Guide for Sustainable Communities" and their more recent "Good Practice Guidance for Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity".</p>	<p>suggestions are useful and we will refer to these within the SPD as appropriate to the topic area, e.g. creating resilient environments.</p>
--	----------	------------	--	---

Lynne Simons, Clerk and RFO, Aspley Guise Parish Council	10	All	<p>The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity (para 180).</p> <p>The Parish Council would like to know the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• your plans for boundary expansion and</li> <li>• your standards for Design for Manufacture and Assembly and Modern Methods of Construction</li> </ul>	<p>Milton Keynes Council has no plans for boundary expansion. As Policy D4 in Plan:MK states, we encourage 10% of homes in proposals for 50 new dwellings to be built using modern methods of construction (MMC). However, we don't set our own standards for MMC and as SPDs cannot set new policy, this SPD cannot introduce new MMC standards.</p>
Sean Rendall, Chief Operating Officer, ThamesWey Central Milton Keynes Ltd.	11	Chapter 6 'Energy and Climate' to Chapter 7 'Energy and Climate Statement'	<p>We feel that the draft SPD as proposed does not fully meet Plan:MK policy objectives with regards to sustainable construction, due to the omission of clearer signposting to Plan:MK Policy SC2 and Para 17.18. There are only brief mentions of these.</p> <p>Early engagement between developers and district energy operators is important to deliver the design-stage benefits of this technology. For example, ThamesWey provides assistance to developers, ensuring that designs are optimised to use heat networks and negating the need to re-engineer parts of the mechanical systems – saving on time and costs. This follows the guidance in CIBSE CP1 (Code of Practice for Heat Network)</p> <p><a href="https://www.cibse.org/knowledge/knowledge-items/detail?id=a0q200000090MYHAA2">https://www.cibse.org/knowledge/knowledge-items/detail?id=a0q200000090MYHAA2</a> which</p>	<p>We welcome these comments and support for developments using CHP. The main aim of this document is to provide guidance on Policy SC1. However, we will include more explicit references to Policy SC2 in Plan:MK but we will not provide in-depth guidance on SC2. We will also include recommendations that developers should contact CHP network operators in the early design stages to ensure designs are optimised for CHP use. We will remove reference to the 'Hotmaps' tool as a tool for locating CHP networks, but will retain it as a method for locating heating and cooling 'hotspots' in the borough.</p>

<p>Sean Rendall, Chief Operating Officer, ThamesWey Central Milton Keynes Ltd.</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>Chapter 6 'Energy and Climate' to Chapter 7 'Energy and Climate Stateme nt'</p>	<p>stresses the value of pre-application advice to alert developers to the benefits of connecting to heat networks. The best practise also recommends the use of planning conditions to mandate that developments follow CIBSE CP1 design standards.</p> <p>ThamesWey is reducing the carbon intensity of the energy supplied in the CMK network and pledges to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030. We'll continue to save carbon through heat networks and affect positive change. The CMK heat network can serve new sites and as more sites join, the whole network becomes more efficient and lower carbon.</p> <p>Implementing policy SC2 will create a positive multiplier effect, with benefits for all users.</p> <p>In the draft SPD, a footnote on page 70 references 'Hotmaps' as a tool to identify existing heat networks in Milton Keynes, however this tool does not show this information. In place of, or supplementing this, we recommend that a link is included to a map on the ThamesWey website which shows the extent of the existing CMK network (<a href="https://www.thameswegroup.co.uk/interactive-map-milton-keynes/">https://www.thameswegroup.co.uk/interactive-map-milton-keynes/</a>). This map is kept updated and shows if a development site is close to the network, as well as network operator details.</p>	
--	-----------	--	---	--

