

Tameside Residential Design Guide

Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Statement

This statement has been prepared in order to comply with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, for the adoption of Supplementary Planning Documents by Local Planning Authorities.

Published by

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Strategic Planning

January 2010

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 it is a requirement to prepare and publish a Consultation Statement for a range of planning policy documents, including Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's). This is a reflection of the Government's desire to "strengthen community and stakeholder involvement in the development of local communities"²⁶. The Council formally adopted a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) on 11th July 2006, which sets out how the public will be consulted on new planning policy and significant planning applications. As the Statement of Community Involvement is now adopted, all such planning documents will be required to conform to its provisions.
- 1.2 This Consultation Statement has been prepared following the adoption of the Statement of Community Involvement, and aims to reflect the intentions of Government planning guidance for reporting on community involvement in the plan making process. It describes the involvement of stakeholders, the community, voluntary organisations and statutory consultees in the preparation of the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The Scoping report was made available during a period of statutory consultation in September 2009 for five weeks, and was also be made available to view alongside the Supplementary Planning Document and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report, in accordance with the appropriate regulations²⁷.

2.0 Sustainability Scoping Report

- 2.1 The Supplementary Planning Document will replace the current Residential Development Guidelines SPD and aims to enhance relevant policies within the Tameside UDP with more detailed residential design policies.
- 2.2 Prior to producing the SPD a Sustainability Scoping Report was produced highlighting the Council's intentions and describing the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal to be carried out for the SPD. This Report was circulated to statutory consultees during September 2009 for a five week period of consultation. A list of consultees and their comments is included in appendix 1.

3.0 Officer and Member Consultation

- 3.1 Prior to the public consultation stage internal consultation was undertaken with Council Officers and key Members of the Council to ensure a robust and accurate draft document was produced.

²⁶ "Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks", Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004, paragraph 1.3 (iii).

²⁷ "Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004", ODPM 2003

- 3.2 Officers were consulted on the first draft document during July & August for a period of 3 weeks, following which amendments were made. Details of which departments were consulted are given in Appendix 3.
- 3.3 Following consultation with Officers, consultation was carried out with key Members of the Council related to planning and housing; Councillors Bray, Warrington and Whitehead (Cabinet Deputy for Technical Services).
- 3.4 The draft Supplementary Planning Document was finalised during October 2009 taking full account of the consultation responses from Officers and Members of the Council. This then received an Executive Decision from Councillor Whitehead on 16th November for it to be deposited on draft for 7 weeks of public consultation.

4.0 Consultation of draft Supplementary Planning Document

- 4.1 The draft Supplementary Planning Document was the subject of a 7 week formal public consultation from Tuesday 1st December until Tuesday 19th January 2010. The SPD together with its accompanying documents were placed on the Council's website, with reference copies made available at Customer Services Centres and libraries in Ashton, Denton, Droylsden, Hattersley, Hyde, Stalybridge, Longdendale and Mossley; libraries in Ashton, Haughton Green, Hurst, Newton and West End; and in the Planning and Building Control Department at the Council Offices in Ashton.
- 4.2 In order to inform the public, groups, businesses and organisations that the consultation was taking place a public notice was placed in the Tameside Reporter on 26th November (appendix 6). Allied with this an email or letter was sent to individuals or organisations on the Local Development Framework mailing list, informing them of where they could view the SPD documents and how to submit comments. Details of consultees are given in appendix 2 (Member), 4 & 5.
- 4.3 Consultees were informed that any comments they wished to make had to be submitted in writing or emailed to the Council by Tuesday 19th January at 4.00 p.m. By this deadline period the Council had received 13 responses and 2 responses were received within a day of the consultation ending. Due to the relevance of the late comments received, the Council has decided to consider these with the other responses; resulting in a total of 15 consultation responses.
- 4.4 On completion of the consultation period, all the responses were gathered, read and assessed and a précis of the main points produced, together with proposed revisions to the SPD resulting from these comments (as agreed by key Council Officers and Councillor Whitehead). This précis is presented in appendix 7.
- 4.6 For a summary of this report in Gujarati, Bengali or Urdu please contact 0161 342 8355. It can also be provided in large print or audio formats.

Appendix 1 – Scoping Report Consultees & Comments

The following organisations were consulted on the Sustainability Scoping Report via email:

- Government Office for the North West
- Natural England
- 4NorthWest
- North West Development Agency
- Environment Agency
- English Heritage
- Manchester City Council
- Stockport M.B.C
- Oldham M.B.C
- High Peak Borough Council

Of these organisations comments were received from Government Office for the North West and 4NorthWest.

Government Office for the North West

The comment received from Government Office relates to the changes in procedure following the 2008 Planning Act:

'The report says in para 1.1 that SA is mandatory for SPDs. For future reference, we would just like to draw your attention to the changes which came in following the 2008 Planning Act in this respect. Please see the advice in the PAS manual at the address below. Basically SA may not be required on SPD if it can be shown that it has already been carried out on a parent policy.'

As the parent policy for the Residential Design SPD is a UDP policy that has not been subject to an appropriate SA, the SPD does require an SA.

4NorthWest

4NorthWest issued a standard response issued for supplementary planning documents and planning guidance:

'4NW's aim is to focus our resources on our input into Development Plan Documents and Regionally Significant Planning Applications. This means that we are not usually able to provide bespoke responses on SPDs, other non statutory planning guidance and scoping requests. Consequently we have developed a standard response for SPD and similar consultations. This provides background on the Regional Spatial Strategy and emerging Regional Strategy, web links to a number of strategy and guidance documents produced by 4NW, and a series of RSS policy pointers for key SPD topics.'

