

Halton Borough Council

Design of Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document Statement of Consultation

May 2012

Operational Director
Policy, Planning and Transportation
Halton Borough Council
Municipal Building
Kingsway
Widnes
WA8 7QF



I Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of the Design of Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is to provide additional practical guidance and support for those involved in the planning and design of residential development within Halton. It will also be used by the Council in its assessment of applications for planning permission for schemes of residential development or mixed use schemes containing a residential element.
- 1.2 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 SPDs. This is a reflection of Government's desire to "strengthen community and stakeholder involvement in the development of local communities".
- 1.3 This Statement of Consultation summarises the two periods of public consultation that have been carried out on the Design of Residential Development SPD, in accordance with Regulation 12 (a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012¹. The Regulations state that the Statement of Consultation should include:
- the persons consulted when preparing the SPD
 - a summary of the main issues raised in the consultation
 - how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.
- 1.4 Two separate six-week periods of consultation were undertaken on the Design of Residential Development SPD and they took place during the following dates:
- 13th August - 24th September 2009
 - 27th January – 9th March 2012

2 2009 Public Consultation

- 2.1 The first period of public consultation on the Design of Residential Development SPD (which at the time of the consultation was known as the Design of New Residential Development SPD) was held in late summer-autumn 2009. Methods of consultation included:
- Letters to Statutory Consultees (Specific Consultation Bodies)
 - Letters to Non-statutory Consultees (Parties who have registered an interest in the SPD)
 - Press Notice placed in the Local Paper
 - Consultation material placed in the Council's deposit locations (Halton Direct Links and Libraries)
 - Consultation material placed on the planning pages of the Halton Borough Council website
- 2.2 Representations from 17 parties were received during the initial consultation on the SPD in 2009. These parties were:
- 4NW
 - Government Office for the North West
 - Natural England
 - Environment Agency
 - Highways Agency
 - United Utilities
 - Homes and Communities Agency

¹ http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/pdfs/uksi_20120767_en.pdf

- The Coal Authority
 - Halton Housing Trust
 - The Mersey Forest
 - British Wind Energy Association
 - HBC Waste Management (Two representations)
 - HBC Accessible Housing Service (Two representations)
 - HBC Elected Member: Cllr Hodgkinson
 - HBC Elected Member: Cllr Howard
- 2.3 Appendix I to this report details all of the representations received during the first round of public consultation and how the comments have been taken on board in the revisions to the SPD.
- 2.4 Following the public consultation period, the SPD was edited to take full account of the comments received. Efforts on the Halton Local Development Framework switched to focus on the Core Strategy and progress on this SPD therefore stalled for a considerable period. Due to the time period since the last period of public consultation and also because the changes made to the SPD meant that the document was now substantially different to the 2009 draft, it was considered prudent to carry out a further period of public consultation before the Council move to formally adopt the revised SPD. This led to a second period of public consultation in 2012.

3 2012 Public Consultation

- 3.1 The second period of public consultation on the Design of Residential Development SPD was held in spring 2012. Methods of consultation included:
- Letters to Statutory Consultees (Specific Consultation Bodies)
 - Letters to Non-statutory Consultees (Parties who have registered an interest in the SPD and those who previously responded to the consultation)
 - Press Notice placed in the Runcorn and Widnes Weekly News on 25th January 2012
 - Consultation material placed in the Council's deposit locations (Halton Direct Links and Libraries)
 - Consultation material placed on the planning pages of the Halton Borough Council website: <http://www3.halton.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/planning/196372/>

Public & Legal Notices

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004
 THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2004 AS AMENDED BY THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2009.

Regulation 17: Notice of Public Consultation on DESIGN OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT.

On the 17th November 2011, the Council formally approved the Design of Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the purpose of public consultation. The period of public consultation on the Design of Residential Development SPD is taking place from 27th January 2012 until 9th March 2012.

The purpose of the Design of Residential Development SPD is to provide additional practical guidance and support for those involved in the planning and design of residential development within Halton. It will also be used by the Council in its assessment of applications for planning permission for schemes of residential development or mixed use schemes containing a residential element.

During the period of public consultation the Design of Residential Development SPD will be available to view on the Council's website (<http://www3.halton.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/planning/>) and in the following deposit locations:

- Halton Lea Direct Link, Runcorn
- Runcorn Direct Link
- Widnes Direct Link
- Halton Lea Library, Runcorn
- Widnes Library (Kingsway)
- Runcorn Library
- Ditton Library, Widnes

The Direct Link offices' opening hours are:

- Monday to Friday: 9.00am - 5.30pm
- Saturday: 9.00am - 1.00pm

Opening times of the Council's Libraries can be found online at: <http://www3.halton.gov.uk/educationandlearning/libraries/>

Representations can be made on the SPD by completing the relevant representation form, which can be obtained from the deposit locations, the Council's website or by contacting the Planning Policy Team. **The Council must receive representations by no later than 5pm on Friday 9th March 2012.**

Please contact the Planning Policy Team on 0151 511 7660 or 0303 333 4300 ext. 167660, or email forward.planning@halton.gov.uk, if you have any queries regarding the SPD or how to send your representation to the Council.

Mick Noone, Operational Director (Policy, Planning and Transportation)
 URN: 000763RES



Press Notice from 25th January 2012



Online for Runcorn & Widnes
 0303 333 4300

search: [GO] Home | News Room | Web Accessibility | Website Help | Contact Us | Listen to this page

My nearest: [Enter Postcode] GO My council: [Enter Postcode] GO

You are here: Home > Environment and planning > Planning > Design of Residential Development SPD

Design of Residential Development SPD

Information | See Also | Contacts | Links | In this section

Design of Residential Development SPD

On the 17th November 2011, the Council formally approved the Design of Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the purpose of public consultation. The period of public consultation on the Design of Residential Development SPD is taking place over a six week period from 27th January 2012 until 9th March 2012.

Design of Residential Development – Public Notice

Purpose of the SPD

The purpose of the Design of Residential Development SPD is to...

Statutory Development Plans
 Planning - Area search service
 Planning decision notices
 Planning appeals
 Planning service and performance
 Planning enforcement
 LDF Evidence Base
 Planning Policy
 Joint Merseyside Waste Development Plan Document

SPD webpage: January 2012

3.2 Representations from 11 parties were received during the second round of consultation on the SPD in 2012. These parties were:

- Highways Agency
- Environment Agency
- The Coal Authority
- United Utilities
- Network Rail
- Cheshire Wildlife Trust
- Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service
- Bellway Homes
- HBC Elected Member: Cllr Hodgkinson
- Chris Brough (Resident)
- Ray Liprot (Resident)

3.3 Appendix 2 to this report details all of the representations received during the second round of public consultation, which have been separated into 62 individual comments. Appendix 2 also details how the comments have been taken on board in the revisions to the SPD to create the final version to be adopted.

