



WIRRAL BOROUGH COUNCIL

**DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING
DOCUMENT CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

HOUSEHOLDER DEVELOPMENT

JUNE 2026

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This is the Consultation Statement for the Wirral Borough Council Householder Development Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which was subject to public consultation for 4 weeks between 16th March and 17th April 2026. It has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 1.2 The background documents relating to the preparation of this SPD are available to view on the [Council's website](#).

2.0 Town and Country Planning Regulations (2012)

- 2.1 Regulation 12(a) requires a Local Planning Authority to prepare a Statement that sets out:
- who has been consulted while preparing the SPD;
 - a summary of the main issues raised; and
 - how these issues have been addressed in the SPD.
- 2.2 Regulation 12(b) requires a Consultation Statement to be published as part of the formal consultation on the SPD, during which formal representations are then invited under Regulation 13. Regulation 12(b) also requires SPDs to be published for a minimum consultation period of 4-weeks, specifies the date by which responses should be received, and identifies the address to which responses should be sent.

3.0 Statement of Community Involvement

- 3.1 Wirral Borough Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was updated in March 2021. The SCI sets out how the Council will consult and involve communities and stakeholders in the preparation of Local Plans and other planning documents, including SPDs. Consultation on the SPD was carried out in line with the principles of the adopted SCI.

4.0 Data Protection

- 4.1 Consultation on the Draft SPD was undertaken in accordance with the Forward Planning Privacy Notice available on [Wirral Borough Council's website](#), which advises how we use, manage and store your data in

accordance with the requirements of the general data protection regulations (UK GDPR).

4.2 The Forward Planning Privacy Notice is available from the link below:

<https://www.wirral.gov.uk/planning-and-building/local-plans-and-planning-policy/forward-planning-privacy-notice>

5.0 Consultation undertaken on the Draft SPD

5.1 A formal public consultation was undertaken on the Draft SPD from 16 March to 17 April 2026.

5.2 As part of the formal consultation Wirral Borough Council consulted widely with the following groups:

- Residents, organisations and other stakeholders registered on the Local Plan consultation database
- Elected Members
- Statutory Consultees
- Neighbouring Local Planning Authorities

Availability of Consultation Documents

5.3 During the consultation period, the Draft SPD was available to view on the Council's online [consultation portal](https://haveyoursay.wirral.gov.uk/hub-page/supplementary-planning-documents) at <https://haveyoursay.wirral.gov.uk/hub-page/supplementary-planning-documents>.

5.4 They were also available to view electronically and/or in hard copy format at Birkenhead Central Library, during normal opening hours.

5.5 Representations to the Draft SPD consultation were invited through the Council's online consultation portal Have Your Say, by email or by post.

5.6 Queries about the consultation could be made by email and by telephone to the Council's Strategic Planning Team.

SPD Consultation Communication

5.7 Wirral Borough Council publicised the consultation through a variety of methods including the issue of a press release, an article in Wirral View,

social media posts and mailouts to statutory consultees, individuals and organisations on the local planning database.

6.0 Summary of main issues raised during the consultation

- 6.1 Wirral Borough Council received representations from 14 respondents to the Householder Development Draft SPD consultation.
- 6.2 A summary of the issues raised during the consultation and how the Council has responded to those issues in the preparation of the finalised SPD is shown in the table in Appendix 1. The table also indicates which organisation or individual made the comments.
- 6.3 Paragraph numbers may have changed in the final SPD compared with the consultation Draft SPD. Any changes to paragraph numbers have been highlighted in the Council's response to comments.

Appendix 1: Summary of main issues raised to the Householder Development Draft SPD consultation and summary of response to the issue raised

The table below summarises the main issues raised to the Householder Development Draft SPD consultation, how the issues have been addressed in preparing the finalised SPD and which organisation or individual made the comments.

