



# Uley and Owlpen **Community Design Statement**

## **Consultation Report**



**CONTENTS**

1. Introduction .....	2
2. Community Involvement .....	2
3. Consultation Phase .....	3
4. Summary .....	4
Appendix	A
Membership of the CDS Sub-committee	
Appendix	B
Findings from the CDS Questionnaire	
Appendix	C
CDS Distribution for Public Consultation	
Appendix	D
Consultation Comments Received and Responses	



## Uley and Owlpen Community Design Statement

---

### 1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide evidence that the Uley and Owlpen Community Design Statement (CDS), as issued in July 2016, was prepared with a sufficient degree of engagement and consultation as to ensure that it fairly reflects the views and opinions of the whole local community and also takes account of relevant concerns of surrounding parishes, local authorities and other interested bodies.

Uley Parish Council decided at its Annual Meeting on 4th June 2014 to initiate the production of a CDS and invited interested parishioners to join members of Uley Parish Council in forming a CDS sub-committee. The first meeting of the CDS sub-committee was held in July 2014. The parish of Owlpen joined the project in August 2014 as it was felt that the two parishes, although distinct in character, effectively interact as a single community. The final membership of the CDS sub-committee is given in Appendix A.

There were two distinct phases to the preparation of the CDS and each required the involvement of parishioners, public bodies and other relevant organisations to ensure that the document genuinely reflects the views and wishes of local residents and aligns with the policies and practices of Stroud District Council (SDC) and other interested bodies.

During the first phase of community involvement, efforts were made to engage local residents in the preparation of the CDS. In the second, consultation phase, the draft document was made widely available for review and comment both by members of the public and formal consultees. Following the consultation period the document was revised to address comments and suggestions received and was reissued as final for adoption by the parishes and then SDC.

### 2. Community Involvement

The success of a CDS depends on gathering views and opinions that are representative of the entire community and several initiatives were undertaken to obtain community engagement in the original production.

Public awareness was initially raised with a display at the Uley Show in September 2014 and visitors were invited to indicate what they particularly appreciate about living in Uley and Owlpen by writing their thoughts on sticky notes that were pinned to a map of the area. The results over thirty respondents, when analyzed by word frequency, gave an early indication of the issues, both positive and negative, that would be of relevance to the CDS.

Short presentations were given to local society meetings (e.g. The Uley Society, WI) to help raise the profile of the project.

The children of Uley C of E Primary School were invited to give their views on how the community might be improved and sent us some class-work that informed the sub-committee.

Members of the sub-committee undertook extensive, detailed street surveys of the entire area and in the course of this work frequently interacted with residents; taking the opportunity to explain the purpose of their making notes and taking photographs.



## Uley and Owlpen Community Design Statement

---

By far the widest community involvement obtained during the CDS drafting stage was by means of a questionnaire sent to all households in Uley and Owlpen via the *Village News* in November 2014. The questionnaire could be completed in hard copy and left at the Uley Community Stores or could be submitted online. A summary of the results of the questionnaire is given in Appendix B. It was very encouraging that responses were received from about a quarter of all households.

As a consequence of the efforts made the sub-committee was able to draft the CDS with the benefit of substantial community input.

### 3. Consultation Phase

An issue of the CDS was launched for public consultation on 1st March 2016 allowing a period of six weeks for the return of comments. Parishioners of Uley and Owlpen were advised of the consultation by means of a flyer inserted in some 500 copies the *Village News* and by means of posted notices. The document was available online via the Uley Parish Council website and we know from web statistics that there were over 290 clicks on the link, indicating a good level of interest.

More than thirty hardcopies of the document were also distributed. Nine were placed in public locations such as the two parish churches, Uley Community Stores and the Village Hall. One hardcopy was sent to each of the seven immediately adjoining parishes and to Dursley town council. Other hardcopies were provided to SDC and local councillors.

Various potentially interested bodies were contacted by email to advise of the consultation, including but not limited to: Gloucestershire CC Highways, Gloucestershire Constabulary, Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue, Natural England, Environment Agency, English Heritage and Cotswold Conservation Board. The full list of consultees is given in Appendix C.