- 3.4 A number of the representations were standard responses stating that the organisation had no comments to make on the content of the SPD. Comments made on the content of the document can be summarised as follows:
- Environment Agency: comments related to flooding and specifically, including a reference to the Sequential Test promoted in PPS25.
 - United Utilities: comments primarily concerned surface water run-off and flooding and wanted additional reference to this added.
 - Network Rail: comments related to transport and specific requirements in relation to development in proximity to the Borough's railways.
 - Cheshire Wildlife Trust: made a variety of comments in relation to ecology and biodiversity on potential development sites.
 - Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service: provided a wide range of comments on a number of matters namely, waste management, ecology and sustainable design
 - Bellway Homes: comments centred around not over-burdening developers through additional requirements for residential development.
 - Cllr Hodgkinson: comments predominantly related to highways matters.
 - Comments from residents: ranged from support for the document to concerns about the spread of urbanisation leading to a loss of green spaces.
- 3.5 As can be seen in Appendix B, the comments received have been fully considered and the suggestions made have resulted in the SPD being amended accordingly. As such, the Design of Residential Development SPD can be adopted as planning guidance for Halton Borough Council.

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
00393: Cllr Hodgkinson	<i>3.3 Connecting Places (3.3.1)</i>	New highways off main roads with residential development should be designed to offer priority to pedestrians and cyclists. However, concerned if applied to most residential streets as this priority does not apply elsewhere in the current network and could cause confusion. Could this be clarified?	Acknowledged	Provide further clarification in this section.
	<i>3.3 Connecting Places (3.3.2)</i>	Does the desirability to follow pedestrian desire lines apply to all routes or only pedestrian routes?	This applies to all routes that would be taken by a pedestrian.	None required
	<i>3.8 Parking and Servicing</i>	Numbering communal parking spaces could be useful.	Noted however this is not an issue to be addressed in the SPD.	None required
	<i>3.10 Respecting the Environment (3.10.5)</i>	The use of soakaways should be encouraged for small hard areas. For houses with gardens, space should also be allocated for a water butt and their installation should be encouraged.	Acknowledged	Consider adding reference to soakaways and water butts.
	<i>General comment</i>	Free standing communal letter boxes for flats should not be permitted.	Noted however this is not an issue to be addressed in the SPD.	None required
00748: Cllr Howard	<i>3.11 Contribution Towards Infrastructure and Services</i>	What does the following mean? Provide provision for comprehensive and combined communication Infrastructure?	Further explanation is given at 3.11 on this point. The intention is that developers make necessary provision for modern communication systems such as broadband and wireless etc whether through the installation of the technology from the outset or through appropriate ducting throughout the development to allow later installation by system providers. Developers will be expected to provide a statement of how provision has been made or accommodated.	Clarify the existing wording.

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
00797: Homes and Communities Agency	<i>General comment relating to Sandymoor</i>	HCA is keen to ensure that the emerging Design of New Residential Development SPD reflects its own aspirations for residential development at Sandymoor.	The Design of New Residential SPD reflects and considers the design aspirations of Sandymoor which have been expressed within the Sandymoor SPD.	None required
	<i>General comment relating to Sandymoor</i>	Alongside the Sandymoor SPD, separate design codes have been prepared on behalf of the HCA. These design codes should relate as closely as possible to the design principles within the Design of New Residential SPD.	Agree that the Sandymoor Design Codes should be considered for integration into the SPDs design principles.	Ensure that the Sandymoor Design Codes have been considered and where possible integrated into the SPDs design principles.
	<i>General comment relating to Sandymoor</i>	What weight will be afforded to the emerging Design SPD specifically in assessing proposals for residential development at Sandymoor given that separate, detailed Design Codes have already been prepared? The Sandymoor SPD and Design Codes should take overall precedence when assessing future residential proposals on the site. In this instance, the Council's emerging Design SPD should merely offer an overarching aspiration for new development.	Agree that the Sandymoor SPD and Design Codes reflect the aspiration for this area and should therefore be the main consideration for development designs in this location. However, the Design of New Residential Development should be in accordance with the Sandymoor SPD and the design codes, and therefore should also be considered in the design of all new development across the Borough.	Ensure that there is reference to other applicable SPDs and design codes for specific areas of the Borough and make clear that if new SPDs and design codes emerge these should also be considered by development where applicable.
	<i>3.8 Parking and Servicing</i>	Reference is made to the RSS parking standards for new residential schemes, however, there is no consideration given to the HCA's Car Parking – What Works Where toolkit and other good practice guidance.	Acknowledged	Consider inclusion of HCA's guidance.
	<i>General comment</i>	References to Building for Life, Regional Design Reviews, and many of the requirements set out by the HCA in its Quality Price Standards are not discussed at the right places within the document.	Agree	Ensure references are addressed in the correct sections in the document. Consider adding an additional section discussing design standards?
	<i>General comment</i>	Minimal guidance on the Council's aspirations for the delivery of adequate dwelling space, and on the important role of street frontages.	Agree	Add reference

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
	<i>General comment relating to Privacy Distances</i>	<p>Need for greater clarity on which elements are mandatory and which are not.</p> <p>For example, there is much content around designing in privacy, but little or no emphasis on how to design in 'neighbourliness'. Within that context, there is a significant amount of information in respect of standards regarding aspects such as privacy distances; however, the accompanying images illustrate the Kingshill Lacuna development in Kent, one which is much more flexible in its approach to this particular issue. It is unclear how the Council expects to achieve some of its higher densities targets if it follows these proposed privacy, garden and parking standards.</p>	Paras 3.7.4 and 3.7.5 offers the exception to the Privacy standards.	No change required.
	<i>3.10 Respecting the Environment</i>	No mention of solar orientation and the implications that this will have on layout or design of buildings other than as solar or PV accessories. Sustainable design should be more central to the SPD. Further, there is no mention within the document of Government guidance on sustainable design, notably Codes for Sustainable Homes; the cues are instead taken from the RSS.	Agree	Further develop the SPD to ensure that sustainable design is a key component and ensure that there is a good level of integration with the Core Strategy.
	<i>General comment</i>	SPD could be more aspirational in terms of what the Council would actually wish to see delivered.	Acknowledged	Where possible ensure that the SPD sets out the Council's aspirations.
	<i>General comment</i>	To ensure consistency suggest that HCA and Council representatives meet to discuss the SPD, HCA standards and the Sandymoor Design Codes.	Agree	Meeting to be arranged

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
00858: Environment Agency	<i>3.10 Respecting the Environment</i>	The SPD should highlight the need for SuDS type systems to be a requirement on all new development sites. A return to a more traditional (and less sustainable) drainage system would only be acceptable if it is proven inappropriate for SuDS-type drainage systems to be compatible with particular ground conditions on the site (i.e. high levels of contamination, high water table, etc).	The SPD supports the use of SuDS type systems in new development where appropriate.	None required
	<i>3.10 Respecting the Environment (PPS25 & PPS23)</i>	The document needs to make reference to PPS 25: Development and Flood Risk and PPS 23: Planning and Pollution Control.	Agree	Include reference within this section or in Appendix I.
	<i>3.10 Respecting the Environment (Water Framework Directive)</i>	The Water Framework Directive (WFD) criteria should also be taken into account. For the document to be consistent with WFD, it should:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure development phasing accounts for water/wastewater capacities and consents • Reduce and manage flood risk • Ensure development is water efficient and encourages Sustainable Drainage Systems • Adapt to and manage climate change effects 	The SPD already contains references to managing flood risk in Policy 7 of the SPD and includes references to Sustainable Drainage Systems. Policy 7 “Sustainable Design” also incorporates requirements to ensure the risks of climate change are considered in new residential development. Agree that the SPD could include reference to managing available capacities for water and wastewater.	Include reference to managing water and wastewater capacities to the SPD.
	<i>3.10 Respecting the Environment</i>	Housing developments should aim to meet or exceed the minimum CSH rating. Growth Point areas should also be considered as exemplars of sustainable design	The Core Strategy will be setting a target for housing developments to exceed the minimum CSH rating in accordance with the Liverpool City Region Renewable Energy Capacity Study.	Ensure that the SPD is consistent with the Core Strategy.
	<i>SA – Objective 14</i>	No mention of whether the objective will safeguard statutory protected and Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species.	The requirement to produce a Sustainability Report alongside a Supplementary Planning Document was removed by the introduction of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2009 which came into force on 6 th April 2010. As such, the draft Sustainability Appraisal report for this SPD has not been progressed to a final version.	No action required.