Summary of main issues raised	Summary of response to issues raised	Respondent(s)
The SPD needs to make it clear that it does not apply to a designated heritage asset and its setting. It is the significance of the heritage asset and the harm that is made to that significance which determines the suitability of the proposal not whether the content of the SPDs is met. This approach is supported by the NPPF and national legislation on this matter.	Any development proposal will need to comply with Policy WD 2 of the Wirral Local Plan. Criterion B requires the following: “Development proposals which have the potential to impact upon a heritage asset or its setting must be accompanied by proportionate evidence set out in a Heritage Impact Assessment.” No changes considered necessary.	Historic England
Wirral Wildlife support most of the Draft SPD, including Paragraph 3.37.	Support for SPD noted.	Wirral Wildlife
Wirral Wildlife support Paragraph 3.38, but request adding an encouragement to use native species and other wildlife-friendly planting, including those which support invertebrates such as pollinators. They also request reference to Hedgehog Highways through boundaries and the encouragement of other wildlife	These comments are noted and the local authority has amended Paragraph 3.38 in the final SPD to include the suggested wording. We expect that this will be covered by the Emerging Supplementary Planning Guidance note on Biodiversity and Nature Recovery.	Wirral Wildlife

support measures such as sparrow boxes and bat boxes. These measures will presumably come under the Biodiversity and Nature Recovery SPG, however householders may not look at that. Therefore, the Biodiversity and Nature Recovery SPG should be referenced within this SPD, along with the LCR Local Nature Recovery Strategy and the Recreation Mitigation Strategy.	Paragraph 1.2 in the SPD makes clear that the SPD sits alongside other guidance and information. No changes considered necessary to the Householder Development SPD.	
Regarding separation distances, appeal decisions sometimes accept marginally reduced distances. They suggest including more guidance on circumstances where a shorter distance may be appropriate. They also identify a potential inconsistency between separation distances and minimum garden depths.	These comments are noted but the local authority considers that the approach set out in the SPD is appropriate, with separation distances assessed on a case-by-case basis. No changes considered necessary. The local authority has amended Paragraph 3.3 in the Draft SPD to clarify that this is to prevent unacceptable levels of overlooking into neighbouring gardens. This is Paragraph 3.4 in the final version.	Stuart Kelly
There have been situations where balconies have been subject to objection from neighbours. Whilst the SPD mentions side obscure glazing, perhaps a sketch or diagram showing what level over side overlooking would be acceptable could	The local authority considers that it would be too prescriptive to include a diagram in the form suggested. The SPD should retain some flexibility to allow proposals to be assessed on their individual merits.	Stuart Kelly

be included, in some areas the bottom of garden areas could still end up being overlooked.	No changes considered necessary.	
Suggests including guidance on overbearing and overshadowing, including minimum distances between development walls and the boundaries of private gardens (particularly to the rear). They refer to an appeal decision where a proposed development was positioned near an existing garden and was found to be a looming and oppressive feature that would cast a shadow.	These comments are noted and the local authority has added a new paragraph after Paragraph 3.2 in the Draft SPD to prevent development which appears excessively oppressive and results in overshadowing of neighbouring properties. This is Paragraph 3.3 in the final version.	Stuart Kelly
Regarding Section 3, the respondent asks whether kitchens without dining facilities could be defined as non-habitable rooms. The wording of the third bullet point in Paragraph 3.1 is unclear. In relation to Paragraph 3.7, the respondent queries whether the requirement for two-storey side extensions to be set in 1m from the boundary has been removed.	The Local Plan glossary includes definition of habitable room that excludes rooms solely used for cooking purposes. No changes considered necessary. This comment is noted but the local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate and sufficiently clear. This is now the fourth bullet point in Paragraph 3.1 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. This requirement has been removed in the final SPD to be more consistent with the local authority's decision making on these types of proposals in recent years. This is now Paragraph 3.8 in the final version.	Chris Wathen