<p>Karen Goss, Clerk and RFO, Emberton Parish Council</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>Part 5.5. Green Roofs and Walls</p>	<p>Emberton Parish Council is in agreement and would endorse the following statement made in clause 5.5 relating to green roofs and walls:  “Green roofs and walls may not be appropriate in certain settings, particularly for heritage assets and in Conservation Areas.”</p>	<p>Support for wording noted.</p>
<p>Astrid Chaplin, on behalf of, Kelly Tolhurst MP</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Thank you for your email of 2 November to Kelly Tolhurst MP regarding the above consultation.  As it is not appropriate for Government Ministers to comment, I would be grateful if you could amend your mailing list accordingly.</p>	<p>Response noted.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Relevant Part of SPD	Summarised Comments	MKC Response
<p>Martin Taylor, Lichfields, for and on behalf of (FAOBO), Ashley Spearing, St James Group Ltd.</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>Overall SPD</p>	<p>Summary: Overall, St James Group is supportive of the SPD however, see suggestions/clarifications below.</p>	<p>Overall support for SPD noted.</p>
<p>Martin Taylor, Lichfields, FAOBO, Ashley Spearing, St James Group Ltd.</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>Annex E</p>	<p>The carbon offset price is identified as £200 per tonne. The SPD should clarify that this carbon offset payment only applies outside of MK Tariff 1&amp;2 areas. Within tariff areas any carbon offset contributions will be set out by the tariff arrangement.</p> <p>We note that unregulated energy emissions are included in the calculations, but this is not mentioned in Policy SC1 of Plan:MK so should be omitted such that the SPD is consistent with the statutory development plan.</p>	<p>We shall update the SPD wording to reflect the alternative payment method for carbon offsetting in Tariff Areas 1 &amp; 2, for residential and non-residential buildings.</p> <p>As Policy SC1 does not include reference to unregulated energy, the reference to unregulated energy shall be removed. The reference to the GLA methodology shall also be removed.</p>

<p>Martin Taylor, Lichfields, FAOBO, Ashley Spearing, St James Group Ltd.</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>Section 7.5</p>	<p>There is a reference to GLA's energy statement guidance (page 121) but this should be removed as it does not follow the same methodology for carbon offsetting calculations.</p> <p>There are many reasons as to why a dwelling may use more energy than predicted which are not necessary just related to build quality.</p> <p>We would suggest this requirement is refined as there are a number of reasons why the 'as built' performance will not match the values stated at design stage. For example, Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) is intended to only be correct on average and uses a variety of assumptions such as occupancy level, hours heating systems are used, lengths of showers, external weather conditions etc.</p> <p>These are not necessarily factors where "specific actions" (e.g. as identified as part of the quality regime reporting by the developer) will be able to effect change or close any performance gap and therefore this implications of this requirement may fall to be overly onerous on the developer.</p>	
<p>The aim of the building performance monitoring regime requirement is solely to understand more about how the building performance gap functions and may change over the time it is in use. It is not designed to punish or place obligations on developers who may not, for whatever reason, close the performance gap. It is acknowledged that some factors, such as energy use, will be affected more by how occupiers use a building, and is therefore outside a developer's control. However, many factors such as carbon emissions from materials used in construction, material specifications, overheating risk and reducing draughts all can be controlled through changing building techniques and will influence the energy efficiency of buildings and therefore how much energy is required to heat them. These are variables that shall be able to be understood in more depth through the pre-occupation and during-occupation monitoring tests.</p>				

				<p>We will update section 7.5 to make it clearer what the requirements are for this part of the Policy. We shall also emphasise how a reasonable worst-case scenario will need to be calculated for each performance metric. It would only be in circumstances where that worst-case scenario is close to being, or is, exceeded during occupation/use when we would ask for more in-depth investigation of why the identified performance gap exists.</p>
<p>Martin Taylor, Lichfields, FAOBO, Ashley Spearing, St James Group Ltd.</p>	<p>17</p>	<p>Section 5.4</p>	<p>The SPD notes, use of sustainable materials should be prioritised. St James (as part of the wider Berkeley Homes group) support this and are committing to reducing the carbon impact of the materials and services they use by 40% by 2030, using a 2019 baseline.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd.</p>	<p>18</p>	<p>Overall SPD</p>	<p><u>Whole document</u> Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are referenced in the SPD but terminology varies.  Anglian Water supports use of SuDs to address the risk of surface water/sewer flooding and bring wider benefits incl. water quality. We support measures to reduce water use in new development which reduces</p>	<p>These comments are noted and we will ensure references to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are consistent in the document.</p>

			<p>demand on water networks and has community/environmental benefits.</p> <p>The SPD should follow Para 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework which uses the term 'sustainable drainage systems'.</p>	
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Relevant part of SPD</b>	<b>Summarised comments</b>	<b>Our Response</b>
Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd.	19	Table 1, p.8	Reference is made to water requirement being applicable to residential development only. However, Part M of Policy SC1 of the MK Plan does not refer specifically to residential development.	Comments noted. We will update Table 1 to reflect that Part L of SC1 refers only to residential development whereas Part M refers to both residential and non-residential development.
Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd.	20	Section 3.14, p.15	SUDs are seen as distinct from green roofs. However, green roofs can form part of effective SUDs solution by reducing storm water run-off and attenuating peak flow rates.	Comments noted. We will note that green roofs can be part of SuDS.



Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd.	21	Section 8, p. 86	The Milton Keynes supply system forms part of Ruthamford Central Water Resource Zone together with neighbouring authorities.	We will note that the city of Milton Keynes is part of the part of Ruthamford Central Water Resource Zone (WRZ) together with neighbouring authorities.
Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd.	22	Section 8.2	<p>'Water reuse'/water reuse and recycling' are overarching terms which include all types of reuse and recycling (e.g. rainwater harvesting etc.). There is no need to include rainwater harvesting in the title as well. Instead, include reference to those specific examples in the text.</p> <p>Pg. 89 – Refer to Waterwise statistics which finds that carbon emissions from buildings with water reuse systems is lower than those with mains water systems.</p> <p><a href="https://www.waterwise.org.uk/knowledge-base/independent-review-of-costs-and-benefits-of-rwh-and-gwr-options-in-the-uk/">https://www.waterwise.org.uk/knowledge-base/independent-review-of-costs-and-benefits-of-rwh-and-gwr-options-in-the-uk/</a></p> <p>Pg. 89-90 - Rainwater harvesting can include larger scale/communal systems for multiple dwellings or commercial/industrial use. These systems can collect the rainwater from roof areas, as well as surface water runoff.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. In terms of use of the term 'rainwater harvesting' in the policy, this is something we can look at amending in the next local plan. However, for now, we cannot amend the policy wording through an SPD. The Waterwise statistics are noted and will be referred to in section 8.2. Likewise, in section 8.2.1, we will refer to the fact that rainwater harvesting systems can include communal systems for multiple dwellings or commercial/industrial use.</p> <p>Regarding water reuse as part of integrated water management, developments should do this as per Policy FR2 (Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) and Integrated Flood Risk Management) in Plan:MK. In the SPD we will refer to how water reuse can function as part of an</p>

<p>Darren Woodward, Forest of Marston Vale</p>	<p>23</p>	<p>All</p>	<p><i>General comment</i> - Could also consider how water reuse systems can form part of an integrated water management approach. Further information on the Anglian Water website here: <a href="https://www.anglianwater.co.uk/siteassets/household/about-us/aws-water-smart-communities---flyer.pdf">https://www.anglianwater.co.uk/siteassets/household/about-us/aws-water-smart-communities---flyer.pdf</a></p>	<p>integrated water approach and signpost Policy FR2.</p>
			<p>The SPD reflects the Forest Plan in terms of sustainability and use of biomass for generating heating and hot water. Use of biomass to meet large scale energy needs will require large quantities of chip or wood pellets. These could be sourced through management of local trees and woodlands, which is more sustainable than importing from elsewhere in the UK/Europe.</p> <p>Large scale tree planting in new developments to meet local biomass energy systems demand would reduce transportation costs and help stimulate the rural/local economy. Planting trees and creating new woodlands have far reaching benefits: biomass, ecological, lumber and flood management and improving mental health and wellbeing.</p> <p>As Milton Keynes is close to the Forest Area the Marston Vale Trust highlights the potential for partnerships involving supply of biomass.</p>	<p>We agree that planting trees can be beneficial and complementary to sustainable construction. Tree planting ties into the criteria under Part J of Policy SC1 - ensuring developments are resilient to ongoing and predicted impacts of climate change. Tree planting is already a requirement in this section.</p>

Edward Winter, Historic England	24	All	Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above. We do not wish to comment.	Response noted.
Simon Harkins, SGN	25	All	Many thanks for keeping us up to date. With regards to Draft Sustainable Construction SPD, we at SGN (your gas transporter) do not have any comments to add at this time, but I would like to offer our continued support in the future.	Response noted.