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
	SA – Objective 14	No mention of locally designated wildlife sites i.e. Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). The target should be to maintain the number and total area of SINCs to enable compliance with the objective to protect biodiversity from residential development.	<p>The requirement to produce a Sustainability Report alongside a Supplementary Planning Document was removed by the introduction of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2009 which came into force on 6th April 2010.</p> <p>As such, the draft Sustainability Appraisal report for this SPD has not been progressed to a final version.</p>	No action required.
	SA – Objective 14	Believe there should be an indicator and target put in place to quantify the enhancement of biodiversity as part of residential development schemes. There should be reference made to Halton's very own BAP, and the targets within this documents relating to priority species and habitats in the borough (e.g. reedbed, reed bunting, water vole).	<p>The requirement to produce a Sustainability Report alongside a Supplementary Planning Document was removed by the introduction of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2009 which came into force on 6th April 2010.</p> <p>As such, the draft Sustainability Appraisal report for this SPD has not been progressed to a final version.</p>	No action required.
	SA – Objective 13	No mention of Defra's Making Space for Water and how it relates to the target within this objective. The indicator refers to the quality of inland waters in terms of biological and chemical parameters. In keeping with the Water framework Directive, we feel this indicator should also include the physical quality of inland waters (i.e. geomorphology) and possible river restoration as part of residential development.	<p>The requirement to produce a Sustainability Report alongside a Supplementary Planning Document was removed by the introduction of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2009 which came into force on 6th April 2010.</p> <p>As such, the draft Sustainability Appraisal report for this SPD has not been progressed to a final version.</p>	No action required.
	SA – Objective 13	Incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) into residential development should be included as a target, not just the indicator.	<p>The requirement to produce a Sustainability Report alongside a Supplementary Planning Document was removed by the introduction of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2009 which came into force on 6th April 2010.</p> <p>As such, the draft Sustainability Appraisal report for</p>	No action required.

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
			this SPD has not been progressed to a final version.	
00860: Halton Housing Trust	<i>General comment relating to contamination</i>	Little reference to contamination. Suggest the inclusion of: "Where contamination has been proven to exist and prior to any remediation action being undertaken, a remediation strategy should be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. This strategy should also include provisions for post-remediation validation of the site, and a completion statement issued on completion of the remediation programme."	Agree that there is little reference to the contamination in the Borough and that this could be improved.	Consider and include reference (or similar) to contaminated land within the SPD.
	<i>3.10 Respecting the Environment (3.10.7)</i>	Our approach to Clause 3.10.7 of the SPD would not be not always to provide '10% of predicted energy requirements from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources' but rather to 'demonstrate that the principles can be achieved through alternative and compensatory means such as, increased insulation or energy efficiency measures.' Suggest that the CSH could be used as an alternative approach to that set out in the RSS. As such we would ask an additional sentence be added to end of Clause 3.10.7 . . . 'Any scheme achieving a minimum of Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes would be deemed to have demonstrated an alternative approach to the principles set out in the RSS policy as set out in Clause 3.10.6'.	Noted	Consider approach
	<i>3.11 Other Considerations</i>	Any contributions to the costs of Council services should be reasonable and proportionate and should not become onerous on any particular development particularly affordable housing developments.	Acknowledged	None required
G O	<i>2.2 Character and Context</i>	Include more in the way of the UDP policy context with brief mention of national/regional policy.	Although this policy background is referred to in Appendix I agree that this could be referred to in section 2.2 Character and Context.	Include reference to the UDP (and LDF) policy context and to national and regional policy in

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
	2.2 <i>Character and Context / Appendix I</i>	The SPD could be more Halton specific in its context and take the opportunity to highlight issues which have arisen within the historical context of the design of new residential development in Halton and how the SPD wishes to address these. Although some issues are mentioned in Appendix I these could be built on within the main body of the document.	Agree	section 2.2. Include a sub-section which sets out Halton's historical context along with a series of photos.
00872: Highways Agency	<i>General comment</i>	Keen to see developments located in sustainable locations which are accessible by a variety of modes and also that LAs provide an evidence base in support of any proposals.	Ensuring development is located in sustainable locations is a fundamental principle of the Design of New Residential Development SPD.	None required
00875: The Coal Authority	<i>3.11 Other Considerations</i>	Suggest that the following text is added in order to comply with national guidance set out in PPG14: "Coal Mining Legacy Issues The northern part of Halton Borough is located within a coalfield area and therefore has the potential to be affected by the legacy of former mining activities. In accordance with PPG14, developments within this area should take account of these risks by ensuring that land	Suggest reference is made within the Development Management DPD.	None required

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
		is thoroughly investigated to establish the presence and extent of any mining legacy problems, and that by ensuring that mitigation measures are including, where appropriate, to ensure that the development is safe and stable. In addition, it should be noted that permission must be obtained from the Coal Authority for any development or site investigations works which intersect, disturb or enter into any coal seams, coal mine workings or coal mine entries (shafts and adits). Further information can be obtained from the licensing and permissions section of the Coal Authority's website at: www.coal.gov.uk/services/permissions/index.cfm "		
00876: The Mersey Forest	<i>3.10 Respecting the Environment</i>	Appendix I refers to RSS policy DP7 which includes a number of criteria for enhancing environmental quality. A specific reference should also be made to green infrastructure, suggest that 3.10.1 may be an appropriate location.	Acknowledged.	Consider inclusion of a reference to Green Infrastructure in 3.10.
	<i>General comment</i>	Reference to the generic point that all development will be expected to safeguard the best of existing green infrastructure, integrate with surroundings and create new green infrastructure as appropriate to further the wide range of functions including climate change.	Agree with comment and the fact that more mention should be made to Green Infrastructure, however, the more strategic issue of creating new, and improving existing, green infrastructure is made within the Core Strategy DPD.	Consider adding reference to Green Infrastructure in the SPD
	<i>General comment</i>	Reference could be made to forthcoming guidance at the sub-regional level which will guide a more strategic requirement for individual developments' contribution to green infrastructure.	Noted	None required
	<i>General comment</i>	Reference to growth point would also be useful to reinforce the contribution that new development through the SPD will be expected to contribute to the raising of design quality.	Agree	Include reference to the Mid-Mersey Growth Point