Substantive comments were eventually received from Gloucestershire Rural Communities Council, Gloucestershire County Council, Dursley Town Council and two parishioners. The final issue of the CDS for adoption was amended to take account of all the comments received. A matrix of all comments received and the responses as it affected the CDS is given in Appendix D.

The consultation process did not result in any substantial changes to the guidelines as originally drafted, but more supporting information and clarification was added in places.

We wish to acknowledge that Stroud District Council (SDC) and Gloucestershire Rural Community Council (GRCC) gave invaluable help towards the production of this document. Particular thanks must go to Conrad Moore of SDC Planning Policy Department for his advice and careful reviews of the evolving drafts of this report; thanks also to Natalie Whalley for her advice and to Vince Warwick for the provision of excellent maps. Thanks are due to Marilyn Cox of GRCC for early advice on the scope of the CDS and techniques for gathering the required background information



#### 4. Summary

It is our belief that the Uley and Owlpen Community Design Statement, as now presented for adoption by SDC, has been prepared fully in conformance with applicable guidance on the scope and content for a design statement.

We made extensive efforts to ensure that the local community had every opportunity to contribute to the drafting of the CDS.

We undertook a carefully organised formal consultation phase which included the distribution of hardcopies to adjoining parishes and placing others in strategic locations accessible to anyone without online access. We emailed statutory consultees to inform them of the CDS consultation and provided a link to download a pdf copy. Some consultees responded with comments. We therefore believe that every reasonable effort was made to enable consultation on the draft document.

Mike Griffiths,

Chairman of CDS sub-committee



## Appendix A Membership of the CDS Sub-committee

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>CDS sub-committee role</b>
Mike Griffiths	Uley parish councillor	Chairman
Juliet Brown	Uley parish councillor	Member
David Coull	Uley parishioner	Member
Jim Dewey	Uley parish councillor	Member
Belinda Holley	Uley parish councillor	Member
John Penley	Uley parishioner	Member
Thoss Shearer	Uley parishioner	Member
David Sykes	Uley parishioner	Member
Karen Randall	Owlpen Meeting - chairman	Member
Phyllida Hart Davis	Owlpen Meeting - clerk	Sub-editor

## Appendix B

### Findings from the CDS Questionnaire

A questionnaire was sent to all households in Uley and Owlpen via the *Village News* in October 2014. By the closing date of 23 December 139 responses had been received, representing a response from approximately a quarter of all households. It must be acknowledged that the generous offer of prize draw vouchers from the Uley Community Stores was no doubt of assistance in generating interest. A copy of the questionnaire was available to download from the Uley Community Stores website.

It was clear from the results that the residents of Uley and Owlpen value the rural nature of the valley, the fields, woodlands, footpaths and existing appearance and oppose strongly any changes which would detract from the beauty of this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The nature of the existing buildings are obviously treasured and highly regarded by those who live here.

Responses to questions in the first part of the survey, with results in excess of 75%, are shown below in order of ranking as 'very important' from a planning point of view:

Summary of issue or concern	Very Important	Important
1) That planners take account of the fact that Uley and Owlpen fall within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty when considering future development or planning applications ( <i>joint top highest scoring question</i> ).	89%	9%
2) That any new development does not spoil our natural environment (hanging woods, sides of the Bury, our surrounding farmland etc.).	89%	10%
3) The preservation of Woodland.	82%	17%
4) The preservation of the existing network of footpaths & bridleways.	81%	18%
5) The preservation of fields & hedgerows.	78%	22%
6) That the design of new buildings and extensions or other changes to existing buildings is sympathetic to buildings in their immediate vicinity.	77.5%	22%
7) That new buildings and any changes to existing buildings do not adversely affect views of (or looking out from) Uley and Owlpen.	77%	20%
8) New homes – interpreted as concern about permission for any new homes being granted.	81%	19%
9) The preservation of existing water courses, ponds & rivers.	75%	23%

The second part of the survey allowed respondents to give views in free format, and the majority of replies expanded on the views already expressed above. Respondents felt very



## Uley and Owlpen Community Design Statement

---

strongly that the valley landscape, the views, the Cotswold Scarp, the Bury, the green open spaces and vistas, the unspoilt nature of the Uley valley, its flora and fauna (especially the wildlife), the open fields, hedgerows, farms and Cotswold stone walls, the walks, footpaths and bridleways and the river, streams and ponds should all be preserved for posterity and not damaged or endangered or spoilt by future development in the valley.