Respondent	Comment ID	Relevant part of SPD	Summarised comments	Our response
Chris Bridgeman, FAOBO, Bridgman & Bridgman LLP	26	5.5 E Green Roofs and Green Walls	<p>The biodiversity crisis, climate change adaptation and the links between these issues and green roofs and green walls should be made in the Introduction and Context.</p> <p>On biophilic design: the text refers to green roofs (indoors). We presume that this should be green walls.</p> <p><i>5.5.1 Definitions</i></p> <p>'Soil' should be replaced by 'growing medium'. Soil is not normally used on green roofs. A growing medium that meets the requirements of the GRO Code should be used.</p> <p>The term 'brown roof' is out-dated and results in the installation of many sub-standard green roofs.</p> <p>Sedum mats without substrate beneath should not be listed as an option as without substrate beneath them, they usually fail and do not meet the GRO Code. Reused aggregates may also be contaminated and might not meet the standards set in the GRO Code.</p> <p>Section 6.2.9 on page 34 seems to be in the wrong place.</p> <p>Page 36</p>	<p>We shall reference the link between the biodiversity crisis and climate change adaptation and green walls/roofs in the introduction.</p> <p>The biophilic design purposes list in section 5.4.3 will be updated to refer to green walls.</p> <p>Soil will be substituted by 'growing medium' and reference will be made to 'GRO Code' guidance, as published by the Green Roof Organisation, a UK-based organisation producing best-practice guidance on green roofs for the construction industry.</p> <p>Reference to brown roofs will be removed.</p> <p>We will maintain reference to re-used aggregates but add that use of these should ensure they are high quality.</p> <p>We will reword the section on green wall maintenance to simply state that</p>

<p>Chris Bridgeman, FAOBO, Bridgman &amp; Bridgman LLP</p>	<p>26</p>	<p>5.5 E Green Roofs and Green Walls</p>	<p>Green roofs should meet the UK Code of Practice for Green Roofs published by the Green Roof Organisation (see <a href="https://greenrooforganisation.org/">https://greenrooforganisation.org/</a>) rather than the FLL as cited in the draft. Although the UK GRO Code is largely based on the German FLL, the GRO Code is the most relevant code to follow in the UK.</p> <p>5.5.2 Green walls: Delete 'self-regenerating' and 'cladding'. Reason: Green walls are not self-regenerating and are not necessarily cladding systems. Delete 'vertical systems'. This term is not normally used. Suggest 'Modular green walls'. Delete 'soil' and replace with 'growing medium'. Delete 'steel framework' as green walls are not necessarily supported on a steel framework. Delete 'Pivots' and 'removable screens' as pivots and removable screens are not common practice and these terms are ambiguous.</p>	<p>maintenance should be considered at the initial design stages.</p> <p>We will amend the SPD to reflect the suggested changes to Section 5.5.2.</p>
<p>Vicky Mote, FAOBO, Broughton and Milton Keynes Parish</p>	<p>27</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Further evidence and explanation is required of the long-term effects of a number of the initiatives and their effect on the ongoing maintenance of buildings constructed in this manner.</p>	<p>Regarding the maintenance of sustainably built buildings, Part D of Policy SC1 requires that developers prioritise use of materials and construction techniques that have smaller ecological and carbon footprints, help to sustain or create good air quality, and improve resilience to a</p>

<p>Council (BMKPC) Vicky Mote, FAOBO, Broughton and Milton Keynes Parish Council (BMKPC)</p>	<p>27</p>	<p>All</p>		<p>changing climate where appropriate. This works alongside the use of high quality and durable materials as set out in Policy D3 in Plan:MK. Accordance with these criteria should result in developments that do not require costly and/or extensive repairs a short time after construction. However, it is not possible to completely design out the need to carry out building repairs at some point in a building's lifecycle. Although, general maintenance and good building management by owners and occupiers should minimise costs associated with these. We consider that these policies represent the best approach to helping ensure new developments are built to last and no not incur owners/occupiers' unnecessary costs.</p>
<p>Vicky Mote, FAOBO, BMKPC</p>	<p>28</p>	<p>2 - Introduction</p>	<p>The introduction should pay more attention to how climate change will affect us in the future.  The SPD needs to show how buildings will be future-proofed and be resilient to a changing climate.</p>	<p>We agree that it is important to future proof buildings so they can cope with the impacts of climate change. As such, and noted above in other responses, Parts D and J of Policy SC1 and Part A.7. of Policy D3 in Plan:MK require buildings to be built using high quality materials using methods that ensure they will be resilient to a changing climate. Therefore, we think the SPD is future-oriented already, but we will</p>