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
00879: British Wind Energy Association	<i>General comment (3.10 Respecting the Environment)</i>	The Council should provide positive, pro-active guidance on utilising local and / or building integrated renewable energy technologies in all building development in accordance with the Climate Change Supplement to PPSI.	Agree that this element of the SPD could be strengthened.	Consider including guidance within the SPD relating to renewable energy technologies. Possibly within section 3.10 Respecting the Environment.
	<i>General comment (3.10 Respecting the Environment)</i>	The Council should implement a policy for the mandatory requirement of onsite renewables. Such a policy would require onsite renewables to provide electricity for at least 10% of all new buildings' needs.	Such a policy requirement will be addressed within the Core Strategy DPD and the Detailed Development Policy DPD.	None required
	<i>General comment (3.10 Respecting the Environment)</i>	A policy should be included on sustainable design and construction methods, and the introduction of minimum efficiency standards for extensions, change of use conversions, and refurbishments / listed building restorations.	Such a policy requirement would be addressed within the Detailed Development Policy DPD. However, the Design of New Residential Development SPD should provide guidance relating to energy efficiency in new developments.	Include guidance within the SPD on the energy hierarchy and the need to increase energy efficiency in new development.
	<i>General Comment</i>	Recommend the SPD contain information on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed information on each of the renewable technologies Information on funding – grants Planning requirements – what type of installations will need planning permission? Case studies of successful installations in the UK The level of support available from the Council Links to further information / websites 	The majority of this information will be addressed within the forthcoming Liverpool City Region Renewable Energy Capacity Study with policy guidance relating to this evidence base included within the Core Strategy DPD and the Detailed Development Policy DPD where applicable.	Provide information where applicable in the Design of New Residential Development DPD.
00880: 4NW	<i>Standard Consultation Response</i>	Standard response includes reference to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RSS RSS Partial Review Draft Regional Strategy – RS2010 NW Best Practice Design Guide (2006) NW Green Infrastructure Guide (2008) NW Integrated Appraisal Toolkit NW Sustainable Energy Strategy (2006) NW Climate Change Action Plan 	None required	None required

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
00881: HBC Waste Management (AH)	Appendix 2 – Waste Storage and collection guidance as part of new residential development	The current document states that the total number of bins required for a development will be split between residual waste at 60% and recyclables at 40%. There should be an aim for 50% / 50% as this would be in keeping with the national waste strategy and also seems in line with recent WRAP guidance on recycling for flats	Agree	Change to 50% / 50%.
		Would also be worth illustrating the different containers as above in the photo on page 38.	Agree	Include photo to illustrate the different containers.
00882: Halton Home Improvement & Independent Living Services	General comment	Document would be strengthened if it included comments regarding the current legislation and guidance relating to accessible residential accommodation for older people and people with physical and sensory disabilities i.e.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lifetime Homes Standard • Part M of the Building Regulations • Housing Corporation Scheme Development Standards • BS 8300 Code of Practice for the Design of Buildings and Approaches to Meet the Needs of Disabled People 	Agree that further reference should be made within the SPD relating to accessible residential accommodation.	Include reference to accessible residential accommodation.
	General Comment	SPD should make reference to the Lifetimes Home standard.	Acknowledge that the Lifetime Homes standard could be referred to within the SPD.	Include reference to the Lifetime Homes Standard and how this standard could be used to ensure accessible residential accommodation.

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
00883: Accessible Housing Service	<i>1.1 Purpose of the SPD</i>	When ensuring an appropriate mix of dwelling size and type and that new development creates a mixed and inclusive community there seems no specific mention of ensuring properties are designed to Lifetime Homes standard as a minimum and that wheelchair housing is also provided.	Acknowledge that reference to the Lifetime Homes standard should be included within the SPD, however, would have to investigate if a minimum standard should be included.	Investigate the potential of including a minimum standard for Lifetime Homes?
	<i>2 How to use this document (2.1.5)</i>	It is important that the Council does set the minimum standards it expects to see in new build developments to ensure it meets the wider community needs regarding disability both physical and sensory and the needs of ageing population.	Acknowledged.	Re-word paragraph to make clear the Council expectations.
	<i>3.3. Connecting Places (3.3.3)</i>	The only time the word disabled is used within the SPD relates to the design of the street.	Agree that the SPD should consider all aspects of the design of places and spaces for those with a disability.	Ensure (where applicable) that the needs of those with a disability are taken into consideration within the SPD.
	<i>3.4 Amenity Space – Public and Private</i>	Access to garden space also needs to consider accessibility for people with a disability / ageing.	Noted	See action relating to 3.3 Connecting Places (3.3.3) above.
	<i>3.8 Parking and Servicing</i>	Parking close to a property for a person with a disability is not mentioned.	Noted	See action relating to 3.3 Connecting Places (3.3.3) above.
	<i>3.8 Parking and Servicing</i>	Visitor parking should also be accessible for disabled persons	Noted	See action relating to 3.3 Connecting Places (3.3.3) above.
	<i>3.8 Parking and Servicing (Servicing and Waste)</i>	Refuse storage also needs to be accessible for people with disabilities.	Noted	See action relating to 3.3 Connecting Places (3.3.3) above.
	<i>Appendix 1 – Meeting the Needs of the Borough</i>	No mention is made of the level of disabled / elderly people within the Borough and the demographic trends of our ageing population.	Agree that reference should be made to the demographic trends of the borough within this section.	Include paragraph describing Halton's demographic trends.

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
00884: HBC Waste Management (JU)	<i>3.8 Parking and Servicing Principles</i>	Take out 'and composting'.	Agree	Amend text accordingly.
	<i>3.8 Servicing and Waste (3.8.10)</i>	<p>Replace paragraph with the following text:</p> <p>'For all new dwellings, whether flats or houses, the developer will be required to supply, at its own expense, appropriate bins or other receptacles to accommodate the Council's waste and recycling services prior to occupation. The specification and number of bins or receptacles will be determined by the Council and shall be notified to the developer. The Council will, subject to written agreement with the developer, provide the appropriate bins or receptacles prior to occupation and in such circumstances shall be fully reimbursed for the costs of doing so by the developer. Developers will also be required through their Design and Access Statements to identify alternative schemes for flatted developments, such as provision of communal recycling facilities. For all new developments to accommodate 50 persons or more (see table on page 14), the developer will be required to include provision for land to accommodate shared recycling facilities. The specific facilities to be provided on the land shall be determined by the Council, and may include underground recycling units. Such schemes are an integral part of a well designed residential layout in line with a design approved by the Council and can be secured through conditions attached to any planning permission. The developer shall meet all costs associated with the provision of shared recycling facilities.'</p>	Paragraph referred to has been substantially revised.	Revise Servicing and Waste section to reflect current Council practices.