The relevant documents detailed in the standard response have been acknowledged and aligned with where relevant to the SPD.

Appendix 2 - List of Member Consultees for Draft Supplementary Planning Document

Councillor Consultee List - (L- Letter)

AMBLER, Richard	L
BAINES, Derek	L
BEELEY, Basil	L
BELL, John S	L
BOWDEN, Helen	L
BRAY, Warren	L
BRAZIL, Jean	L
BRELSFORD, Wendy	L
BUCKLEY, David	L
CARTER, Valerie	L
CARTWRIGHT, Dorothy	L
COONEY, Gerald P	L
DAVIS, Jack	L
DICKINSON, Doreen	L
DOUBLEDAY, Andrew	L
DOWNS, Margaret E	L
DOWNS, Walter	L
ETCHELLS, Ann	L
ETCHELLS, Roy	L
FITZPATRICK, James M	L
FITZPATRICK, Philip M	L
GWYNNE, Allison	L
HARRISON, William	L
HIGHTON, Andrew	L
HOLLAND, Ann J	L
HOLLAND, Barrie	L
KELLY, John	L
KITCHEN, Joseph A.P.	L
LANE, Dawson	L
LANE, Jackie	L
MIDDLETON, James	L
OLDHAM, S Roy	L
PARKER-PERRY, Sean	L
PATRICK, Clive	L
PIDDINGTON, Catherine M	L
QUINN, Kieran	L
QUINN, Susan	L
REYNOLDS, Jonathan	L
RICCI, Vincent	L
ROBERTS, George	L
ROBINSON, Peter J	L
SHORROCK, Eileen	L
SIDEBOTTOM, Margaret C	L

SMITH, Michael	L
SMITH, Stephen	L
SULLIVAN, John	L
SWEETON, David	L
TAYLOR, John C	L
TRAVIS, Lynn	L
WAREING, Martin	L
WARRINGTON, Brenda	L
WELSH, Kevin	L
WELSH, Ruth	L
WHITE, Colin	L
WHITEHEAD, J Alan	L
WHITLEY, Michael	L
WILD, Brian	L

Appendix 3 – Officer Consultation

Internal Consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document

The draft Supplementary Planning Document was circulated internally (via email) for comments on 16th July 2009 for a period of three weeks to the following departments within the Council:

- Development Control
- Building Control
- Conservation Officer
- Highways & Engineers
- Environmental Health
- Legal Services
- Assistant Executive Director – Housing, Planning & Economic Development

Comments were received from Development Control, Building Control and the Conservation Officer, elements of which were inserted into the SPD.

Appendix 4 - Specific Consultation Bodies Consulted on the Draft SPD

The following list of consultation bodies are those identified in Appendix G of the adopted Tameside Statement of Community Involvement.

- The Regional Planning Body – The North West Regional Assembly
- A relevant authority any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority:
 - Derbyshire County Council;
 - Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council;
 - Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council;
 - Peak District National Park Authority;
 - High Peak Borough Council;
 - Manchester City Council;
 - Mossley Town Council;
 - Saddleworth Parish Council;
 - Tintwistle Parish Council;
 - Charlesworth Parish Council; and
 - Chisworth Parish Council.
- The Countryside Agency²⁸
- The Environment Agency
- The Highways Agency
- The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (English Heritage)
- English Nature²⁹
- Network Rail
- A Regional Development Agency whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority – North West Development Agency, East Midlands Development Agency
- Any person to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under Section 106 (3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003: British Telecommunications
- Any person who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority: Mobile Operators Association, Vodafone Ltd, One2One Personal Communications Ltd, O2 (UK) Ltd, Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd
- Any of the bodies from the following list who are exercising functions in any part of the area of the local planning authority:
 - I. Strategic Health Authority – Greater Manchester Strategic Health Authority
 - II. Person to whom a license has been granted under sec 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986 – Transco North West
 - III. Sewage undertaker United Utilities Properties Limited and United Utilities – Service delivery
 - IV. Water undertaker: United Utilities Properties Limited and United Utilities – Service delivery

²⁸ The Countryside Agency merged with English Nature in October 2006 to form Natural England which is now a statutory consultee.

²⁹ English Nature merged with the Countryside Agency in October 2006 to form Natural England which is now a statutory consultee.

- Government Departments:
 - Department for Constitutional Affairs;
 - Department of Culture, Media and Sport;
 - Government Office for the North West (GONW);
 - Defence Estate Organisation (Ministry of Defence);
 - Department for Work and Pensions;
 - Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs;
 - The Home Office;
 - Office of Government Commerce;
 - Department for Education and Skills (through GONW);
 - Department of Transport (through GONW);
 - Department for Health (through the regional public health group);
 - Department for Trade and Industry³⁰

³⁰ The Department for Trade and Industry was replaced by the Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) in 2007

Appendix 5 - General and Other Consultees

General consultation bodies are those identified in Appendix G of the adopted Tameside Statement of Community Involvement:

- Voluntary bodies, some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the authority's area;
- Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the authority's area;
- Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the authority's area;
- Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the authority's area; and
- Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the authority's area.