Specific buildings or amenities were mentioned as being particularly valued.

Other much-valued benefits of living in Uley are: the rural community and village spirit, the tranquillity and lack of road noise, the Village Envelope (to contain all further development) and the Conservation area within Uley and Owlpen, the listed buildings, the beneficial lack of wind turbines or similar intrusive structures, the AONB, the lack of building infill in gardens and the space between Uley and Dursley which should be preserved at all costs from infill development.

The final section of the questionnaire asked what residents would change if they could. The majority of replies concerned the general appearance of the village. However, there was a strong desire for parking problems in Uley to be resolved as well as further measures to prevent speeding by traffic passing through the village. It does appear that the generous provision of parking is thus an issue which should be considered thoroughly by planners whenever a house is extended or a new build considered in the future.





## Appendix C CDS Distribution for Public Consultation

Category	Body / Organisation	Address / Contact	Sent / delivered	Response
<b>Public Access Copies (9)</b>				
	Dursley Library		By hand	
	Uley Village Hall		By hand	
	Uley Community Stores		By hand	
	St Giles Church, Uley		By hand	
	Holy Cross Church, Owlpen		By hand	
	Uley Surgery		By hand	
	Prema		By hand	
	Uley Sports Field Pavilion		By hand	
	Uley C of E school		By hand	
<b>Town and Parish Councils (10)</b>				
	Uley PC Clerk	Ms A McKay Clerk to Uley Parish Council	By hand	
	Owlpen PM Clerk	Mrs D Hart-Davis Clerk to Owlpen Parish Meeting	By hand	Member of sub-committee
	Cam PC	Mrs Andrea Durn Clerk to Cam Parish Council	Hardcopy by post	
	Coaley PC	Mrs Lynn Thornton Clerk to Coaley Parish Council	Hardcopy by post	
	Dursley Town Council	Mr John Kay Clerk to Dursley Town Council	Hardcopy by post	Positive comments from Council.
	Horsley PC	Mr J R Nicholson Clerk to Horsley Parish Council	Hardcopy by post	
	North Nibley PC	Mr R Symons Clerk to North Nibley Parish Council	Hardcopy by post	
	Kingscote PC (Cotswold DC)	Mrs. Anna Davison Clerk to Kingscote Parish Council	Hardcopy by post	
	Nympsfield PC	Mrs Ann Robertson Clerk to Nympsfield Parish Council	Hardcopy by post	
	Wotton under Edge PC	Mrs Sue Bailey Clerk to Wotton under Edge Town Council	Hardcopy by post	



Category	Body / Organisation	Address / Contact	Sent / delivered	Response
<b>District &amp; County Councillors (2)</b>				
	County Councillor	Steve Lydon	email	Acknowledged by email.
	District Councillor	Tim Boxall	email	No response
<b>Statutory Consultees (16)</b>				
	Stroud District Council Planning	Conrad Moore, Planning Strategy, Stroud District Council	Hardcopy plus email	Considerable helpful comment and advice.
	Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service	Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service	email	No response
	Gloucestershire Constabulary	Mark Murphy (Crime Prevention Design Advisor)	email	No response
	Gloucestershire County Council Highways	Daniel Tiffney Gloucestershire County Council Highways	email	Acknowledged by email, passed to Andrew Middlecote.
	Gloucestershire County Council	Gloucestershire County Council Mr R Drake	email and sent pdf by email	Comments received from Rob Niblett.
	Natural England	Natural England Worcester	email	No response
	Environment Agency	Environment Agency Tewkesbury	email	No response
	English Heritage	English Heritage Bristol Amanda Smith	email	No response
	Cotswolds Conservation Board	Andrew Lord Cotswolds Conservation Board Northleach	email	No response
	Gloucestershire Rural Community Council (GRCC)	Elin Tattersall Community House Gloucester	email	Comments received from Barbara Pond
	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust Conservation Centre Dr Colin Studholme	Sent message on web form	No response
	Health and Wellbeing Boards	Andrea Clarke (Committee Administrator) Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Board Shire Hall Westgate Street Gloucester GL1 2TG	email	Responded to advise Board does not comment on individual plans.