<p>Vicky Mote, FAOBO, BMKPC</p>	<p>29</p>	<p>2.1 para 2</p>	<p>BMKPC are concerned that 'read in conjunction with' indicates that Plan:MK is to take precedent in any determination. It is hoped that this document is written and constructed in such a way as not to be at odds with any other policies of MKC. We recommend amended wording to make this clear.</p>	<p>reiterate that it is a forward-looking document.</p>
<p>As noted in the Planning Practice Guidance, SPDs should build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on policies in an adopted local plan. As such, the SPD has been written to conform with the policies in Plan:MK. We do not consider changing the wording is required in section 2.1 paragraph 2.</p>				

Respondent	Comment ID	Relevant part of SPD	Summarised Comments	Our response
Vicky Mote, FAOBO, BMKPC	30	2.3 Purpose of the SPD	<p><i>"The SPD will help to ensure that the Council meets Plan:MK policy objectives with regards to sustainable construction.</i></p> <p>Bearing in mind the BMKPC's view expressed concerning Point 2.1 it is felt that this should read:</p> <p><u>Recommended wording:</u> The SPD will ensure that the Council meets Plan:MK policy objectives with regards to sustainable construction.</p>	<p>As noted in our response to comment 29, the SPD is guidance. As such we will not amend the wording in such a way that would make the SPD more stringent than Policy SC1 allows.</p>
Vicky Mote, FAOBO, BMKPC	31	3.3 BREEAM Certification	<p><i>"It states that there are 7 ratings under BREEAM but goes on to list only 6.</i></p> <p>This requires clarifying and corrected where appropriate.</p> <p>Is BREEAM updated to be in line with changes to legislation and international agreements. If so, the SPD should highlight this.</p> <p>Can the 'expectation' for developers to recover at least 70% of the materials from the demolished building for reuse on either the new build or on a local site (within 35 miles) be made a requirement?</p>	<p>We shall update section 3.3 to note that there are only six possible BREEAM ratings, not seven.</p> <p>With regards to BREEAM standards, it is likely these will be updated over time. However, they are entirely within the purview of BRE who administer the BREEAM schemes. We shall update our policies within periodic local plan reviews in response to changes in national planning policy and legislation.</p>



<p>Vicky Mote, FAOBO, BMKPC</p>	<p>32</p>	<p>3.8 Green Roofs and Walls</p>	<p>The long-term effect on the building structure and what happens if the green material dies should be addressed.</p>	<p>With regards to the percentage of materials to be reused on brownfield sites, as the wording of Policy SC1 does not specify an exact percentage of materials to reuse, we cannot do so in the SPD. Therefore, we shall retain the 'expectation' that 70% of on-site materials will be reused with the proposed development or on another local site (within 35 miles).</p>
				<p>Structural considerations are a building regulations matter and so we will not add structural requirements for green walls/roofs into the SPD, beyond advising developers to consider how a proposal would accord with structural building regulations requirements. We will also remind developers that when considering use of green walls/roofs, they should consider how the proposed components and any associated structural elements/changes would affect the character and/or special significance of the site (e.g. if the site is a Listed Building or in a Conservation Area). To ensure ongoing health of green walls/roofs, we shall require ongoing maintenance arrangements to be put in place.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Relevant part of SPD	Summarised comments	Our response
Vicky Mote, FAOBO, BMKPC	33	3.13 Energy Storage and demand Side Response	<p>We wish to see reference and referral to the effect of battery lifecycle and the responsibility of replacement and possible repair which would by nature be expensive.</p> <p>In addition, what provision must developers make where batteries are the preferred option for some form of secondary power in the event of failure? As technology moves forward, MKC needs to ensure that contractors have considered battery life and replacement where technology has made the current product redundant and unavailable. Future proofing needs to be built in.</p>	<p>As with using sustainability constructed materials, energy storage component replacement, repair and failure are outside the scope of the SPD. We will always recommend that developers use high quality and durable materials and components when building new developments, to reduce the number of incidences where repairs have to take place soon after construction.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, as part of the lifecycle approach required by Part F of Policy SC1 and section 5.6 of the SPD, developers should be considering how the buildings they build, including components such as storage batteries, will be recycled at the end of their working life. In this way we can future proof developments, although we have no way of compelling developers and building owners/occupiers to continuously upgrade the technologies they use within developments from a planning perspective. Our position on this would not, however, affect any obligations</p>

