

## 2024 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) consultation

### Consultation statement – Boundary Treatments SPD

The Council consulted statutory and other consultees on the draft Boundary Treatments SPD in line with the approved 2018 Statement of Community Involvement (<https://www.sefton.gov.uk/sci>). The consultation period ran from Monday 26<sup>th</sup> February 2024 to 15<sup>th</sup> April 2024.

Four responses were received, from:

- Canal & Rivers Trust
- Highways England
- Mersey Forest
- Historic England

The table below summaries the main issues raised by consultees ('summary of comment'), and how these issues have been addressed in the SPD ('initial response').

Consultee	Summary of comment	Initial response
Canal & River Trust	The trust support the production of the boundary treatment SPD. We support the overall thrust of the document in terms of trying to provide a mechanism to ensure boundary treatments are appropriate to the character of the area and can have significant impact on how an area is perceived. We particularly welcome section 10 in terms of the boundaries adjacent to a canal corridor. As noted within the document, closing the canal corridor off with closed-board or palisade fencing would not maximise the potential of developing near water. We welcome the intention that new development should seek to provide an open and positive frontage to the canal corridor. We also welcome the intention of section 12 in terms of the retention of hedgerows.	Noted
Highways England	"Our focus whilst reviewing the SPD was the impact to road safety that unsuitable boundary treatments might have. We certainly see it as key that sight lines, for example, are not obstructed through the erection of boundary fences or walls	Noted

Consultee	Summary of comment	Initial response
	<p>in poor locations. Additionally, we would like to stress the point that the boundary fences for motorways are the responsibility of National Highways as Highway Authority for those routes, and developers are reminded that the removal of these fences would not be acceptable. There have been recent issues where our own fences have been replaced with acoustic barriers without consent. As we cannot permit a third party to maintain a highway boundary, this is causing land and legal issues that need to be overcome. Our responses to planning consultations for sites adjacent to motorway boundaries would almost always recommend the construction of a secondary, 2m-high closeboarded fence at least 1m inside the developer's land. This allows for the continued maintenance of our own boundary, with the additional safety benefits of a close-boarded fence to reduce the risk of access on to the network.</p>	
Mersey Forest	<p>"The Boundary Treatment SPD says "Development proposals must replace any trees lost as a result of development at a ratio of 1:1 within the site". We would strongly encourage you to go further with this ratio, to replace trees lost at a higher ratio to encourage an overall increase in tree cover. It is very important to take into consideration not just the number of trees lost, but also their overall canopy cover, species type, maturity, and the ecosystem services that they are providing. The loss of a smaller tree is much less significant than the loss of a larger more mature tree.</p>	<p>Noted. However, Local Plan policy EQ9 'provision of public open space, strategic paths and trees' outlines 'replace any trees lost as a result of the development at a ratio of 1:1 within the site'. An SPD can not introduce new policy, but rather build on those within a development plan, and as such, we are unable to ask for a higher ratio of tree replacement within this SPD.</p>
Historic England	<p>We would encourage you to consider the historic environment in the production of your SPD. We recommend that you seek advice from the local authority conservation officer and from the appropriate archaeological staff. They are best placed to provide information on the historic environment, advise on local historic environment issues and indicate how heritage assets may be affected and identify</p>	<p>Noted. The historic environment is covered by various Local Plan policies.</p>

Consultee	Summary of comment	Initial response
	opportunities for securing wider benefits through the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.	