Uley and Owlpen  
Community Design Statement

Category	Body / Organisation	Address / Contact	Sent / delivered	Response
	Federation of Small Businesses	Russell Warner (Cotswold Branch Chair) Federation of Small Businesses Cotswold Branch	email	No response
	gfirst Local Enterprise Partnership	Peter Carr (Deputy Chief Executive) gfirst Local Enterprise Partnership Gloucester	email	No response
	Dursley & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce	Peter Jones Dursley & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce	email	No response
<b>Utility Providers</b>				
	Western Power	Adam Pritchard - Western Power Distribution -	email	No response
	Severn Trent water	Severn Trent Water - Ms Dawn Williams,	email	No response
<b>Others</b>				
	GRCC	Marilyn Cox	email	Comments and advice received.
	SDC	Natalie Whalley	email	Comments and advice received.
	Leonard Stanley PC	Hayley Holland	email	Acknowledged by email.



## Appendix D

### Consultation Comments Received and Responses

	CDS Page	CDS Para /Policy	Respondent	Comment	Response to Comment
A		General comment	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	<p>“The photographs and maps need better notation + text. For example the picture pg. 5 has no compass or labels explaining which is Owlpen and which is Uley.</p> <p>Rather than using maps and photos as appendices it would be beneficial to lend more clarity to add these into the text. E.g. Pg6 para 1 at top of the page starting The landscape of the two parishes.... harmony with it. Insert photograph here to help illustrate the point made as this is stating that this is ‘absolutely critical’”</p>	<p>The caption to the photo on p5 already states the direction of view but Uley now identified as in the foreground and Owlpen behind.</p> <p>The maps need to be full page to be readable and inserting them in the main body of text would significantly break the flow of the document. Putting them together makes it easier for the information they contain to be compared.</p> <p>In printed booklet form the aerial photo on page 5 appears opposite the text on page 6 so they work together.</p> <p>Some additional references to the maps and key view photos have been added.</p>



Uley and Owlpen  
Community Design Statement

	CDS Page	CDS Para /Policy	Respondent	Comment	Response to Comment
B		General comment	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	<p>“More emphasis needs to be made of the key distinctive character of Uley &amp; Owlpen. When defining distinctive character refer to consultation for evidence to justify guidance. Knowing the parish as we do, we do not feel that the separation of the two areas, Owlpen and Uley is given enough weight. There is separation from each settlement and separation from the escarpment.</p> <p>Not enough weight is given to the two settlements being surrounded by agricultural land. The CDS should contain a clear statement which summarises parish distinctiveness at the start of CDS, i.e. landscape setting, views, heights, size of parish, green space in proportion to building development, size of parish in cares, flat valley sided; how far it is to next place/village/ town (this helps to emphasis its rurality) as well as settlement pattern etc. When reading this the reader should be able to identify the parish.”</p>	<p>Largely not accepted. Much of the material suggested is already in section 3 (Landscape).</p> <p>Distance to Dursley added in para 1 and in the first sentence of para 2 of section 3 we have added population figures for the two parishes and a statement that they are both surrounded by agricultural land.</p>



	CDS Page	CDS Para /Policy	Respondent	Comment	Response to Comment
C		General comment	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“Planning and policies [sic] are placed throughout the document. We would advise a specific section on this, where these are grouped together. If the distinctive character varies according to the areas describe, bring out the key features of each; allocate guidance to each if required; guidance could then be interspersed.”	Comment declined. The guidelines are already both interspersed in the text and collected together in Appendix A. Where the guidelines are specific to parts of Uley or Owlpen, this is made clear (e.g. UO8 and UO10) and follows from the main text.
D		General comment	Dursley Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group/Dursley Town Council	“The [NDP Steering Group] commended the professional design, layout and structure of the publication. The document is well written and supportive of Uley. The photographs and maps are also clear and help to engage the reader with the content of the Design Statement. The document provides a good account of the history of the development of the parishes of Uley and Owlpen. It will also help to preserve the character of the two settlements.  “There was a discussion about the flow of traffic through Uley and the main routes into and out of the village.”	No action needed. Dursley Town Council subsequently endorsed the NDP Steering Group’s comments, adding “The style and format of the document is excellent.”