Would welcome the strengthening of connections between this SPD and The Mersey Forest Plan, so that any development coming forward in the area also helps to deliver key aspects of The Mersey Forest, bringing benefits for people, nature, and climate.	The issues raised are covered in the Wirral Tree, Hedgerow and Woodland Strategy. The emerging Biodiversity and Nature Recovery SPG will be informed by the Wirral Tree, Hedgerow and Woodland Strategy and this SPD is intended to be read alongside the other emerging SPGs. No changes considered necessary to the Householder Development SPD.	Susannah Gill
Regarding boundary treatments in Paragraph 3.19, they would like to see natural boundary treatments such as hedges given priority where this is possible. They suggest that hedges are encouraged to be of native species and/or species of value to wildlife. Their use in helping manage air quality should be acknowledged, as well as wider benefits.	These comments are noted and the local authority has added a bullet point referencing hedges as a potential option for boundary treatments. This is now Paragraph 3.20 in the final SPD.	Susannah Gill
Regarding the first bullet point of Section 2, many approved householder planning applications in Heswall involve the complete remodelling of older properties which result in dwellings with very different appearances to the character, scale and design of the existing property. Therefore, the respondent considers that the second part of this bullet point does not seem appropriate.	These comments are noted but the local authority is satisfied that the wording in Section 2 is appropriate. The guidance is not prescriptive and uses “should” to allow flexibility on a case-by-case basis. No changes considered necessary.	Roger Lane on behalf of the Heswall Society

They request guidance on whether extensions (or replacement of one half of a semidetached building) in Conservation Areas should match the original design and materials to blend in, or whether there should be some differentiation to distinguish the extended part from the original building. They ask whether the latter approach remains recommended practice by reference to a recent example.	The local authority considers that design approaches within Conservation Areas are guided by the relevant Conservation Area Management Plan. No changes considered necessary.	
Within the definitions in Section 3, a study would benefit from being based on a minimum floor area. Basing floor area on the Nationally Described Space Standards for a single bedroom does not indicate whether this is for an adult or child and the need for space (length) for a bed is not relevant to a study. The definition of Principal Elevation as referring to both the front and rear elevations may lead to confusion as it differs from that used for Permitted Development. The second bullet point of Paragraph 3.1 widens the definition used in SPG11. Including fences and embankments will be challenging for rear extensions in smaller gardens which currently have no problems achieving approval.	These comments are noted and have been taken into account where appropriate. The local authority considers that the existing definition of a study is appropriate and meets the minimum National Described Space Standards. No changes considered necessary. The SPD makes clear that the definition of “principal elevation” is “for the purposes of this document”. No changes considered necessary. These comments are noted and have informed amendments to the second bullet point and added a new third bullet point in Paragraph 3.1 to clarify the application of separation distances in relation to neighbouring properties and to the host dwelling.	Roger Lane on behalf of the Heswall Society

Regarding the third bullet point of Paragraph 3.1, overlooking is just as important whether a habitable room is on a principal or side elevation. In relation to Paragraph 3.2, the respondent queries the justification for decreasing the horizontal separation distance for every metre of vertical height distance from that set out in SPG11. The respondent also requests that guidance on oblique overlooking is provided, suggesting the Tameside Residential Design SPD as an example. They state that Paragraph 3.3 should also include guidance for oblique overlooking. Regarding Paragraph 3.5, the respondent notes that it is a ubiquitous practice to use UPVC for replacement windows and doors so the reference to materials in this paragraph is unrealistic, even in Conservation Areas (in the absence of any Article 4 directives). They suggest more actionable guidance is provided on the use of uPVC.	The local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the third bullet point of Paragraph 3.1 in the Draft SPD is appropriate. This is now bullet point four in the final version. This bullet point addresses interface distances rather than overlooking. No changes considered necessary. The local authority considers that Paragraph 3.2 provides a clearer method for determining required separation distances in circumstances where there are differing land levels. No changes considered necessary. These comments are noted but the local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate as the guidance uses “should” to give flexibility and applies in instances where planning permission is required. This is now Paragraph 3.6 in the final SPD. Proposals within Conservation Areas will additionally be considered through the application of conservation area policies set out in the Local Plan alongside Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans. No changes considered necessary.	
--	---	--