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
	<i>Appendix 2 (para 6)</i>	Suggest slight re-word: 'It is the Council's intention to provide multi-material recycling collections to all properties using appropriate bins or receptacles. This is in addition to residual waste collections (i.e. mixed household waste not destined for recycling or diversion of waste from landfill).'	Appendix 2 of the SPD regarding Waste Requirements to be removed from the SPD.	Not applicable.
	<i>Appendix 2 (Euro Bins Graph)</i>	Add an additional few words to accompany the graph: 'The number of bins required in an apartment development can be calculated using the graph below. However, this shall be used as a guide only, and the number of bins to be provided shall be agreed with the Council'.	Euro Bins Graph to be removed from SPD.	Not applicable.
S025: United Utilities	<i>3.4.1 Private Amenity Space</i>	Please could you add to this section that: 'Underground public utility services should be located within highways or public open spaces. Their presence in rear gardens or enclosed gardens should be avoided as this can lead to great distress when utility companies require access to their assets'.	It is not felt that detailed wording such as this is necessary in the SPD. General principles regarding utilities services to be added to the document.	Reference to the location and routes of utilities to be added to Policy 1) Character and Context.
	<i>3.10 Respecting the Environment (3.10.5 – Hard Standing)</i>	In relation to hard surfacing please could you add: 'Land drainage or subsoil drainage water must not be connected into the public sewer system directly or by way of private drainage pipes. It is the developer's responsibility to provide adequate land drainage without recourse to the use of the public sewer system'.	Agree that this would be a useful addition to the SPD.	Wording to be added to the Sustainable Development section of the SPD about the need for developments to drain into separate sewerage systems.
	<i>3.10 Respecting the</i>	Please could you add the following wording:	The SPD takes the approach to incorporate flood	No action necessary.

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
	<i>Environment (3.10.5 – Development and Flood Risk)</i>	'Design of development should allow flood pathways to be kept clear so that, should flooding occur the development layout will allow flood waters to pass through'.	risk mitigation measures into development design and therefore it is not felt necessary to include this specific wording.	
S075: Natural England	<i>1.1 Purpose of the Proposed SPD</i>	In this section would also like to see a reference to ensuring that housing developments fully consider landscape and visual impacts and ensure that adverse impacts on areas of nature conservation importance are minimised.	Agree that there should be reference made to the natural environment in this section.	Consider inserting an additional bullet relating to the natural environment.
	<i>3.1 The Importance of Design (3.1.2)</i>	It would be useful to provide an environmental hook early in the document and suggest a reference to the recent HMG Strategy "World Class Places: The Government's strategy for improving quality of place". Including such an addition at 3.1.2 could provide a context for green infrastructure related inclusions in other sections such as 3.4 (private and public amenity space), 3.5 communal and public realm and 3.10 respecting the environment.	Agree that an environmental hook should be provided early on in the document, however this would be better placed under a sub-section in 3.10 Respecting the Environment.	Add a new sub-section relating to the natural environment in section 3.10 Respecting the Environment.
	<i>3.1 The Importance of Design (3.1.2)</i>	Reference might also be made to Halton being within the Mid-Mersey Growth Point.	Agree that a reference to Growth Point should be made within the SPD.	Add reference to Growth Point.
	<i>3.10 Respecting the Environment</i>	Would like to see reference made to ensuring developments do not have an adverse impact on statutory nature conservation sites (SSSI, SPA, Ramsar & SAC)	This would be included within the proposed new sub-section relating to the natural environment within 3.10 Respecting the Environment (see action above).	Make reference to ensuring residential developments do not have an adverse impact on statutory nature conservation sites in the new natural environment sub-section (as proposed above).
	<i>Appendix I – Policy Background</i>	Would like to see reference to PPS9 and PPS17	Agree	Add PPS9 and PPS17 to the policy background section.
	<i>Appendix I – Policy Background</i>	Reference to the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006 could also be referred to in this section.	Reference to this Act may be too detailed for this section.	None required.
	<i>Appendix I – Policy Background</i>	Reference to "World Class Places" and CLG policy for Growth Points	Will consider references to see if appropriate in this section.	Consider inclusion of references.

Appendix I: Results of Initial Public Consultation 13th August - 24th September 2009

	Policy/ Section	Comment Summary	Response	Action
	<i>Appendix I – Policy Background</i>	Expand the regional policy reference to underscore the reference to DP7 by making a firmer link through to EM1 and EM3.	Agree	Expand policy reference.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
1	Chris Brough (Resident)	General	<p>Picked up well on all current planning and environmental themes. Used clear and relevant diagrams to illustrate complex issues, such as privacy and overlooking, waste disposal etc.</p> <p>It is a very useful document for those who don't want to think through new residential development from first principles and need both an intelligent and comprehensive checklist and an inspirational overview of what to try and achieve.</p> <p>I did not find any particular technical matter to challenge and consider that you have produced a revised document that properly reflects up to date planning thinking.</p> <p>My only suggestion is to try and make the final document as interesting and as readable as possible and, to this end, try and introduce any useful local examples to make it meaningful to people in the area.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed.	Investigate whether there is any scope to include some further local examples within the SPD.
2	Diane Clarke, Network Rail	Para 6.20 / Para 7.11	Delete paragraphs relating to developer contributions.	The Council does not agree that there is any reasoning which would support the deletion of these paragraphs. (Please also refer to comments in section 7 below).	No action required.
3	Diane Clarke, Network Rail	Para 2.9	<p>Delete bullet point relating to public transport:</p> <p><i>'Provide safe, secure and accessible routes for all members of society, with particular emphasis on walking, cycling and public transport'</i></p>	<p>The Council is not clear from the comments why this should be deleted. This bullet relates to wording within the Core Strategy policy CS18: High Quality Design and therefore cannot be deleted.</p> <p>Moreover, comments regarding the Core Strategy should be made in Core Strategy specific</p>	No action required.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
				consultations. The Council notes that Network Rail did not identify any issues relating to the Core Strategy in its email correspondence in relation to the Proposed Submission stage (06.12.10) and no further comments relating to the Core Strategy have been received from Network Rail.	
4	Diane Clarke, Network Rail	Para 9.11 / Para 9.12	Delete paragraphs relating to Transport Assessments and Travel Plans	<p>The Council is not clear from the comments why these paragraphs should be deleted.</p> <p>The Core Strategy, which is the overarching document in the Council's LDF, in policy CS15: Sustainable Transport refers to the production of Travel Plans and Transport Assessments. As stated above no comments relating to the Core Strategy and more specifically the Sustainable Transport policy have been received from Network Rail.</p>	No action required.
5	Diane Clarke, Network Rail	Forward	Delete second paragraph: <i>'The Design of Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document provides guidance for all those involved in building new homes in Halton. The many and varied aspects of design are brought together to help guide and ensure a quality of residential environment for the Borough.'</i>	It is not clear why this general paragraph should be deleted as it sets out a general summary of the SPD. The Council does not agree that this paragraph should be deleted.	No action required.
6	Diane Clarke, Network Rail	Section 6: Outdoor Spaces	The SPD does not cite the railway as 'green infrastructure'.	Within the Council's LDF and more specifically the Core Strategy, it includes rail corridors in the	No action required.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
	Rail			definition of green infrastructure (para 24.2). Para 6.20 of the SPD refers to the guidance set out through the wider LDF and therefore includes this definition.	
7	Diane Clarke, Network Rail	Section 6: Outdoor Spaces / General Rail	<p>The SPD should set a strategic context requiring developer contributions towards rail infrastructure.</p> <p>Request that a policy is included which requires developers to fund any qualitative improvements required in relation to existing facilities and infrastructure as a direct result of increased patronage resulting from new development.</p> <p>The policy document states that a Developer Contribution consultation is to be issued, however, developer contribution comments should be included in this policy consultation.</p>	<p>The Council does not agree that the Design of Residential Development SPD is the appropriate document to require specific developer contributions. This is a complex area which would require a level of detail which would need to be explored in a specific document. The SPD therefore refers to the draft Open Space SPD and the forthcoming Developer Contributions SPD.</p> <p>It should also be acknowledged that the Halton Core Strategy, which is the overarching document within the Council's LDF, details how infrastructure provision will be dealt with in the Council's LDF (Policy CS7: Infrastructure Provision). As stated above Network Rail did not identify any issues relating to the Core Strategy in its email correspondence in relation to the Proposed Submission stage (06.12.10) and no further correspondence has been received.</p>	No action required.
8	Diane Clarke,	General	Development proposals arising from the SPD affecting the safety of level crossings is an important	The Design of Residential Development SPD is not seen as	Consider the inclusion of specific reference or policy