Mike LeRoy	34		General	<p>MKS's commitment to be 'the greenest city' is most welcome, but it is imperative that this does not open the way to 'greenwash', as developers attempt to impress by providing features that lack evidence of their effectiveness.</p>	<p>on building owners/developers within Building Regulations.</p> <p>We agree that greenwashing can be a problem. To do our part in combatting the potential to greenwash, the Council Plan contains a review mechanism to check our progress towards these goals. Also, we will always determine planning applications in a robust manner, taking account of all relevant material considerations and assessing development proposals to ensure they accord with development plan policies.</p>
Mike LeRoy	35		General	<p>'Sustainability' can refer to many different issues and the SPD tends to cover those relating to sustainable construction well, but further information on the 'biodiversity' and other aspects of should be included.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We recognise that sustainability refers to many other issues besides sustainable construction, such as biodiversity. However, it is not possible for us to address all these matters within one SPD. As such, many of these related matters are addressed within other Policies within Plan:MK e.g. NE1, NE2, NE3, CT1, NE5 and NE6, and within other council SPDs/documents, e.g. the Milton Keynes Landscape Character Assessment (2016) and the Biodiversity SPD.</p>
Mike LeRoy	36	2		<p>"Biodiversity is not adequately addressed in this Sustainable Construction SPD. Of course there is another SPD about Biodiversity, but there is a</p>	<p>Due to the limited scope of Policy SC1 we are unable to cover all biodiversity matters within this SPD, only those covered within</p>

Mike LeRoy	37	5 Material s and Waste	<p>disturbing gap between these two SPDs of issues that should be prominent in this SPD. I make specific suggestions below relating to Section 5, Materials and Waste.”</p>	<p>SC1. Nonetheless, in line with our duty to account for biodiversity conservation in all decisions in the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and to conform with our need to provide net gains for biodiversity, we have other policies within the local plan which address biodiversity and landscape considerations in new development. Please refer to policies NE1, NE2, NE3 and NE4 in Plan:MK. Also relevant is our Biodiversity Accounting SPD.</p>
			<p>The SPD excludes wider issues of biodiversity in direct relationship to buildings and development. These are not mentioned here or in the draft SPD on Biodiversity. There should be at least some paragraphs or a new section on biodiversity here, because provision is an integral aspect of building design.</p> <p>At least House Sparrows, Starlings, House Martins, Barn Swallows, and Swifts nest in buildings. There is a decline in numbers of all these species in the UK. Starling and House sparrow are on the Birds of Conservation Concern 4 Red List and House martin and Swift are on the Amber List.</p>	<p>As in our response to comment 36, there is limited scope for addressing biodiversity matters within the SPD. However, we shall include wording on the importance of catering to a wide array of biodiversity as part of making the built environment resilient to climate change and preserving the benefits of biodiversity for communities. We will also reference integrating bat and bird boxes into new buildings as part of a biodiversity-aware approach.</p>

Mike LeRoy	37	5 Materials and Waste	<p><a href="https://www.bto.org/sites/default/files/shared_documents/publications/birds-conservation-concern/birds-of-conservation-concern-4-leaflet.pdf">https://www.bto.org/sites/default/files/shared_documents/publications/birds-conservation-concern/birds-of-conservation-concern-4-leaflet.pdf</a></p> <p>This SPD should include guidance to encourage inclusion of nest-site bricks in new developments. Much the same is appropriate for advice on provision for bat roost boxes or bricks.</p> <p>Reference could be made to:</p> <p>Guidance in the RIBA book: '<a href="#">Designing for biodiversity: A technical guide for new and existing buildings</a>' (RIBA Publishing 2013, 2nd edition).</p> <p>Or: MK Swifts Group's guidance note on Swifts and Development from the Swift Conservation website: <a href="https://www.swift-conservation.org/">https://www.swift-conservation.org/</a></p>
------------	----	--------------------------	---