Other consultees are those identified in Appendix G of the adopted Tameside Statement of Community Involvement:

- | | |
|---|---|
| (a) Age Concern; | (s) Environmental groups at national, regional and local level, including: Campaign to Protect of Rural England ³¹ ; |
| (b) Airport operators: Manchester Airport; | i. Friends of the Earth; |
| (c) British Chemical Distributors Association; | ii. Royal Society for the Protection of Birds; and |
| (d) British Geological Survey; | iii. Wildlife Trusts. |
| (e) British Waterways, canal owners and navigation authorities; | (t) Equal Opportunities Commission |
| (f) Centre for Ecology and Hydrology; | (u) Fire and Rescue Services |
| (g) Chambers of Commerce, Local CBI and local branches of the Institute of Directors; | (v) Forestry Commission |
| (h) Church Commissioners; | (w) Freight Transport Association |
| (i) Civil Aviation Authority; | (x) Gypsy Council |
| (j) Coal Authority; | (y) Health and Safety Executive |
| (k) Commission of Architecture and the Built Environment; | (z) Help the Aged |
| (l) Commission for New Towns and English Partnerships; | (aa) Housing Corporation |
| (m) Commission for Racial Equality; | (bb) Learning and Skills Council |
| (n) Crown Estate Office; | (cc) Local Agenda 21 bodies including: |
| (o) Diocesan Board of Finance; | i. Civic Societies; |
| (p) Disability Rights Commission; | ii. Community Groups; |
| (q) Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee; | iii. Local Transport Authorities; |
| (r) Electricity, Gas and Telecommunications undertakers, and the National Grid Company; | iv. Local Transport Operators; and |
| | v. Local Race Equality Councils and other local equality groups. |

³¹ Formerly The Council for the Protection of Rural England

- (dd) National Playing Fields Association
- (ee) Network Rail
- (ff) Passenger Transport Authorities: Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive
- (gg) Passenger Transport Executives
- (hh) Police Architectural Liaison Officers/Crime Prevention Design Advisors
- (ii) Port Operators
- (jj) Post Office Property Holdings
- (kk) Rail Companies and Rail Freight Group
- (ll) Regional Development Agencies
- (mm) Regional Housing Boards
- (nn) Regional Sports Boards
- (oo) Road Haulage Association
- (pp) Sport England
- (qq) The House Builders Federation
- (rr) Transport for London
- (ss) Traveller Law Reform Coalition
- (tt) Water Companies
- (uu) Women's National Commission
- (vv) Council for British Archaeology
- (ww) Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit

Appendix 6 - Public Notice

Public notice from the Tameside Reporter 26th November 2009.

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Draft Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document
Public Notice Inviting Representations
Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) England
Regulations 2004
Planning and Building Control

Tameside Metropolitan Council gives notice that it has published the above draft supplementary planning document for public consultation

The Draft Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides specific planning guidance on the design of high quality, sustainable homes. This new guidance document replaces the existing Residential Development Guidelines SPD, with greater emphasis on design, updated permitted development rights and alignment with regional and national planning policy.

The document's primary role is to guide the design of residential developments and household extensions within Tameside. Guidance reflects this, with two main sections providing policies on residential developments and the design of household extensions. Policies within these section focus on issues such as:

- Acknowledging local character
- Applying appropriate scale & mass to buildings
- Car parking
- Privacy & natural light
- Public & private space
- Residential layouts
- Sustainable developments
- Size, location & design of extensions

These policies will indicate to designers the issues considered by the Council when assessing planning applications, whilst providing Council Officers with criteria to assess planning applications.

The draft SPD is subject to a period of public consultation from Tuesday 1st December to Tuesday 19th January 2010 during which period we will received representations. **The consultation period will end at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday 19th January 2010. We cannot accept late representations.**

Representations should be in writing and sent by post to The Strategic Planning Office, Rm 1.41, Tameside Council Offices, Ashton-Under-Lyne, Tameside.OL6 6DL or FAX to 0161 342 2837 or by email to Planpolicy@tameside.gov.uk. Any submitted representations will be available for public inspection at the Council Offices on closure of the consultation period.

If you wish to be notified of the adoption of the Supplementary Planning Document then please let us know and provide an address to which representations may be sent.

The draft Residential Design SPD and support documents (including the consultation statement) will be available for inspection from Tuesday 1st December on the Council's website at <http://www.tameside.gov.uk/planning> and at:

- **Tameside Council Offices**, Planning and Building Control, Council Offices, Wellington Road, Ashton-under-Lyne, Tameside, OL6 6DL.

Opening times: Monday to Wednesday - 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m.
Thursday - 9.00 a.m. to 4.30 p.m. Friday - 9.00 a.m. to 4.00 p.m.

The draft SPD is also available for inspection at:

- **Tameside Customer Service Centres**
- **Libraries in Tameside MBC**

Details of locations and opening times can be obtained:

- on the Council website www.tameside.gov.uk
- by telephoning the Customer Service Centre (Tel: 0161 342 8355)
- by emailing customer.services@tameside.gov.uk

906648

Appendix 7 - Summary of Consultation comments on the consultation draft SPD

The following section summarises the main comments received during the seven week statutory consultation period during December 2009 and January 2010.

The summary is presented in tabular form for ease of understanding – amendments to the SPD text are shown in red and deleted text is shown in red strikethrough.

If required you may see the original consultation comments – please contact the Strategic Planning team to arrange on Tel: 0161 342 2750.

