

House Extensions

Supplementary Planning Document
Statement of Consultation
December 2006



Halton Borough Council

House Extensions

Supplementary Planning Document

Statement of Consultation

Environmental & Regulatory Services
Environment Directorate
Halton Borough Council
Rutland House
Halton Lea
Runcorn
WA7 2GW

Introduction

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 it is a requirement to prepare and publish a Statement of Consultation for a range of planning policy documents, including Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). This is a reflection of Government's desire to "strengthen community and stakeholder involvement in the development of local communities". The Council has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), this sets out how the public will be consulted on new planning policy and significant planning applications. This Statement of Consultation has been prepared to meet the requirements of the SCI, and also aims to reflect the intentions of Government planning guidance for reporting on community involvement in the plan making process.

This Statement of Consultation sets out the comments and representations made, and the response to them, in respect of Partnership Consultation Stage and the formal Public Participation Stage conducted by Halton Borough Council, in relation to the House Extensions SPD. This Statement of Consultation has been produced in accordance with Regulation 17 (1) and 18 (4) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

The Partnership Consultation Stage took place between 13th June and 27th June 2006 and involved participation of key stakeholders with an interest in this particular document. The period of formal public participation on the draft House Extensions SPD was conducted between 14th September and 26th October 2006. The document was made available at various deposit locations throughout the Borough, along with a copy of the public notice of 'SPD Matters and Public Participation', Representations Forms, the Sustainability Appraisal Report and an explanatory letter. Each of the aforementioned documents was also made available on the Council website and in various formats upon request.

Statutory consultees (as outlined in Planning Policy Statement 12 - Local Development Frameworks, Appendix E) were consulted specifically via letter with an individual copy of the draft SPD attached. In addition, those individuals on the Council's Local Development Framework consultation database that had requested to be informed of the publication of the draft SPD were also sent a covering explanatory letter, a copy of the public notice of SPD Matters and Public Participation, and a Representation Form.

Partnership Consultation

Partnership consultation period: 13th June – 27th June 2006

Date of consideration of representations: 28th June 2005 - 30th June 2005

Note – All paragraph and page references relate to the numbers as set out in the partnership consultation draft