Respondent	Comment ID	Relevant part of SPD	Summarised comments	Our Response
Mike LeRoy	38	General	<p>It is imperative that local air pollution is addressed as well as climate change gases. More recently, higher development densities in MK are making newer areas more prone to air pollution. Although battery cars have no tailpipe emissions, particulate pollution will still occur.</p> <p>This SPD does not adequately cover the issue of gas supply and how this will need to be addressed, and it should do.</p> <p><a href="https://www.energyvoice.com/renewables-energy-transition/282979/national-grid-uk-gas-network-hydrogen/">https://www.energyvoice.com/renewables-energy-transition/282979/national-grid-uk-gas-network-hydrogen/</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.northerngasnetworks.co.uk/2018/11/29/hydrogen-to-heat-homes-14-9m-for-uks-first-trials-on-public-gas-network/">https://www.northerngasnetworks.co.uk/2018/11/29/hydrogen-to-heat-homes-14-9m-for-uks-first-trials-on-public-gas-network/</a></p> <p>The air and noise emissions from diesel generators can be considerable and they are not tightly regulated. Permanent back-up generators are not the only issue. A Sustainable Construction SPD is an appropriate place to address these kinds of issues and to give guidance on how to reduce air and noise pollution related to buildings as well as addressing climate change gases.</p>	<p>We acknowledge that the type of fuel and/or method of energy generation that owner/occupiers use to heat and power their buildings plays a large role in the environmental impact of a development when it is in use. However, these matters are largely beyond the scope of this SPD and planning legislation. While we can require some carbon reductions in design as per Part K of Policy SC1, the type of utilities contract an owner/occupier signs, and whether it makes use of renewable or non-renewable energy sources, is a civil matter. As such we will not be able to include guidance on this point beyond referring to Part K, and requiring that developments follow the energy hierarchy as set out in section 6.1 of the SPD.</p> <p>With regards to the potential air quality and health impacts of locating roads too close to buildings, this is an important material consideration as set out in Part D of Policy NE6 of Plan:MK. Therefore, it is not within the scope of this SPD to address</p>

Mike LeRoy	38	General		<p>the layout of new developments, beyond how this may affect the performance of new buildings from an energy use viewpoint. Policy NE6 also states our position on air and noise pollution within new development; these topics are outside the scope of this SPD and so therefore they won't be addressed here.</p>
Mike LeRoy	39	General	<p>The lack of reference to sustainability certifications for residential buildings deserves explanation in this section because a lack of mention of this may well cause confusion to developers.</p> <p>Certifications the SPD should mention include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BRE Home Quality Mark</li> <li>• The AECB Building Standard</li> <li>• AECB Lifetime Carbon Standard</li> <li>• Arup SPeAR</li> <li>• <a href="https://www.arup.com/projects/spear">https://www.arup.com/projects/spear</a></li> <li>• LEED Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design</li> <li>• <a href="https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Leadership_in_Energy_and_Environmental_Design_LEED">https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design LEED</a></li> <li>• CEEQUAL (for Climate Resilience in the Built Environment)</li> <li>• <a href="https://www.ceequal.com/">https://www.ceequal.com/</a></li> <li>• Passivhaus.</li> </ul>	<p>We shall signpost alternative sustainability standards for housing but will note that meeting them won't be a requirement of Policy SC1 or the SPD. As above, SPDs do not allow us to rewrite development plan policies. Therefore, as Policy SC1 does not require meeting any sustainable housing standards, neither shall the SPD. Notwithstanding this, we shall review whether we could require new homes to be built to a set sustainability standard during our next Local Plan review.</p>

Mike LeRoy	40	6.3	<p>The SPD mischaracterises management of accountabilities for the large balancing lakes. The Parks Trust is responsible for managing their landscapes and activities that take place by and on them, but Anglian Water remain responsible for managing their flood control purposes and engineering features. The SPD should be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>We shall revise this paragraph as suggested.</p>
Mike LeRoy	41	7.2	<p>I question whether biomass or wood-burners for heating in urban areas should be encouraged in this SPD due to the potential air pollution impacts.</p> <p>The Government's Air Quality Expert Group report in 2017 'The Potential Air Quality Impacts from Biomass Combustion' raised concerns about particulate pollution from biomass combustion:  <a href="http://aqma5.co.uk/assets/AQEG_Biomass_Combustion_report_Defra_2017.pdf">http://aqma5.co.uk/assets/AQEG_Biomass_Combustion_report_Defra_2017.pdf</a></p> <p>The issue was accentuated by evidence from the Office for National Statistics in 2019 in 'A burning issue: biomass is the biggest source of renewable energy consumed in the UK':  <a href="https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/theenvironmentalimpactofburningwood">https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/theenvironmentalimpactofburningwood</a></p> <p>The Greater London Authority has seen the need to issue 'Guidance for wood burning stoves in London' as have some London boroughs:</p>	<p>The Government's Clean Air Strategy 2019 reported that burning wood and coal in open fires and stoves makes up 38% of the UK's primary emissions of fine particulate matter (PM2.5). In line with government policy LAQM PG16 (to work towards reducing emissions/concentrations of particulate matter), we shall remove reference to use of wood burning stoves in new homes as a renewable energy/heating source.</p> <p>Policy SC3 in Plan:MK does not take a stance on the acceptability of large-scale biomass energy systems in particular. However, SC3 sets out criteria, such as ensuring no unacceptable impact on air safety, that low carbon and renewable energy systems must accord with to be acceptable in principle and any proposals</p>