The definition of "main front elevation" in the first bullet point of Paragraph 3.7 is unclear and circular, including uncertainty around the meaning of "frontage". The respondent suggests using the permitted development definition and make reference to the highway serving the house. They suggest that "visibly lower" is used in the second bullet point of Paragraph 3.7 as in the third bullet point of Paragraph 3.17. The fourth bullet point of Paragraph 3.7 seems to duplicate Paragraph 3.6 in terms of restricting size of side extensions. Regarding Paragraph 3.8, the respondent requests clarification on whether building lines on both adjacent highways need to be respected. The importance of achieving adequate visibility splays so close to a junction is also required. They consider that the 3-metre maximum projection for rear extensions set out in the first bullet point of Paragraph 3.9 is overly restrictive based on previous approvals and it is less than permitted development limits for a detached	These comments are noted but the local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate and sufficiently clear. This is now Paragraph 3.8 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority has added "visibly lower" to the second bullet point in Paragraph 3.7 in the Draft SPD. This is Paragraph 3.8 in the final version. Noted. The local authority is not focusing on building lines in Paragraph 3.8 in the Draft SPD, which relates to maintaining an open appearance on corner plots and restricting the size of extensions on corner plots. This is Paragraph 3.9 in the final version. No changes considered necessary. The local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate as the guidance uses "should" to allow flexibility on a case-by-case basis. In addition, the guidance does not restrict	
--	---	--

house. The respondent suggests that some discretion should be allowed, noting that this may be considered to be adequately addressed in Paragraph 3.10. Regarding the first bullet point of Paragraph 3.12, they suggest retaining the SPG11 wording on porches "restricted in size and scale to the exterior door over which they are sited". They also request ensuring that porch projection does not compromise minimum driveway length where the porch is at the end of a driveway. The respondent strongly agrees with the principle in Paragraph 3.15, also noting that it can be overruled by permitted development rights. Regarding Paragraph 3.18, the same separation distances as for windows should be imposed and guidance on oblique overlooking should be introduced. In the third bullet point of Paragraph 3.19, they request emphasis that planning permission is required for any fence higher than 1 metre where it is adjacent to a highway.	permitted development rights. This is Paragraph 3.10 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate. This is now Paragraph 3.13 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. There is no control over driveway length in the Local Plan and the SPD cannot introduce policy that is not in the Local Plan. No changes considered necessary. Support noted. This is now Paragraph 3.16 in the final SPD. The local authority considers that the separation distances set out in Paragraph 3.1 in the SPD apply to all extensions to a property. No changes considered necessary. Requirements for fences adjacent to highways are defined in the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO), and it is therefore not necessary to repeat	
---	--	--

Regarding the fourth bullet point of Paragraph 3.19, the use of hedges should be encouraged, and hedgehog highways should be provided in new walls and fences. They ask whether guidance in the fifth bullet point of Paragraph 3.19 can include that, where new fences are erected, posts must face inwards towards the enclosed plot and away from the public views. They suggest providing examples of acceptable visibility splays or making reference to highway standards in Paragraph 3.19.	this within the SPD. This is Paragraph 3.20 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority has added a bullet point to Paragraph 3.19 in the Draft SPD referencing hedges as a potential option for boundary treatments. This is Paragraph 3.20 in the final version. In addition, the local authority considers that hedgehog highways are more appropriate for larger schemes proposing multiple adjacent dwellings and therefore it is referenced in the Residential Development SPD. The local authority would consider this to be part of the requirement for boundary treatments to be of good design in bullet point four of Paragraph 3.19 in the Draft SPD and does not need to be separately stated. This is Paragraph 3.20 in the final version. No changes considered necessary. These are too detailed to include in an SPD. Additional guidance and information on Adoptable Residential Roads is intended to be published alongside the validation checklist which can be found on the Council's planning webpage at Planning application forms and checklists wirral.gov.uk. No changes considered necessary.	
---	---	--