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
	Network Rail		<p>consideration for emerging planning policy.</p> <p>Request that the potential impacts from development affecting Network Rail's level crossings is specifically addressed through planning policy. This policy should confirm that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council has a statutory responsibility 2. Any planning application which may increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact 3. The developer is required to fund any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed. 	<p>the appropriate document to refer to issues regarding level crossings in the Borough. This would be more appropriate within the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD or the Transport and Accessibility SPD</p>	<p>within the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD and/or the Transport and Accessibility SPD.</p>
9	Diane Clarke, Network Rail	General	<p>Where residential developments close to Network Rail or operational railway land, depots, stations etc. are proposed we would recommend that the applicant is advised to contact Network Rail's Asset Protection Team at the pre-application stage.</p>	<p>The Council agrees that such a reference could be included within the Halton LDF; however, this would be more appropriate within the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD or the Transport and Accessibility SPD.</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of specific reference to rail asset protection within the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD and/or the Transport and Accessibility SPD.</p>
10	Cllr Hodgkinson	General	<p>The document covers the main issues in a clear manner and I support most of the advice which is based on national standards. However I wish to comment on a few issues.</p> <p>Previously, the emphasis on urban road design was to minimise road accidents by segregating vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists from vehicular traffic as far as practicable. Insufficient thought was given to personal security and there was too much emphasis on grade separation which has costly maintenance implications and, in the case of too many subways, personal security issues. There has been an</p>	<p>Support for the document and comments regarding road segregation are noted.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
			understandable reaction to this philosophy, but we must be careful to ensure that Halton's current good record for road safety continues to improve. In addition we have to live with past mistakes, such as parts of the Runcorn expressway, which are difficult to change.		
11	Cllr Hodgkinson	Para 4.7 – Ease of Movement	Some connections for vehicular traffic could create unsafe conditions on residential roads by encouraging 'rat running'. Change to 'residential development should be readily permeable with connected layouts provided they allow safe and direct access for those users and do not have a negative impact on the safety and security of people in adjacent residential areas.	Para 4.7 sets out general principles of urban design and therefore does not need to be as specific at this point in the document.	No action required.
12	Cllr Hodgkinson	Para 6.1, Connectivity and Movement	The optimum variety of journeys will <u>not</u> ensure the maximum <u>road</u> safety. Change to ' ... access to local services and public transport provided this does not have a negative impact on the safety and security of people in adjacent residential areas.	Para 6.1 lists a number of objectives for residential development, two of these being to provide for the optimum variety of journeys and to ensure maximum safety. The two objectives are not related.	Para 6.1 has been reordered, namely by using bullet points to improve its reading.
13	Cllr Hodgkinson	Policy 2 – Connectivity and Movement	Add to c) Where a vehicular link is not appropriate, consider creating a short link for pedestrians and cyclists where this can be achieved without a negative impact on the safety of users and adjacent residents.	Part c) of the policy has been drafted to cover vehicle, cyclist and pedestrian routes. It is therefore not felt necessary to add to this criteria.	No action required.
14	Cllr Hodgkinson	Policy 6 – Safer Places	d) Avoid segregating pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. Add ' unless it is shown that segregation is needed for road safety reasons. '	Agree with the comment made that there may be cases where road users should be segregated.	Suggested wording added to part d of the policy and reference added to paragraph 6.32.
15	Cllr Hodgkinson	Para 6.32, Safer Places	The segregated pedestrian and cyclist routes have improved road safety but have community safety problems, especially at night. Footways should have been provided along the circulatory roads of Runcorn New Town. However there are benefits in providing links from new development to the segregated	Comment noted.	No action required.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
			footways/cycle ways, which I use whenever possible, when I am cycling.		
16	Cllr Hodgkinson	Section 7 – Sustainable Design	My house has no mains drainage or sewerage. The large front paved area has a simple soakaway. Where practicable, adequate space needs to be left for a water butt.	Paragraph 7.9 already makes reference to rainwater harvesting through the use of water butts.	No action required.
17	Cllr Hodgkinson	Adaptability and Accessibility, para 7.12	Elderly or disabled visitors benefit from the provision of accessible access. Change to ‘.....needs of residents and their visitors over a lifetime.’	It is not felt necessary to refer to meeting the needs of potential visitors to new residential development in paragraph 7.12.	No action required.
18	Cllr Hodgkinson	Connectivity and Movement	Infill development. Where this is on a main road frontage, the need for turning facilities within the land around the property should be examined, so that reversing into a major road can be avoided.	This comment is felt to be too detailed to incorporate into this SPD and would be best dealt with through the Transport and Accessibility SPD.	No action required in this SPD. Ensure this matter is covered in the forthcoming Transport and Accessibility SPD.
19	Andy Farquhar, Highways Agency	Whole Document	No representations to make.	No response needed.	No action required.
20	David Berry, The Coal Authority	Whole Document	No specific comments to make.	No response needed.	No action required.
21	Chris Driver, Cheshire Wildlife Trust	Para 2.9, Policy Framework	The Trust welcomes the reference to Core Strategy Policy CS18 High Quality Design, which includes a requirement for incorporating 'appropriate landscape schemes into development designs, integrating local habitats and biodiversity'.	Comment noted.	No action required.
22	Chris Driver, Cheshire Wildlife Trust	Policy 9: Respecting the Environment	Policy 9 'Respecting the Environment' highlights an important aspect of good residential design.	Comment noted.	No action required.
23	Chris Driver, Cheshire	Respecting the Environment, Para 7.22	“Where habitat loss is unavoidable mitigation measures will be required.” Depending on the value of the lost habitat, this clause should also allow Halton to require	Comment noted.	Para 7.22 amended to refer to compensation measures.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
	Wildlife Trust		'compensation' measures such as the provision of new or enhanced habitat - possibly at an alternative location.		
24	Chris Driver, Cheshire Wildlife Trust	Respecting the Environment, Para 7.23	It is perhaps worth mentioning that enhancement can also be achieved via less substantial means e.g. the provision of bird nesting boxes on or within the structure of the houses, and bat boxes in surrounding areas.	Comment noted.	Reference added to para 7.23 regarding easily implementable enhancement measures.
25	Chris Driver, Cheshire Wildlife Trust	Appendix A: Submitting a Planning Application	Part (a) We suggest 'ecology' is added to the list of topics to be covered by the brief site appraisal at pre-application stage. We believe the sooner that biodiversity-related issues are flagged up, the more likely they are to receive proper consideration in any proposals for a site.	Comment noted.	Reference to ecology added to the Brief site appraisal bullet point.
26	Dave Sherratt, United Utilities	Policy Framework, para 2.4	Other applicable national planning policy relevant to the design of residential development should include PPS12 Local Spatial Planning	PPS12: Local Spatial Planning does not refer to design or residential development and as such it is not relevant to this SPD.	No action required.
27	Dave Sherratt, United Utilities	Policy 7: Sustainable Design	Part h) should be changed to: Ensure the risks of a changing climate and changing climatic events are incorporated into development design and include flood risk mitigation measures	Comment noted.	Part h) of policy changed as per the response.
28	Dave Sherratt, United Utilities	Sustainable Design, para 7.4	Remove text: 'encourages'.	This text reflects the Core Strategy policy which encourages development to meet sustainability standards, and therefore the word encourages should remain in this paragraph.	No action required.
29	Dave Sherratt, United Utilities	Sustainable Design, para 7.9	See United Utilities guidance text on Surface Water.	Comments regarding additional guidance regarding the treatment of surface water noted.	Additional guidance for site drainage added to paragraph 7.9.
30	Dave Sherratt, United Utilities	Sustainable Design, para 7.10	'Critical Drainage Areas' should be incorporated into the assessment process.	It is agreed that the Critical Drainage Areas identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 (2011) should be referred	Reference to Critical Drainage Areas added to para 7.10.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
				to in paragraph 7.10.	
31	Dave Sherratt, United Utilities	Respecting the Environment, para 7.19	Text required on the protection of utilities infrastructure and should be included in the assessment process.	Suggested addition to para 7.19 does not sit with this introductory paragraph to the Respecting the Environment section. Part j of policy I – Character and Context refers to planning applications including analysis of the location and route of relevant utilities and services.	No action required.
32	Dave Sherratt, United Utilities	Policy 13: Parking	Text required to highlight and address the issues of urban creep. See United Utilities guidance text on 'Climate change adaptation'.	It is understood that this comment relates to the paving over of gardens to create parking areas.	Reference to the need for permeable or porous surfacing of front gardens added to the justification for the parking section. Reference also added to the CLG/EA guidance on this matter.