Mike LeRoy	41	7.2	<p><a href="https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/environment/pollution-and-air-quality/guidance-wood-burning-stoves-london">https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/environment/pollution-and-air-quality/guidance-wood-burning-stoves-london</a></p> <p>In February 2020 the Government issued new guidance and rules on household burning of biomass and fossil fuels to reflect the national Air Quality Strategy: <a href="#">Government takes action to cut pollution from household burning - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</a></p>	<p>for biomass energy systems would be assessed against these points. Of course, any such schemes would need to demonstrate they involve low carbon/renewable systems in order to be in line with this policy.</p>
Mike LeRoy	42	7.2.4	<p>I support wind generated electricity but question its effectiveness and appropriateness mounted on urban buildings. Where is the evidence for their effectiveness on tall buildings?</p> <p>The BRE report in 2007 'Micro-wind turbines in urban environments: an assessment' raised considerable doubts about their efficiency in most urban areas. BRE Trust report FB17, ISBN 978-1-84806-021-0) <a href="https://www.bre.co.uk/news/Microwind-turbines-and-their-role-in-combating-global-warming-456.html">https://www.bre.co.uk/news/Microwind-turbines-and-their-role-in-combating-global-warming-456.html</a></p>	<p>In line with our position on wind turbine developments set out in Part D of Policy SC3 in Plan:MK, and further research which has highlighted issues with locating wind turbines in urban areas (such as unfavourable wind conditions, poor scheme feasibility and viability, noise and vibration disruption for building users) we will remove the wording highlighting potential for wind turbines to be located on tall buildings.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Relevant Part of SPD	Summarised Comments	Our Response
Mike LeRoy	43	7.2.5	<p>These paragraphs understate the substantial advantages of CHP which avoid energy losses associated with long distance energy transmission.</p> <p>Mention should be made here of the Central Milton Keynes district heat and power system which has scope for many more buildings to be connected to it. Its case will be strengthened when investments are made to change from use of gas to a renewable power source.</p>	<p>Comment noted. We will add a reference to the CMK CHP network, as also noted in Paragraph 17.18 in Plan:MK.</p>
Dominic Williams, Strategic Lead Education Sufficiency, Access and Attendance, MKC	44	General comment	<p>No specific objections or comments on the content.</p> <p>Two possible implications for education school places across Milton Keynes as a result of this SPD:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is likely to increase costs of construction of new school buildings/expansion projects</li> <li>2. It will increase costs to developers in terms of dwelling construction</li> </ol> <p>With this in mind what is the view from a planning perspective of how much of an impact on costing of projects is likely to happen? i.e. are we anticipating meeting the requirements of the SPD will increase costs by 1%? 5%? 10%?</p>	<p>The SPD won't introduce any additional costs for developers above those associated with the requirements set out in Policies SC1 (Sustainable Construction) and CT6 (Low Emission Vehicles) in Plan:MK, which was adopted in March 2019. The SPD only outlines in more detail how to meet those requirements.</p> <p>Part of the evidence base for Plan:MK included a Whole Plan Viability Study, which looked at the impacts of policy requirements on development costs. The Study concluded that the cumulative effects of policies in Plan:MK would not</p>

				<p>make (both residential and non-residential) development unviable. The cost per new dwelling of the Policy SC1 requirements was noted as £500, which the Inspector for the Plan process concluded was acceptable. The Study is available on this <a href="#">Council webpage</a>, under 'Infrastructure and Viability Documents', if you'd like more information on this point and detail on impacts on development costs.</p>
--	--	--	--	--