

2018 Supplementary Planning Document consultation

Consultation statement – New Housing SPD (2018)

The Council consulted statutory and other consultees on the draft New Housing SPD in line with the approved Statement of Community Involvement (<https://www.sefton.gov.uk/sci>). The consultation period ran from mid-February to 13th April 2018.

A total of 11 responses were received, from the following:

- Barret Homes
- CPRE
- Historic England ('no comment')
- Jigsaw Homes
- Merseyside Police
- Natural England
- Network Rail
- Persimmon Homes
- Taylor Wimpey
- The Canal & River Trust
- United Utilities ("no specific comments")

Consultee	Summary of comment	Response
Barratt Homes	Guidance should be given on when lower density development is acceptable. The heritage section should refer to national policy and legislation as it is not consistent with it. No justification has been provided on garden sizes. There should be guidance of what constitutes thin strips of land. The requirement for brick walls is considered excessive. No need to refer to cycle parking in SPD. Flood Risk section should be amended as there is no requirement within national policy, to address existing flooding issues. Electric vehicle charging point requirement should be reduced to only 25% of new dwellings.	No changes proposed.
CPRE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Par.2.1: add: g) "include as much sustainable innovative design as possible" (ref ;Local Plan EQ7 'major developments should incorporate measures to reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions'; Local Plan par. 5.4.' the council will take a positive approach in favour of sustainable development'). 2. Par.6.2: Insert additional sentence "Artificial turf should not be used for Garden areas instead of grass."(ref;Local Plan par.10.58) 3. Par.8.4: change "...will be supported" to "...will be encouraged." 4. Par.8.4: Add list of sustainable design features as per House Extension SPD, Par.2.13.(a) to f).(CPRE feels new development should be as sustainable as possible and the current wording in this SPD could serve to discourage rather than encourage sustainability!) 5. Par.8.8: Add additional statement to encourage the improvement rather than merely maintenance 	Agree to add a reference to improving air quality in para 8.8, but no other changes are proposed.

Consultee	Summary of comment	Response
	of air quality, "...Development that promotes Green Living such as a Green roof being incorporated into the design, is encouraged".	
Jigsaw Homes	Having reviewed the document, the only item of concern is the proposal under point 10 for the distances between existing properties and access roads. If the standards proposed are adopted then this would potentially prevent the development of backland commercial sites across the borough. An alternative proposal would be that where access roads exist that there is no worsening of existing distances.	No change proposed- para 10.2 is sufficiently flexible. It already allows a reduced distance if there would be no significant harm to residential amenity.
Merseyside Police	Boundary treatments 6.5 – rear and between plots to be 1.8m in height to assist in prevention of neighbour disputes, dangerous dog attacks and offenders moving easily between gardens as a means to escape Parking – 7.1 amend this to include ‘sufficient in curtilage parking in view of habitable rooms’ Access – 7.3 amend to include ‘safe and attractive footpaths which discourage off-road motorcycle use’	Agree to amend SPD to include these points.
Natural England	Natural England previously recommended that Sefton Council provide detail on how recreational pressure related issues associated with new housing development will be addressed. The SPD does not make clear reference to nature conservation issues, we acknowledge that a specific chapter for heritage is included and we would recommend wording is included within the document to highlight nature conservation and how recreational pressure will be addressed. This should also include reference to the draft information note of “At what dwelling threshold should housing development mitigate increased recreation pressure on the Sefton Coast?” and also specific mention to the Visitor Management Strategy. We previously recommended that guidance is also included specifically regarding the provision of green / open space to be provided on site is close to where people live. We acknowledge that there is a separate SPD for Open Space and a link to this document is provided within Chapter 6 however, for completeness, it would be useful within this chapter to summarise the key conclusions relevant to the provision of open space within new housing developments.	No change proposed. These issues are addressed in the Nature Conservation and Open Space SPD’s.

Consultee	Summary of comment	Response
Network Rail	Section 7.3 promotes “safe and attractive footpaths”, which should be further supported by a requirement for developers to assess the impact of their proposals on the increase in use and change in the character of users of any level crossings in the vicinity of the development site. Appropriate risk reduction measures should be incorporated into proposals, and funded by developers, where required. Early engagement with Network Rail and RoW officers is advised.	No change proposed- This section provides general advice for all housing development site specific issues are best addressed at the planning application stage.
Persimmon Homes	<p>3. Density</p> <p>For clarity, the wording of Para 3.1 should be revised to: <i>‘In order to utilise land efficiently and to make public transport viable, new residential development should achieve a minimum average density of 30 dwellings per hectare of the net developable area of the site unless:…’.</i></p> <p>This would avoid confusion and allow large residential schemes to have some areas at a density of less than 30 dph, which may be more appropriate for the location, whilst ensuring that overall, the average density is at least 30 dph.</p>	This wording will be added to paragraph 3.1. We will also make it clear that this applies to each application submitted for a site, to take account of phased developments and multiple developers on some of the larger Local Plan allocations.
Taylor Wimpey	<p>The SPD should specify that higher density housing will be supported where it will not impact on other requirements of the Local Plan and SPD's, such as parking standards and interface distances. Furthermore, clarity is sought on the definition of 'close proximity to a town/district or local centre'. Justification should be provided for the garden size standards.</p> <p>It is unclear what the justification for shared surfaces not being acceptable for schemes of 10 dwellings or more is. Clarification and justification for this requirement must be provided to ensure that the SPD is robust and enforceable.</p> <p>This requirement does not appear to be based on robust evidence. There should be more detail on the specific electric charging points proposed. It also should be subject to viability.</p>	No change proposed.
The Canal & River Trust	<p><u>New Housing SPD</u></p> <p>The Trust support and welcome the inclusion of paragraph 6.6, in relation to the Leeds & Liverpool canal. At present three criteria has been drafted which new housing development should adhere to. The Trust consider that these criteria could be usefully expanded as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Be of a high quality of design that enhances the character of the waterway and integrates the canal into the development in a way that generates sustainable waterway neighbourhoods, where waterway and waterside communities are combined and the waterway is treated as an area of usable space and where appropriate a focus for public activity; 	Minor changes are proposed. Whilst some of the Trust’s points are laudable, they tend to be too onerous and do not relate directly to any extra harm that may be caused by a new housing development.

Consultee	Summary of comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Integrate the waterway, towpath and canal environment into the public realm in terms of design and management of the development; Improve access to, along and from the waterway for all users (where appropriate) and enhance / improve the environmental quality and green infrastructure of the waterway corridor in that area, providing a net gain in biodiversity; c. Optimise views to and from the waterway and generate natural surveillance of water space through the siting, configuration and orientation of buildings, recognising that appropriate boundary treatment and access issues may differ between the towpath and the offside of the canal; d. Improve the amenity and character of the canal in that area. Development that would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the canal by virtue of noise, odour or visual aspect will not be supported by the Council; e. Conserve and enhance, wherever possible, the distinctive industrial heritage of the canal and its associated assets; and f. Seeking to maximise opportunities for reducing carbon emissions and building resilience, in particular investigating the potential for using the canal in relation to heating and cooling within new development. 	