Comment	Response	Amendment to SPD
<p>RDSPDR-01 – Coal Authority The Coal Authority would therefore recommend inclusion of the following paragraph to Section 2.6 Layout Considerations:</p> <p><i>“There are mineral resources present in Tameside, including surface coal resources. These will be identified in the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD as Minerals Safeguarding Areas and any proposals for residential development will need to have regard to these resources. Extraction of mineral resources prior to development will be encouraged to avoid permanently sterilising the resource, and this can also remove any potential land instability problems in the process.”</i></p> <p>Reason – In order to address the requirements of MPS1 regarding the need to encourage prior extraction of mineral resources where they would be sterilised by non-mineral development, which can also help address land instability issues, in line with PPG14.</p>	<p>The Council agrees that developers must be aware of their site’s ground conditions to inform any development aspirations they have for it.</p> <p>The Council will insert text outlining the comments made by the Coal Authority within the Introduction section (pg 5) and within 4.6 Contaminated Land Issues (pg 35).</p>	<p>The following revisions will be inserted:</p> <p>1.4 Contaminated Land Issues The previous use of land may have left some contamination or migrating gases behind, particularly if a former industrial site. There are normally relatively straight forward means of addressing such issues during construction. However, if neglected, contamination can become a significant problem. The Council’s pollution control section can be contacted for advice on any contaminated land issues www.tameside.gov.uk/contaminatedland. These issues are also covered at the Building Regulations stage of development.</p> <p>Tameside has a history of coal mining and still contains reserves across its central and western areas capable of surface extraction (according to the Coal Authority). As a result of this mining legacy and to accommodate any future requirement to extract coal, developers must ensure they undertake appropriate ground investigation works to establish whether their site contains coal or any former workings / infrastructure (shafts, adits & shallow mines) that could restrict development. If a mining legacy exists on a site, appropriate mitigation measures must be applied, as required by PPG14. Where coal reserves are present the Coal Authority (www.coal.gov.uk/) encourages extraction prior to development, yet any proposals for extraction must align with UDP policy MW9 Control of Minerals and Waste Developments.</p> <p>The Greater Manchester Authorities are currently producing a Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Development Plan Document (DPD) (due 2012) which will identify the location of minerals, such as coal, within Tameside and establish Minerals Safeguarding Areas, which will need to be considered by residential developers. While this document is</p>

		<p>being produced developers should align with relevant policies in the UDP, particularly policies MW1, MW9 & MW11.</p> <p>4.6 Contaminated Land Issues The previous use of land on which your house was built may have left some contamination or migrating gases behind, particularly if a former industrial site. There are normally relatively straight forward means of addressing such issues during construction. However, if neglected, contamination can become a significant problem. The Council's pollution control section can be contacted for advice on any contaminated land issues www.tameside.gov.uk/contaminatedland. These issues are also covered at the Building Regulations stage of development.</p> <p>Tameside has a history of coal mining and still contains reserves across its central and western areas capable of surface extraction (according to the Coal Authority). As a result of this mining legacy homeowners must ensure they undertake appropriate ground investigation works to establish whether their site contains any former workings / infrastructure (shafts, adits & shallow mines) that could restrict development. If a mining legacy exists, mitigation measure can be applied to enable development to take place.</p>
<p>The Coal Authority would therefore recommend inclusion of the following paragraph to Section 2.6 – Layout Considerations:</p> <p><i>“There is a significant legacy of past coal mining activity across large parts of Tameside, including mine entries (shafts and adits) and also mining at shallow depth. Therefore proposals for new residential development will need to have due regard to ground conditions and any issues of land instability, and where necessary set out measures for mitigating the risk posed by mining legacy, as required by PPG14.”</i></p>	<p>See previous response</p>	<p>The amendments above address the comments made</p>

<p>The Coal Authority would emphasize that former coal mining activities and related hazards are certainly not a strict constraint on development; indeed it would be far preferable for appropriate development to take place in order to remove these public liabilities on the general tax payers.</p> <p>Reason – In order to address the requirements of PPG14 regarding unstable land.</p>		
<p>Comment – Given the prevalence of coal mining legacy issues throughout the Tameside area, The Coal Authority would hope that when the Council come to review their Local List of information requirements for planning applications a further requirement will be added for an assessment of ground conditions and land stability.</p> <p>Reason – In order to address the requirements of PPG14 regarding unstable land.</p>	<p>This request will be passed onto the Development Control Department, who compile the Local List</p>	<p>No revisions proposed</p>
<p><u>RDSPDR – 02 Mr T Barrett</u></p> <p><u>Policy RD5</u> I consider that the minimum distances between developments should not always be applied, as these may not always recognise local distinctiveness. Perhaps character areas for different parts of the borough could be used, or the policy could include a criterion stating that there may be exceptions</p>	<p>The Council considers the application of minimum privacy distances an important tool to ensuring acceptable levels of natural light and resident privacy are retained or achieved.</p> <p>There may be cases where a reduced distance could be considered acceptable, but this would be assessed on a case by case basis. Applicants would have to demonstrate why reduced distances would be acceptable on their site.</p>	<p>No revisions proposed</p>