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Alasdair Cross Planning & Policy Division Environmental & Regulatory Services	19/06/06 Written comments	Para. 1.5 - Change the second 'guidance' to 'document'.	This text has been amended.
		Application of the Policy – Change 'for the disabled' to 'for a disabled person'.	This text has been amended.
		Should there be an introduction to the Guiding Principles section?	Text has now been inserted to explain the Guiding Principles section.
		Para 2.1 – Change 'is aimed at promoting' to 'promotes'.	This text has been amended.
		Para.2.1 provide further information in relation to 'PPGs'.	This text has been amended.
		Para 2.2 is this section in relation to 'Securing the Future' relevant?	It is felt that this document still provides one of the overarching principles for all development (ie sustainable development).
		Diagram 2 – this doesn't do justice to how bad the 2 nd extension is. Consider altering the point of view.	Diagram has been amended.
		Diagram 4 – insert the word 'blank' to 'extended gable wall'.	Diagram has been amended.
		Diagram 9 – the diagram should be made clearer so that it shows 800mm on each side of the boundary.	Diagram has been amended.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Alasdair Cross Planning & Policy Division Environmental & Regulatory Services <i>Continued . . .</i>		Diagram 9 – as this text refers to semi-detached and terraced properties should the diagrams not also show a terrace or semi-detached property.	Diagram has been amended.
		Diagram 10 – this diagram should show room for 2 off road parking spaces.	Diagram has been amended.
		Section 5 –Should a policy to consider linked detached or the creation of linked detached properties be included?	The text in this section has been amended to include linked detached properties.
		Para. 7.3 bullet 1 – does this apply individually or cumulatively?	It is felt that the text contained in this bullet point is sufficient and a change has not been made.
		Para. 7.3 bullet 2 – could a diagram be included to show this?	Diagram to be included.
		Para 7.3 bullet 5 – insert ‘to’ between ‘extend’ and ‘the’.	This text has been amended.
		Para 7.3 bullet 5 – insert reference to diagram 14.	This text has been amended.
		Para. 8.3 – would it be appropriate to say that ‘where space is tight the use of roller or sectional garage doors that require less room may be more appropriate than ‘up and over’ doors.	This text has been amended.
		Diagram 15 – should be amended to show the distance from the garage rather than the porch.	Diagram has been amended.
		Para. 11.3 – this paragraph should be rephrased for clarity.	This text has been amended.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Alasdair Cross Planning & Policy Division Environmental & Regulatory Services <i>Continued . . .</i>		Para. 11.4 – The old SPG had a useful example of a block plan highlighting key information required should this also be included.	Diagram to be included.
Neil Macfarlane Planning & Policy Division Environmental & Regulatory Services	14/06/06 Written comments	Para. 8.5 – is the term ‘property boundary’ correct as this suggests a garden wall or fence should be 300mm clear of the highway boundary.	This is the correct terminology.
		Para. 9.2 – how will this principle work for areas where a covenant states that gardens can not be enclosed?	It is felt that many such covenant would relate to front gardens and in this case would not be included within this principle.
		Para. 10.5 – Contact details should be referred to or included here.	Contact details have now been included.
		Para. 11.3 – Amend address.	Address amended
		Section 11 blue box – should this also refer to building control as there are likely to be extensions that do not require planning but may need building control.	Further text inserted in relation to building control.
		Para 11.4 bullet 1 – Provide further detail as to what a ‘set’ is.	Further detail has been included.
		Para 11.4 bullet 2 – Should this be changed from ‘A’ to ‘4’ location plans.	This text has been amended.
		Para 11.4 bullet 2 – Should this also make clear that the plan must be OS based and include at least 2 street names?	This text has been amended to include OS based however, it not felt necessary to require 2 street names.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Neil Macfarlane Planning & Policy Division Environmental & Regulatory Services <i>Continued . . .</i>		Para 11.4 bullet 3 & 4 – should further information be given as to how many plans should be included?	This text has been amended.
		Para 11.4 bullet final bullet – should this state ‘a signed and dated copy’ of the correct certificate and should it also make reference to the possible need to notify the owners?	This text has been amended.
		Local Information Section – refer to development control website before forward planning.	This text has been amended.
Dave Tierney Building Control Division Environmental & Regulatory Services	14/06/06 by email	The SPD needs to give further consideration to window design in relation to extensions & loft conversions.	Further text has been added to both section 2 and 11 in relation to the need to consider building regulation requirements.
Phil Watts Environmental & Regulatory Services	14/06/06 by email	<p>There should be an agreed format for the Local Information Section i.e.</p> <p>Joanne Dutton - Senior Planning Officer, Planning And Policy Division, Environmental And Regulatory Services</p> <p>John White - Tree and Woodlands Officer, Landscape Division, Environmental And Regulatory Services</p>	This text has been amended.
Steve Williams Housing Strategy Policy & Support Department	22/06/06 by phone	Generally happy with this document.	Acknowledged no change needed.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Steve Williams Housing Strategy Policy & Support Department <i>Continued . . .</i>		Some concern over the 45-degree rule, which may restrict some of the house extensions that are required for those who are less able.	The 45-degree rule is felt to be important in terms of general amenity for neighbouring properties. However, exceptions may be made for those who are less able as set out in section I of the SPD.

Public Consultation

Public Consultation period: 14th September – 26th October 2006

Date of consideration of representations: 30th October – 3rd November 2005

Note – All paragraph and page references relate to the numbers as set out in the partnership consultation draft

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Diane Kisiel The Highways Agency	22/09/06 by email	The Highways Agency has no specific comments to make on these SPDs.	Acknowledged.
Rex Merry Consultant Building Surveyor	13/10/06 Representation Form	Page 6 – No reference is made regarding minimum distance to pavement or highway.	Although no reference is made on page 6 there is a section in relation to the streetscene on pages 3 & 4 and within paragraph 8.6.
		Page 7 – Should the setting back of 1 metre from the front main dwelling not refer to the first floor only?	No, the text on page 7 is felt to be correct.
		Page 7 – If you insist on 800mm distance to side boundary then this will rule out 99% of all first floor side extensions to semi detached dwellings: is this what you want to achieve?	The text in relation to the 800mm distance is felt to be appropriate and is intended to prevent terracing. This remains appropriate with regard to semi-detached properties.
		Page 7 – if there is an existing ground floor garage to the side elevation, will a first floor over have to be set back 800 from side boundary. If so this will cause a very difficult construction problem. Page 10 – Under 7.3 you state that the face of the dormer should be set back 1 metre from the main wall, but diagram 14 shows it level. Which is correct and	The text in relation to the 800mm distance is felt to be appropriate and is intended to prevent terracing. This remains appropriate with regard to properties with ground floor garages. Both diagrams 14 & 15 will be amended to better reflect the text in para 7.3. As stated within para. 7.3 the text in the bullet points relate to dormers on either