33	Dave Sherratt, United Utilities	Other Considerations, paras 9.6 and 9.7	'Critical Drainage Areas' should be incorporated into the assessment process.	It is agreed that the Critical Drainage Areas identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 (2011) should be referred to in paragraph 9.6-9.7.	Reference to Critical Drainage Areas added to para 9.7.
34	Ray Liptrot (Resident)	Whole document	No consideration (I may be wrong) given to the provision of leisure areas for young children and mothers.	The section on Outdoor Spaces (paras 6.12-6.21) deals with the spaces surrounding residential development. This is separated into sections detailing private outdoor space and public green space. The Supplementary Planning Document concerns the design of residential development. The requirement to provide open space	No change required.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
				surrounding residential development is dealt with in a separate SPD entitled 'Provision of Open Space'.	
35	Ray Liptrot (Resident)	Whole document	It appears that the whole green space in and around is being fanatically pursued by the Council to install more urbanisation. We do not require any further spread in North Widnes. Sorry in the whole of Widnes, it is too small.	The Supplementary Planning Document concerns the design of residential development and does not detail areas of the Borough which should / should not be developed.	No action required.
36	Ray Liptrot (Resident)	Whole document	Following on from this policy is the indeterminable disease of the motor car, with all its attendant problems, and, no one seems to be doing anything to ease this growing problem, certainly nothing, as far as I could see, is proposed in the "SPD" document, to allay our fears?	The Supplementary Planning Document concerns the design of residential development and does not propose to deal with the number of cars in the Borough. A separate SPD is planned dealing specifically with Transport and Accessibility.	No action required.
37	Ray Liptrot (Resident)	Whole document	Within this spread of urbanisation, could the Council please reduce the number of those unsightly three story houses.	The Supplementary Planning Document advocates good design in all residential development. Three storey town houses are a popular product offered by house builders and whilst height is a design consideration, it is not for the Council to specify the housing product to be delivered.	No action required.
38	Simon Artiss, Bellway Homes	Whole document	Development Viability - the SPD needs to be realistic and flexible enough to not prohibit development in these challenging times. We are not arguing for poor design, but clearly policy needs to acknowledge the constraints that we are all operating under.	The SPD advocates good design in residential development, the cost of which should already be factored into development costs. Current constraints in terms of the residential market are not expected to remain in the long term. The SPD provides guidance	No action required.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
				for the long term and will remain in place once we return to more buoyant economic times.	
39	Simon Artiss, Bellway Homes	Whole document	The SPD should not go beyond those statutory policy requirements in your adopted UDP (and Core Strategy, but only once that has been adopted). Developers need certainty and policies that accord with such - we have known SPDs, SPGs etc to seek to extend requirements and this can cause delay, added cost and uncertainty, none of which are helpful to the delivery of new homes.	The Design of Residential Development SPD provides additional <u>guidance</u> in addition to UDP and Core Strategy policies. This is clearly set out in the SPD. Developers should aspire to create well-designed residential areas which are attractive to future home owners.	No action required.
40	Simon Artiss, Bellway Homes	Policy 7) Sustainable Design	Code for Sustainable Homes - Government advice is that this is not mandatory and that Building Regulations are the mechanism for introducing requirements, and we build to these. Your SPD must not make this voluntary code compulsory nor go beyond your current policies. The fact is that Code adds considerably to build costs and this is not reflected in sales values/revenues, whilst new homes do exceed existing stock in terms of standards. Our new homes, however, compete with existing stock in terms of price.	The SPD does not require homes to be built to certain levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes. It refers to the wider LDF, with specific reference to the Core Strategy which sets the policy framework in this regard.	Part a) of policy reworded so that SPD is in line with policy CS19 in the Core Strategy.
41	Simon Artiss, Bellway Homes	Policy 8) Adaptable and Accessible Design	Specifically - other residential requirements such as Lifetime Homes etc - again, if you do not have a statutory policy the SPD should not add these as requirements, as again they add to development costs in these challenging times.	Para 7.16 states that Halton Borough Council will <u>encourage</u> the Lifetime Homes standard to be applied to all residential development.	Part b) of policy amended to reflect that Lifetime Homes criteria are encouraged.
42	Simon Artiss, Bellway Homes	Whole Document	Design requirements (density etc) - the SPD should avoid being overly prescriptive. As you know, the NPPF is due out in March 2012 and will set the national policy context. It will not have minimum or maximum density standards and nor should your SPD. As for design details, your SPD should provide guidelines to assist development and provide examples of local good practice.	The SPD does not contain maximum or minimum density requirements. These are included in the Core Strategy where policy is set. The recently released NPPF states that local planning authorities can be set to reflect local circumstances.	No action required.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
43	Simon Artiss, Bellway Homes	Policy 13) Parking	Car Parking - the level of on-site parking should be a reflection of the site's accessibility/sustainability and the types of dwellings proposed and again should not be prescriptive but guidance only.	The SPD provides guidance to be read alongside the currently adopted UDP policies regarding parking standards. The planned Transport and Accessibility SPD will provide further guidance on parking standards.	No action required.
44	Simon Artiss, Bellway Homes	Whole Document	Manual for Streets - the SPD should be clear as to whether it supports these principles and what that means locally.	The Council endeavour to use Manual for Streets principles in new development but to use a more sympathetic approach where new development has to be integrated with older development where Manual for Streets may not be appropriate. The Council is planning to produce guidance on Manual for Streets and its local implementation. The Council's forthcoming Transport and Accessibility SPD will also supplement this advice.	Reference to local interpretation of Manual for Streets added to paragraph 6.5.
45	Simon Artiss, Bellway Homes	Whole Document	Please keep the SPD as concise as possible - there's already too much paperwork to review when progressing a scheme!	Comment noted.	No action required.
46	Dawn Hewitt, Environment Agency	Policy 7: Sustainable Development	We support Policy 7) Sustainable Design, particularly the incorporation of surface water management into development design, and the promotion of the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems.	Support noted.	No action required.
47	Dawn Hewitt, Environment Agency	Paras 7.10 and 9.6 re Flood Risk	There is no mention of the requirement to carry out a Sequential Test and in accordance with PPS 25 this should be undertaken to demonstrate that there are no reasonably available sites in areas with a lower probability of flooding, at all levels of the planning process. We would therefore wish to see this included	Comment noted, although it should be remembered that this SPD deals with the <u>design</u> of residential development and not principles that would apply in the allocations process.	Reference to sequential test added to para 7.10 and para 9.6.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
			within these sections.		
48	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Servicing and Waste	The draft SPD provides a detailed and thorough discussion of waste management within new development. In particular, the section dealing with the requirements for domestic waste collection and storage facilities is comprehensive and covers all the necessary issues. It is also consistent with emerging policies in the Joint Merseyside and Halton Waste Development Plan Document.	Comment noted.	No action required.
49	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Servicing and Waste	DEFRA has issued a voluntary code of practice for local authorities and developers on the provision of recycling facilities within the public realm ² . The draft SPD could usefully refer to this document as the proposals it contains would apply in mixed use development that includes areas of street scene, or in larger residential developments which might incorporate sizeable areas of public open space.	Whilst the guidance note highlighting the voluntary code of practice is a useful resource for the Council and developers, it is not felt to be of use in this particular SPD which predominantly deals with private residential development.	No action required in this SPD. Consider inclusion of reference to DEFRA voluntary code in future LDF documents, particularly SPDs dealing with town centres or mixed use areas.
50	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Servicing and Waste	Policy 11 (d), Building Materials and Features, could also usefully include reference to recycled materials. Building Materials and Features can contribute to reduced carbon emissions. This is not referred to in that section of the draft SPD and it may be appropriate to include a cross-reference to the section on 'Sustainable Design' where these matters are referred to in detail.	Suggestion noted.	Reference to recycled materials added to criteria d) of policy 11 and to para 8.6.
51	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Ecology	The draft SPD addresses ecological issues and will help the Council in meeting its biodiversity duties under PPS9 and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, 2006. The document highlights the need for early consideration of ecological issues. This is key when addressing ecological issues within the planning application process and this pro-active approach is	Comment noted.	No action required.