to applying minimum distance thresholds.		
<u>Policy RD7</u> I support this policy that seeks to reduce the dominance of car parking in developments.	No comment	No changes proposed
<u>Policy RD10</u> Support. Having looked at many apartments across Tameside when looking for somewhere to live, cycle parking hasn't been thought of at all, let alone as an after thought.	No comment	No changes proposed
<u>Policy RD12</u> Communal Areas should contain a mix of planting, trees and play equipment. It could be stipulated, via a condition, that this is maintained via a reasonable service charge levied to the owners of the properties. Such spaces can also be used to accommodate non-visually intrusive cycle parking and bin storage. New development should also include sufficient space to allow food production, or seek a contribution to provide this off site.	The Council agrees that private amenity space should meet the needs of the residents, be it to grow food, enable children to play or relax privately. The Council does not want to stipulate the exact content of these private spaces, but through policies RD11: Private Amenity Space & RD12: Design of Private Amenity Space we hope to ensure functional spaces are provided that can be adapted or utilised for a range of uses. Agree that cycle parking & bin storage could be designed into amenity spaces. Maintenance of communal spaces is generally the responsibility of the building / site's management company.	No changes proposed
<u>Policy RD13</u> Street Trees should always be used as part of the public realm but these should be applied as part of a strategic green infrastructure network, rather than as an after thought.	The Council agrees that trees and street trees provide a valuable green element to the public realm and should be encouraged where appropriate.	The following additions will be made to Policy RD13: Design of Public Realm: 1. Create pedestrian focused streets & spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do not let a highway design dictate a residential layout. ▪ Apply a 20 mph speed limit across the site. ▪ Reduce vehicle speeds through design & do not apply traffic calming as an after thought. ▪ Minimise street clutter.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoid segregating pedestrian and vehicle routes. ▪ Design for pedestrian & cyclist movement and safety. ▪ Provide clear, direct routes. ▪ Use appropriate trees to help 'green' street environments and assist biodiversity.
<p><u>Policy RD14</u> I consider that this is a problem that can't be resolved through planning. Apart from the charge of £35 per bin that the Council levy on new property owners, I do not understand why each property has to have an individual wheelie bin. In Mossley, where there are small stone cottages, there is no room for bins and these clutter the pavements.</p> <p>I think that new developments should include large 'dumpster' style communal bins, rather than individual bins or this should be done more creatively, such as storing bins underground, with waste disposal points at ground level, as seen on the continent.</p> <p>The bin problem could also be resolved if neighbourhood level, or even street level, recycling facilities were provided. These could be provided via Community Infrastructure Levy / Section 106 payments from developers.</p> <p>These ideas, though, will never be workable if the local authority insists on individual wheelie bins.</p>	<p>As detailed by the respondent, the Planning Department has no control over the Council's waste collection methods. However, through Policy RD14: Design of Refuse Storage, we aim to ensure the wheelie bins used by the Council are appropriately stored within residential developments.</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>
<p><u>Policy RD23</u> The policy should not include the 'get</p>	<p>Policy RD23: Decentralised Energy Requirement is copied from the North West Regional Spatial</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>

<p>out clause' for developers to get out of providing energy from renewable sources. The 10% should be an absolute minimum requirement for renewable energy provision. Developments should make provision for further renewable energy provision in the future, or to make contributions to neighbourhood level renewable energy schemes.</p>	<p>Strategy's (RSS) policy EM18 Decentralised Energy Supply, as such cannot be changed by the Council. This policy is being applied across the region and a joint study / procedure is being developed across all Greater Manchester authorities. As such, the Council wish to align itself with this.</p> <p>As detailed by the respondent, the Greater Manchester study / procedure is likely to involve neighbourhood / district level schemes.</p>	
<p><u>Policy RED4</u> Support. As the policy appears to also to apply to conservatories, the second bullet about primary materials is particularly pertinent. Large, overbearing white UPVC conservatories can't possible relate to primary materials (unless the house in question is made out of white UPVC!) and it should be made clear that such conservatories are not acceptable / are sub-standard.</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>
<p><u>General Comments</u> The presentation of the document, with the visuals showing what is and what isn't acceptable and also the lay out of the document, as a guide to householders, help make the document easy to understand.</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>
<p><u>RDSPDR – 03 Ministry of Defence</u> The MOD is concerned with the development of wind turbines either 11m plus above ground level or turbines with a 2m rotor diameter if located on the side of a house. This is due to their potential to create a physical obstruction to air traffic movements and cause interference</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges this concern and will replicate the criteria for consulting the MOD in the SPD.</p>	<p>The following addition will be made to policy RD24:</p> <p>Policy RD24: Installation of Wind Turbines & Solar Panels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If a proposed wind turbine is to stand 11 metres or more above ground level or a turbine attached to a house has rotors with a diameter of 2 metres, then the Ministry of Defence (MOD) must be consulted as part of the planning process.

<p>to Air Traffic Control radar installations. Any turbines meeting this criterion would need to consult the MOD at the planning process stage for further assessment.</p> <p>The MOD has no further comment to make regarding this document.</p>		
<p><u>RDSPDR – 04 CABE</u> Thank you for consulting the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE).</p> <p>Please find attached the above no comments letter</p>	<p>The letter referred to is a standard 'no comments' letter issued by CABE.</p> <p>No comment</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>
<p><u>RDSPDR – 05 Network Rail</u> Thank you for the email of the 3rd December 2009 on the above policy.</p> <p>Network Rail has no comments to make.</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>
<p><u>RDSPDR – 06 Lancashire County Council</u> Thank you for consulting my Council on the draft Residential Design SPG.</p> <p>I do not wish to make any observations.</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>
<p><u>RDSPDR – 07 United Utilities Water</u> Policy RD7: Design of Car Parking Whilst it is mentioned elsewhere in the document there is no mention of the use of permeable surfaces. UU would suggest the following 'bullet'</p>	<p>The Council agrees that this additional 'bullet' point should be added to policy RD7.</p>	<p>The following bullet point will be added:</p> <p>Policy RD7: Design of Car Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Surface materials should be permeable wherever possible.