Regarding Paragraph 3.22, the respondent suggests that where permission is granted due to screening, a condition should require that the screening is maintained. They query whether in Paragraph 3.26 it would be more consistent for this distance to be 10 metres plus 2 metres for every additional storey on which the balcony is situated, given the previous guidance set out in Paragraph 3.2. The respondent requests guidance on acceptable volume increases for extensions in Green Belt in Paragraph 3.31. Regarding Paragraph 3.37, they request emphasis that all trees in Conservation Areas need approval for removal. Special attention should be given to protect veteran and ancient trees, with clear definitions of these tree descriptions.	The local authority considers that the decision to impose planning conditions is a matter determined on a case-by-case basis with individual planning applications and is outside the scope of an SPD. This is Paragraph 3.23 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority considers that the need to add to the 10 metre distance for taller buildings set out in the SPD will be considered on a case-by-case basis. No changes considered necessary. The local authority considers that Paragraphs 3.29 to 3.34 in the Draft SPD provide this guidance and are consistent with the previous approach in SPG11. These are now Paragraphs 3.30 to 3.35 in the final version. No changes considered necessary. Planning legislation already places additional protection on trees within Conservation Areas, and the local authority considers that it is not necessary to repeat this within the SPD. This is now Paragraph 3.38 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary.	
---	--	--

Overall, there is an impression of guidance and clarification being rushed. They consider that some of the guidance is overly proscriptive and that the widespread use of "normally" and other exceptional qualifications will lead to contests and appeals, rather than aiding a smoother planning application process.	These comments are noted but the local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate. The use of the term “normally” is intended to provide flexibility. No changes considered necessary.	John Heath on behalf of WGAS and ITPAS
Regarding Section 3, the respondent suggests amendments to the definitions of non-habitable rooms to include 'Galley Kitchen' without dining or sitting areas and 'Study' with less space than a single bedroom. The definition of principal elevation may cause confusion with permitted development definition. They suggest using "main" or "front". Regarding 'original dwelling', the respondent questions where an 'original' building is to be demolished in order that a replacement new-build would be of that size plus the area of to-be-demolished Outhouses and any permitted development allowance(s), whether the resulting replacement building become an 'original building' and thereby entitled to allowances for extensions and permitted development afresh.	The Local Plan glossary includes definition of habitable room that excludes rooms solely used for cooking purposes. In addition, the local authority considers that the existing definition of a study is appropriate. No changes considered necessary. The SPD makes clear that the definition of “principal elevation” is “for the purposes of this document”. No changes considered necessary. Section 3 in the SPD defines ‘original dwelling’. The local authority will consider whether it is appropriate to remove permitted development rights on a case-by-case basis. No changes considered necessary.	John Heath on behalf of WGAS and ITPAS

In the second bullet point of Paragraph 3.1, the 'blank wall' should be conditioned not to have a window added later if it applies to a new residence (or other building) between 14 and 21 metres from another new residence. The respondent suggests that a diagram is needed to clarify Paragraph 3.3. They note that the general rule in Paragraph 3.6 is undermined by the final sentence and they question why this does not also apply to corner plots in the first bullet point in Paragraph 3.8. They also suggest an amendment to the wording to improve clarity in the second bullet point. Regarding Paragraph 3.9, they consider that the criteria for rear extensions conflict with recent	The local authority considers that the decision to impose planning conditions is a matter determined on a case-by-case basis with individual planning applications and is outside the scope of an SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority considers that Paragraph 3.3 in the Draft SPD is sufficiently clear and that additional diagrams are not required. This is Paragraph 3.4 in the final version. No changes considered necessary. These comments are noted but the local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate. This is now Paragraph 3.7 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate and includes “should” to allow planning judgment to be applied on a case-by-case basis. This is Paragraph 3.9 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority considers that the purpose of an SPD is to provide guidance, not to set policy and	
--	---	--

approvals and allowances. They suggest amended wording to Paragraph 3.11 to address an increase in authorised front extensions and suggest that proposals submitted retrospectively should always be refused. They suggest increasing the maximum porch projection of 1.5 metres to 1.8 metres in the first bullet point of Paragraph 3.12. They also query whether a width restriction should be included. The respondent questions the prohibition of side dormers in Paragraph 3.15 without the qualification of "normally", noting that precedent exists and that both forms can be achieved through good design. They raise concerns about the absence of a design-based exception.	Paragraph 3.9 in the Draft SPD includes "should" to allow planning judgment to be applied on a case-by-case basis. This is Paragraph 3.10 in the final version. No changes considered necessary. The local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in Paragraph 3.11 in the Draft SPD is appropriate, which is now Paragraph 3.12 in the final version. The guidance is not prescriptive and includes "not normally" to give flexibility. In addition, planning legislation allows for retrospective planning applications, and it is not appropriate for an SPD to restrict this. No changes considered necessary. The local authority is satisfied that the approach in the SPD is appropriate and consistent with the previous approach in SPG11. This is now Paragraph 3.13 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority has added "normally" to Paragraph 3.15 in the Draft SPD, which is now Paragraph 3.16 in the final version.	
--	--	--