	CDS Page	CDS Para /Policy	Respondent	Comment	Response to Comment
E		General comment	Rob Niblett (Gloucestershire County Council)	“Ecology: The CDS does not introduce new policy or plans and so the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) is unlikely. The CDS helps to inform the implementation of existing policy in the recently adopted Stroud Local Plan (2015).”	No action needed
F	3-4	2 Background	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“The history section is too lengthy”	No action needed. We have already reviewed and shortened this section (now one page) and agreed it is now focused on what needs to be said to contextualize the current built environment
G	6	2nd para	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“Would advise to expand the point re hanging woodlands – are these a unique aspect of the landscape?”	At end of penultimate sentence (i.e. after “allowed the beech to flourish”) add “and become such a distinctive feature of the landscape”
H	6	4 <sup>th</sup> para	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	Suggests substituting for whole para: “As population increases and more need housing, agricultural land forms a key feature of this rural community and is focal in the landscape and for our local economy. As the economy and technologies change, so the buildings and spaces may change, but we want these to complement rather than be at odds with the character”.	Comment declined. This is not what we were trying to say!



	CDS Page	CDS Para /Policy	Respondent	Comment	Response to Comment
I	6	6 <sup>th</sup> para	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“Would advise that putting a map after para 6 would help understanding (aerial photograph?)” [This para lists the areas of semi-ancient woodland, semi-natural grassland, Key Wildlife Sites etc.]	We do not feel that this level of additional detail is required for a Design Statement. Perhaps would be more relevant for a Parish Plan
J	7	UO3 Design and Setting of Buildings	Rob Niblett (Gloucestershire County Council)	“Archaeology: Policy UO3 makes the correct points regarding the setting of monuments, strictly more of an Historic England concern.”	No action needed
K	7	UO4 Floodlighting	Rob Niblett (Gloucestershire County Council)	“It is noted that guidance UO4 correctly identifies that floodlighting (or any significant new lighting) can sometimes have a negative impact on biodiversity and so is a consideration in new development projects.”	No action needed
L	8	4 Settlement Character	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“Refers to a map 4 but it is unclear where is it in the document?”	No change. We have indicated on page 2 that Maps 1 and 2 start on page 26 – all maps are together.
M	11	4.5(1) Southern Fringes of Uley Village	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“Throughout the CDS there is subjective language used and we would advise that this is avoided and factual statements used in their place e.g. comments made about the Knoll 'forms a pleasant group'.”	Any assessment of settlement character must have a subjective element. In the specific example, substitute “has group value” (a Historic England term of art) for “forms a pleasant group”





	<b>CDS Page</b>	<b>CDS Para /Policy</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
N	15	U07 Settlement Edge	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“would advise to insert a map with comments to help strengthen statement”	Comment declined. At present, the text simply highlights the sensitivity of sites “anywhere near the settlement edge” and we have identified key views into the village. Mapping sensitive sites risks implying that anything goes on other sites – and in any case would be unproductively controversial.
O	16	5 Buildings and Design Features	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“again would advise to insert a map here to help explain and lighten the text”	What seems to be suggested here is a map showing either the buildings mentioned in this section and/or some of the buildings listed in Appendix C. We are not convinced that this is necessary in addition to the individual settlement character descriptions in section 4.