² See: <http://archive.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/localauth/recycleonthego/documents/recycleonthego-code.pdf>,

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
			welcomed. Early consideration of ecological issues will aid in preventing delays in the planning application process. Early identification and consideration of valuable habitats, species or designated sites either on site or adjacent to development sites, will facilitate the planning process and inform appropriate mitigation measures and their incorporation into the design of the scheme as well as identify opportunities for appropriate biodiversity enhancement.		
52	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Ecology	Policy 1, Character and Context, should include (or incorporate within the list) an analysis of existing ecological value on site and adjacent to the site.	Suggestion noted.	Reference to ecology added to criteria h) of policy 1.
53	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Ecology	Section 2, Policy Framework, should make reference to the Liverpool City Region Ecological Framework.	Suggestion noted.	Reference to the Liverpool City Region Ecological Framework added to para 2.7: Regional Context.
54	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Ecology	Section 6, Outdoor Spaces, should recognise that the provision of outdoor space within residential developments provides a significant opportunity to deliver biodiversity enhancement such as tree planting, hedgerows, wildlife meadows and ponds. We advise that additional emphasis on provision of biodiversity enhancement within outdoor space should be included within this part of the draft SPD.	Suggestion noted.	Wording regarding biodiversity added to Public Green Space section (paras 6.19)
55	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Ecology	Policy 9, Respecting the Environment, and Section 9, Ecology, provides no specific detail in respect of Habitats Regulation Assessment. Given the proximity of the Mersey Estuary SPA / Ramsar it would be prudent to identify this potential issue within the SPD. We suggest including the following:	Comment noted, although it should be remembered that the focus of this SPD is the <u>design</u> of residential development, rather than the allocation of sites for housing.	Reference to the potential need for Habitat Regulations Assessment added to the Ecology Section paragraph 9.5.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council may need to undertake Habitat Regulations Assessment to assess the potential for significant effects on Natura 2000 sites. The developer is required to provide sufficient information to enable the Council to complete this assessment. Further advice should be sought from Halton planning officers. 		
56	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Ecology	Section 9, Other Considerations, should identify the need for survey for Japanese Knotweed and other non-native invasive species either under contaminated land section or ecology section.	Comment noted.	The requirement to survey for Japanese Knotweed and other non-native invasive species has been added to para 9.4 of the Ecology Section.
57	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Sustainability	Section 7, Sustainable Design, provides an in-depth discussion of a range of sustainability measures to be considered for new residential development. This is welcome.	Comment noted.	No action required.
58	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Sustainability	Policy 7, Sustainable Design, criteria A – The word ‘contemporary’ should be replaced with ‘current’.	Accept.	Criteria a) of policy amended as suggested.
59	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Sustainability	Policy 7, Sustainable Design, criteria D – Replace ‘renewable sources’ with ‘renewable and low carbon sources’.	Accept.	Criteria d) of policy amended as suggested.
60	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside	Sustainability	Paragraph 7.4 – the word ‘encourages’ should be replaced with ‘requires’ considering that design standards for residential development need to comply	Policy CS19 in the Core Strategy was the subject of discussions at the recent Examination into this	No change required.

Appendix 2: Results of Second Public Consultation 28th January - 9th March 2012

No.	RESPONDEE	POLICY / SECTION	COMMENT SUMMARY	HBC RESPONSE	HBC ACTION
	Environmental Advisory Service		with policies within the wider LDF / Core Strategy.	document, which resulted in the Council agreeing to weaken the policy from a requirement to an encouragement. As such, the text in the draft SPD reflects this.	
61	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Sustainability	Paragraph 7.9 (9 th line) states that surface water run-off should be 'minimal'. The term 'minimal' needs to be defined / clarified.	Comment noted.	Word 'minimal' changed to 'minimised' with regard to surface run-off in para 7.9.
62	Jermaine Daniels, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Sustainability	Paragraph 7.10 (5 th line) states that sites exceeding 1 hectare within flood zone 1 will require detailed flood risk assessment. PPS25 requires flood risk assessment for sites 1 hectare and greater in flood zone 1. The statement should be revised to reflect the requirements of PPS25.	Unclear how the wording in para 7.10 differs from the advice in PPS25.	No change required.