be added to RD7: - use permeable surfacing wherever possible'		
<u>Para. 3.4 SUDS</u> UU supports all aspects of this.	No comment	No changes proposed
<u>Para. 6.7 Driveways</u> UU supports wording on use of porous materials / drainage to soft landscape	No comment	No changes proposed
<u>Contacts pg 47</u> You may wish to add a UU Water contact number 0845 746 2200	The Council agrees with this comment	CONTACTS United Utilities (Water) 0845 746 2200
<u>Local List pg 48</u> UU Water receives 2000 applications per year from people who have received planning permission, begin work and Building Control advises them that they're building near a public sewer and need UU permission to carry on. There is no warning with this SPD that when considering a house extension the presence of underground utility services should be investigated.	The Council agrees that the SPD should highlight this issue to homeowners.	The following additions will be made to the SPD: 4.7 Services During the project planning stages of your extension / development it is vital that you establish whether any services (electricity, water, gas, sewerage or telephone) above or below ground are located within or in close proximity of your site, and could be affected by your proposals. If not established at initial stage of a project, their discovery during construction could stop the development. Land searches undertaken when purchasing your property may provide you with some of this information. United Utilities Water has reported that it receives 2000 applications per year from people who have received planning permission, begin work and Building Control advises them that they're building near a public sewer and need United Utilities permission to carry on.
<u>RDSPDR – 08 Theatres Trust</u> Due to the specific nature of the Trust's remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and as this consultation is not directly relevant to the Trust's work we have no comment to make but look forward to being consulted on further LDF documents	No comment	No changes proposed
<u>RDSPDR – 09 4NW</u> Thank you for consulting 4NW on the above SPD - please find attached a copy of our standard Scoping / SPD	No comment. The Residential Design SPD has aligned with the relevant regional planning policies outlined in the Regional Spatial Strategy and the Regional Spatial Strategy Partial Review.	No changes proposed

<p>response. This standard response outlines the regional policy documents all development plan documents must acknowledge and provides policy alignment examples for specific subject areas.</p>		
<p>RSPDDR – 10 Greater Manchester Ecology Unit</p> <p><u>Paragraph 2.16</u> Trees and hedgerows may be used by nesting birds and roosting bats. All species of British bats and their roosts - even when unoccupied - are protected by European legislation implemented via the Habitats Regulations 1994 (as amended). Where bats are found to be present a licence issued from Natural England may be required to undertake works. Most species of birds are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and it can be an offence to disturb birds whilst they are nesting.</p> <p>If residential development proposals include the loss of, or works to, trees or hedgerows, surveys for these groups may be required, particularly bats. This section should therefore include reference to this requirement.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges this comment and will revise section 2.16 to accommodate the issues raised.</p>	<p>The following additions will be made to Section 2.16 2.17 & 4.5:</p> <p>Existing trees and hedgerows may be used by nesting birds and roosting bats, which must be considered by developers or homeowners when undertaking developments close to or involving trees and/or hedgerows. If development includes existing buildings, consideration should also be given to these being used as roosts or nesting areas.</p> <p>All species of British bats and their roosts (even when unoccupied) are protected by European legislation (via the Habitats Regulations 1994 (as amended)). Where bats are found to be present, a licence issued from Natural England may be required to undertake development. Most species of birds are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and it can be an offence to disturb birds whilst they are nesting.</p> <p>If residential development proposals include the loss of, or works to, trees or hedgerows, surveys for these groups may be required, particularly bats. Contact the Development Control Officer for further guidance on this issue.</p>
<p><u>Paragraph 2.18</u> No reference has been made to the requirement in PPS9 for biodiversity enhancement in developments (paragraph 14). When designing new residential developments, good</p>	<p>PPS9 paragraph states the following:</p> <p><i>Biodiversity within Developments</i> <i>14. Development proposals provide many opportunities for building-in beneficial biodiversity or geological features as part of good design.</i></p>	<p>No amendments proposed</p>

<p>design should include biodiversity enhancements. The SDP therefore specifically include this requirement.</p>	<p><i>When considering proposals, local planning authorities should maximise such opportunities in and around developments, using planning obligations where appropriate.</i></p> <p>The SPD contains policies related to private amenity space (RD11 & RD12) & public realm (RD13), which can contain features that aid and add to an area's biodiversity.</p> <p>Policy RD25 relates to Sustainable Urban Drainage, which depending on the techniques used, can have a positive biodiversity benefit.</p> <p>As briefly outlined by section 2.8, the Council's developer contributions system contains a green space tariff to source funds to create or improve existing green space provision across the Borough.</p>	
<p><u>Habitats Regulation Assessment</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The HRA provides no details on who undertook the assessment and their qualifications to make the assessment. This should be provided. 2. The HRA appears to rule out European sites from the Assessment based on distance alone with no justification provided for the distances chosen. The HRA also needs to demonstrate that there are no pathways between potential effects arising from the SDP and any European site. 3. No consideration of "in combination" effects has been made 4. The Contents page lists Mitigation Measures (section 11) but this section does not occur in 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The assessment was undertaken by the writer of the SPD. 2. The rationale for using distances, was that residential development is restricted by land designation. As such, it seems obvious to assess the distances urban areas are from the European site. Without knowing exactly where future residential development takes place, we cannot assess whether there will be pathways from development to the European site. However given the large area of greenbelt & biological status of land surrounding the European site, it is unlikely that any new developments will include pathways to the site. 3. Unless areas of greenbelt surrounding the European site are released for housing development, the Council doesn't consider the combined effect of housing development across the Borough to be any greater threat to the European site. 4. The Council acknowledges this error. 	<p>The following amendment will be made to the content page:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Introduction 2 Brief Description of the SPD 3 Relationship to Other Plans and Strategies 4 Description of the South Pennine Moors SAC / SPA 5 Primary Reason for the Designation of the South Pennine Moors SAC 6 Primary Reason for the Designation of the South Pennine Moors SPA 7 Impact of the Residential Design SPD on the Special Features of the South Pennine Moors SAC / SPA 8 Description of the Rochdale Canal SAC 9 Primary Reason for Designation of the Rochdale Canal SAC 10 Impact of the Residential Design SPD on the Special Features of