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Rex Merry Consultant Building Surveyor <i>Continued . . .</i>		do you intend the same to both front and rear elevations. Page 11 – Diagram 16: up and over garage doors do not stick out as far as shown.	the front or rear elevation. It should be noted that the diagrams are illustrative. Text will be added to ensure that this is made clear within the document.
		General comment – permitted development rights which do not require planning permission should be clearly shown at beginning of document to avoid confusion to any member of the public.	It is felt that including information in relation to permitted development rights would be too confusing to public and it would be more appropriate to encourage the public to speak to a planning officer to find out whether they require permission, as set out in Section 11 of the SPD. However, reference will be added to the DCLG document ‘Planning – A guide for Householders – What you need to know about the Planning System’, as this provides more information about permitted development.
Helen Barrett Environment Agency	19/10/06 by letter	We support the proposed SPD and would like to make the following comments on the document.	Acknowledged.
		The Environment Agency would only have concerns with this type of development when it lies within an area at risk of flooding or where it falls within main river bye law distance.	Acknowledged.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Helen Barrett Environment Agency <i>Continued . . .</i>		<p>The Environment Agency recommends that in areas at risk of flooding, consideration be given to the incorporation into the design and construction of the development of flood proofing measures. Additional guidance can be found on the environment Agency website: www.environment-agency.gov.uk</p> <p>We would also recommend that floor levels are set no lower.</p>	<p>Further text in relation to this issue will be added to Section 10 of the SPD.</p>
		<p>Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Byelaws, the prior written consent of the Agency is required for any proposed works or structures either affecting or within the 8 metres of the tidal or fluvial flood defences.</p>	<p>Further text in relation to this issue will be added to Section 10 of the SPD.</p>
Paul Entwistle NWRA	19/10/06 by letter & email	<p>The NWRA are responsible for the production of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West of England. I note that the draft SPD as identified both the relevant Adopted RSS (RPG13) policy and its Submitted Draft RSS counterpart. I am therefore satisfied that the RSS has been given due consideration on preparation of the SPD. I also note that the Adopted RSS and the Submitted Draft</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
		<p>RSS have also been given recognition in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>I would like to take the opportunity to draw your attention to the NWRA North West Best Practice Design Guide, which while offering broad guidance on design issues, also has specific chapters on considering the needs of disabled people, integrating development with the historical environment and retaining and integrating development into the character of an area, all of which maybe of some relevance to the Draft House Extensions SPD.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
Dianne Wheatley GONW	23/10/06 by email	<p>It [House Extensions SPD] was well set out with a good comprehensive structure and helpful use of illustrations to aid understanding by the reader.</p> <p>Consider the need for Appropriate Assessment as well as SA: recent draft guidance from DCLG should assist.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>An Appropriate Assessment has been completed alongside the House Extension SPD.</p>
David Hardman United Utilities	24/10/06 by fax	<p>Section 11: The Planning Application</p> <p>United Utilities receive many enquiries from members of the public who have obtained planning permission for a house</p>	<p>Further text in relation to this issue will be added to Section 10 of the SPD.</p>

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
		<p>extension and then under building regulations the building control officer stops them working as they are building near a public sewer.</p> <p>It is the applicants responsibility to check for the presence of underground utility services and it would be helpful if they were reminded of this at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Perhaps on page 15, para 11.5, the bullet point 'a covering letter with any other relevant information in support of your application' could be extended to 'confirming that you have checked for the presence of underground utility services.'</p>	
Janet Belfield Natural England	25/10/06 by letter	<p>The subject matter of this SPD does not directly affect our environmental interests, but we have the following comments to make. We would appreciate a paragraph within section 10 of the draft SPD in relation to protected species. This would be a valuable opportunity to draw attention to the fact that extensions where roof alterations are included can have an impact on protected species, such as bats, where they may occupy roof</p>	Further text in relation to this issue will be added to Section 10 of the SPD.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
<p>Janet Belfield Natural England Continued . . .</p>		<p>spaces.</p> <p>We ask if you would include the paragraph as follows: <i>Species such as bats, which use roof spaces as roost or hibernation sites, and birds which nest under the eaves of buildings are protected from harm by law. Applications for development that involve alterations to existing roof spaces, listed buildings, pre-1939 houses, barns or other traditional buildings and, any work involving disturbance to trees or hedges may have an impact upon protected species. If the presence of bats or birds is suspected then an application may need to include a survey report, together with details of mitigation measures to safeguard the protected a species from the adverse effects of the development. The Council may impose planning conditions or obligations on planning permissions to ensure that these measures are implemented. Such measures may include, for example, avoiding carrying out any work during the bird breeding season, or the inclusion of artificial nest boxes as part of the development. The Council may refuse permission for developments where inadequate survey and mitigation details are included</i></p>	

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
		<p><i>with an application.</i> <i>For further information please visit the Natural England website:</i> www.naturalengland.org.uk</p>	
<p>Roy Stopford Walton Parish Clerk</p>	<p>03/11/06 by email</p>	<p>Walton Parish Council would thank you for extending the opportunity to comment but have no comment to make in respect of this matter.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