	CDS Page	CDS Para /Policy	Respondent	Comment	Response to Comment
P	17	5.2 Building Materials	Gill Cathles (Uley parishioner)	<p>“[This para] should include reference to the use of limestone mortar and limewash as being appropriate for Cotswold stone buildings. It should discourage the use of paints which seal walls [e.g. Dulux Weathershield], rather than allowing them to breathe, often resulting, over time, in the failure of the paint and unsightly patches of mould and damp [and leading to major damp problems inside the building]. The use of Portland cement instead of lime mortar to point Cotswold stone walls is similarly unattractive and leads to damage to the stonework.</p> <p>Ty Mawr lime, in Brecon, has very helpful information on these issues, runs courses and sells tools and materials [<a href="http://www.lime.org.uk">www.lime.org.uk</a>].</p>	Insert new para 3: “On Cotswold stone buildings, traditional materials (limestone mortar and limewash) should be used in order to avoid damage to stonework.”
Q	18	UO9 Scale, Height and Style	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“Would advise to add a comment, 2 storeys max. unsure about the last sentence 'arbitrary detailing...inappropriate' is subjective again”	Comment declined. Scale varies and in some places 3 storeys would be appropriate. The point about superficial customization of standard designs is one we strongly agreed on; and in any case any policy on style is inherently subjective.



	CDS Page	CDS Para /Policy	Respondent	Comment	Response to Comment
R	18	UO11 Building Walls	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“Surely the materials would need to reflect the materials of the current streetscape? “chosen with care” is too loose a term”	Revise final sentence to read: “Building materials should be chosen to reflect the neighbouring streetscape, but also with particular attention to how (and if) these materials weather and reflect the local stone colour palette and texture.”
S	19	UO16 Gardens and Boundaries	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“This [“It is desirable that front gardens remain traditionally cultivated, not used for parking] may cause a conflict, is parking more of a priority than a uniform look to the village? When parking choices are limited this may not be a choice for residents. Would advise to add, 'whenever possible'”	Proposed amendment declined. Wording already qualified by “It is desirable that.” There have been no comments on this policy from residents.
T	20	6.1 Open Spaces	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“Would advise a policy guidance on green spaces as this is stated as being important to villagers”	No action needed. Idea previously considered and rejected. More appropriate to Parish Plan (2006 Parish Plan sets out policies for open spaces but these are probably partly out of date)
U	20	6.1 Open Spaces	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	Suggests again adding a map to explain and lighten the text	Map 5 added to show the location of most of the open spaces on an aerial photographic background.



Uley and Owlpen  
Community Design Statement

	CDS Page	CDS Para /Policy	Respondent	Comment	Response to Comment
V	22	UO22 Trees and Hedges	Rob Niblett (Gloucestershire County Council)	“Promotion of use of native (or perhaps ‘traditional’) species of trees and shrubs in the landscape is supported (section 6.2). UO22 however which follows could be better worded as dead and dying trees provide a valuable resource for rare species such as invertebrates. It is therefore suggested that the last phrase says instead...’where necessary the replacement of dead or dying specimens should be confined to using native species characteristic of the landscape wherever possible.’ “	Accept proposed amendment, except to be consistent with para 6.22 substitute “traditional” for “native”
W	22	7 Social and Economic Activity	Chris Dunn (Uley parishioner)	Reference to a pharmacy at the doctors’ surgery is legally incorrect. It is a dispensary, offering a more limited service and subject to lighter regulation.	Substitute “dispensary” for “pharmacy”
X	24	8.1 & 8.2 Roads and Lanes, Paths	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“You may wish to consider adding policy guidance on cycle paths and footpaths as these are both included in this section but no policy offered.”	No action needed. Idea previously considered and rejected. More appropriate to Parish Plan (2006 Parish Policy sets out footpaths policy which is still valid today; position on Dursley cycle path etc. still unclear)



Uley and Owlpen  
Community Design Statement

	<b>CDS Page</b>	<b>CDS Para /Policy</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
Y	29	Map 3	Barbara Pond (GRCC)	“There is a small area outside the settlement boundary (Map 3) you may wish to add a note to identify this”	Map 3 has been convert from satellite image overlay to traditional map and scale 1:7,000 which will aid both (a) identification of the built areas outside the settlement development limit and (b) comparison with the Conservation Area map.



Uley and Owlpen  
**Community Design Statement**