the main document.		the Rochdale Canal SAC 11 Mitigation Measures Conclusion
<u>RSPDR – 11 Ashton-under-Lyne Civic Society</u> The draft document addresses most or all of the concerns of this society and it is to be commended.	No comments	No changes proposed
<u>RDSPDR – 12 Chair of Technical, Economic & Environmental Services Scrutiny Panel (Cllr. Robinson)</u> The Scrutiny Panel supports the contents of this document, however the Members of the Panel would like to have seen a proposal stating that on new developments, in situations likely to need gritting on the roadway, that developers provide strategic places where grit bins could be located.	The comment related to grit bins was passed to the Highway's Department, who had the following response: <i>There is a note to applicants within the Standard Conditions asking the applicant to contact Engineers regarding the provision of suitable locations for grit bins in the form of hard standings. Even if no formal hard standing exists bins can be provided following request from residents and placed on footways/verges.</i> <i>Bins and salt are provided from Direct Services Organisation (DSO) if judged appropriate; normally at entrances to site or where steeper gradients involved.</i> <i>I'll look to ensure the note is attached where appropriate and also to include grit bin hard standings within s38 adoption agreements</i> In addition to the above comment from the Highway Engineers, the department is also in the process of producing a Residential Developments Highways Guide, which should include details of such information.	No changes are proposed
<u>RDSPDR – 13 Malcolm Johnson, Architect</u> 1) TCP (GPD) Order 2008 allows single storey rear extension of up to	The Council agrees that through permitted development rights there will be cases where homeowners will be able to apply extensions that do not comply with the guidance in the SPD. In	No amendments proposed.

<p>3M (semi) not exceeding 4M in height, and this may be built up hard against or near, Part Wall boundary, with a neighbours small habitable room window adjacent, it may well beak the 60 degree line shown in your Draft 6.1 Rear extensions. RED3. Surely the Statutory Instrument takes precedence? Your document specifically refers to single storey extensions and conservatories.</p>	<p>such cases, the Council accepts that it is up to the home owner to assess what they consider appropriate for their home.</p> <p>The Council would hope that homeowners consider the guidance detailed in the SPD, whether they need planning permission or not. As well as setting out criteria / policies, the guidance aims to help people design an extension that complements their house & its surroundings.</p>	
<p>2) "Flat roofed dormers are not encouraged, neither are front dormers" Its not the Architects fault that Government abolished Parker Morris Standards in 1980 for Public and Housing Association dwellings, and its not their fault that the NHBC didn't adopt them as written, it was the perceived need to build houses smaller and therefore cheaper.</p> <p>Having done so, many householders are faced with the absolute need to extend and therefore these dormers should not be penalised. I would also query the somewhat arbitrary figure of 500mm of a new dormer face; back from the gutter line. Practical construction says (given Planning Permission), that the front face can be built off the internal leaf of the front cavity wall. This is not usually more than 450mm back from the gutter line. My point is that if you want to restrict heavy front dormers, then insist they are set well back into the roof.</p>	<p>As detailed in policy RED6, the Council does not consider dormers appropriate at property frontage, unless an existing precedent has been set or would not detract from the surrounding character.</p> <p>While this policy restricts the use of front dormers, it does not prohibit roof lights or rear dormers. As such, still enables homeowners to extend into their roof space.</p> <p>As detailed in policy RED6, the Council will not permit flat roofed dormers. Exceptions may be made if a flat room design aligns with the house's architectural style. As with all elements of residential design, the design of dormers should reflect the design of the host dwelling and surrounding character.</p> <p>The Council agrees with the comment related to the set back of dormers, and will revise the minimum requirement.</p>	<p>The following amendment will be made to Policy RED6: Design of Dormers:</p> <p>Policy RED6: Design of Dormers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dormers should be set back from the eaves / gutter line by a minimum of 0.5 1 metre. A greater set back may be requested where a dormer is being applied to a long or steep pitched roof.

<p><u>RDSPDR – 14 GMPTE</u></p> <p>There is no reference in the document to public transport. It is important for new residential development to be located within reasonable walking distance of a bus stop, Metrolink or railway station.</p> <p>We would therefore expect the document to include reference to the importance of new residential development being located in areas easily accessed by public transport.</p> <p>Ideally all parts of the residential development should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - within 400m of a bus service running every 15 minutes at all times, or - within 250m of bus service running every 30 minutes (day) & hourly (eves & sun), or - within 800m of a rail / metrolink station. <p>Where a new development is not considered to meet accessibility standards then a developer contribution should be requested to provide additional bus services to the development site.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges that a section outlining guidance on public transport should be included within the SPD. This will acknowledge the suggested guidance detailed in GMPTE's comments.</p> <p>With regards seeking developer contributions, GMPTE were invited to contribute to the Council's developer contributions system in order to have a public transport tariff within the system. However, they failed to respond to our requests.</p>	<p>The following additions will be inserted into the document:</p> <p>Policy RD13: Design of Public Realm</p> <p>1. Create pedestrian focused streets and spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide clear, direct routes; & links to public transport facilities <p>Within the Design & Layout chapter:</p> <p>Access to Public Transport</p> <p>Sustainable travel can make a significant contribution to reducing the carbon footprint of a development, as such developers are encouraged to promote & accommodate public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>GMPTE request that ideally all parts of the residential development should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - within 400m of a bus service running every 15 minutes, or - within 250m of a bus service running every 30 minutes (day) & hourly (eves & Sun). <p>When designing a large development, consideration should be given to whether the scheme will have a bus route running through it. If it is, the designers should contact the Council's Highway Engineers and GMPTE for guidance on designing roads that can accommodate bus movement. However this must not lead to a dominating road network, all designs should align with guidance in Manual for Streets, ensuring the pedestrian environment come first.</p> <p>If a developer wishes to relocate a bus stop, it must contact GMPTE at the earliest opportunity. All costs of relocation must be met by the developer.</p> <p>If a development is to accommodate between 50 and 80 dwellings, the developer must undertake a Transport Assessment. For developments over 80 units, a Travel Plan must also be undertaken.</p>
<p><u>RDSPDR – 15 Natural England</u></p> <p>The draft SPD does not explore and exploit more opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity.</p>	<p>The SPD contains policies related to private amenity space (RD11 & RD12) & public realm (RD13), which can contain features that aid and add to an area's biodiversity.</p>	<p>The following 'bullet' point will be added to Policy RD13:</p> <p>4. Create functional green / open space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spaces should be designed to provide a biodiversity benefit

	<p>Policy RD25 relates to Sustainable Urban Drainage, which depending on the techniques used, can have a positive biodiversity benefit.</p> <p>As briefly outlined by section 2.8, the Council's developer contributions system contains a green space tariff to source funds to create or improve existing green space provision across the Borough.</p> <p>The Council's Trees & Landscaping on Development Sites SPD is intended to provide further guidance on biodiversity & landscaping issues.</p>	
<p>Within the Sustainability Appraisal report the question is asked "will it contribute to the delivery of local and regional Biodiversity Action Plans?". However, the response refers solely to landscape schemes. It should be recognised that a landscape scheme does not necessarily provide outcomes which deliver biodiversity targets.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges this comment, but also considers that the scope of the SPD only extends to public and private landscape / spaces within residential developments, limiting its ability to contribute to Biodiversity Action Plans.</p>	<p>The following addition will be made to the Sustainability Appraisal:</p> <p>12b Will it contribute to the delivery of local and regional Biodiversity Action Plans?</p> <p>The SPD highlights the need to provide private amenity space such as gardens contains guidance on providing private amenity space, retaining existing trees & hedgerows, installing sustainable urban drainage and designing public realm; all of which could contribute to delivering Biodiversity Action Plans.</p>
<p>In addition, we would welcome a direct issue being raised concerning the conservation and enhancement protected species. Protected species, such as bats, often occupy roof spaces in dwellings and this should be brought to the fore in both the SA and the SPD. We would wish to see an additional paragraph that would draw attention to the possibility of the presence of protected species, such as bats.</p>	<p>The Council agrees with this comment and has addressed it in part with its response to Greater Manchester Ecology Unit's comments.</p>	<p>The following addition will be made to the Household Extensions Section:</p> <p>4.8 Protected Species</p> <p>Prior to undertaking extension works to your property the Council recommends you ensure no protected wildlife will be affected by your proposal. Bats and birds are likely to be most common species effected by extensions as they often occupy roof scapes.</p> <p>All species of British bats and their roosts (even when unoccupied) are protected by European legislation (via the Habitats Regulations 1994 (as amended)). Where bats are found to be present a licence issued from Natural England may be required to undertake development. Most species of birds are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside</p>

		Act 1981 (as amended), and it can be an offence to disturb birds whilst they are nesting.
--	--	---

List of Residential Design SPD Respondents (RDSPDR):

- RDSPDR – 01 Coal Authority
- RDSPDR – 02 Mr T Barrett
- RDSPDR – 03 Ministry of Defence
- RDSPDR – 04 CABE
- RDSPDR – 05 Network Rail
- RDSPDR – 06 Lancashire County Council
- RDSPDR – 07 United Utilities Water
- RDSPDR – 08 Theatres Trust
- RDSPDR – 09 4NW
- RDSPDR – 10 Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
- RDSPDR – 11 Ashton-under-Lyne Civic Society
- RDSPDR – 12 Chair of Technical, Economic & Environmental Services Scrutiny Panel (Cllr. Robinson)
- RDSPDR – 13 Malcolm Johnson, Architect
- RDSPDR – 14 GMPTE
- RDSPDR – 15 Natural England

The Council received 13 responses within the allocated consultation period. 2 responses were received after the seven week period had elapsed, but these have been considered by the Council.