They raise concerns that the third bullet point of Paragraph 3.17 may prevent the possibility of loft conversions which contribute to housing supply and can help keep communities together. Regarding Paragraph 3.18, the respondent queries how impact is going to be assessed and asks whether side cheeks of dormers splay out from bottom to top can reduce overlooking. They state that existing boundary treatments which do not comply with the guidance in Paragraph 3.19 should not form precedent for further poor solutions. They suggest amending Paragraph 3.21 to state that outbuildings should be subordinate to the original dwelling.	These comments are noted and the local authority has amended the third bullet point to clarify that dormers should not exceed the ridge height of the dwelling. This is now in Paragraph 3.18 of the final SPD. The local authority considers that the proposed approach in Paragraph 3.18 in the Draft SPD is appropriate. This is Paragraph 3.19 in the final version. In addition, the impact of individual proposals are assessed through the planning application process in the usual way through the application of planning judgement. No changes considered necessary. The local authority has added wording to the fifth bullet point of Paragraph 3.19 in the Draft SPD to clarify that close-boarded wooden fences would need to be an established and positive feature within the street scene. This is now Paragraph 3.20 in the final version. These comments are noted but the local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate. This is now Paragraph 3.22 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary.	
--	--	--

They request the removal of the word “normally” from Paragraph 3.22. Regarding Paragraph 3.23, they seek clarification on how this will be assessed and who determines what is acceptable. They support Paragraph 3.32 but state that the term 'original' requires clearer definition, noting similar concerns in Paragraph 3.33. Regarding Paragraph 3.35, they suggest that the first bullet point should require internal links to ancillary accommodation to be maintained and remain operable. They also question whether there are restrictions on the type of ancillary residential	The local authority has removed “normally” from Paragraph 3.22 in the Draft SPD. This is Paragraph 3.23 in the final version. The local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate. The impacts of individual proposals are assessed through the planning application process in the usual way through the application of planning judgement. This is now Paragraph 3.24 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The term “original” is well recognised in planning and therefore does not require any further clarification. In addition, ‘original dwelling’ is defined in Section 3 in the SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority considers that the proposed approach in the SPD is appropriate and sets out the requirements for the purposes of assessing a planning application. If considered appropriate on a case-by-case basis, this matter could be controlled by planning condition. This is now Paragraph 3.36 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. There are no restrictions on the type of ancillary residential accommodation permitted within	
---	--	--

accommodation permitted within outbuildings, and raise similar concerns in relation to Paragraph 3.36, noting the continued use of the term “normally”.	outbuildings, provided that it remains ancillary to the host dwelling. In addition, the local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate, and the use of the term “normally” is intended to provide flexibility. If considered appropriate on a case-by-case basis, this matter could be controlled by planning condition. This is now Paragraph 3.37 in the final SPD.	
The respondent suggests that Paragraph 3.37 be amended to require that the extent and type of replacements be subject to approval in advance by the Local Authority.	No changes considered necessary. These comments are noted and reference to native species and wildlife-friendly planting, including those which support invertebrates such as pollinators has been added to Paragraph 3.37 in the Draft SPD. This is Paragraph 3.38 in the final version. The local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording with these changes in the SPD is appropriate.	
They request that detailed Landscape Proposals are required as part of planning applications.	The local authority cannot require detailed Landscape Proposals when submitting a planning application as the level of information required is set by the National Validation requirements. Further detail may be sought by means of a planning condition where appropriate. No changes considered necessary.	
Once a Planning Application is lodged, any Pre-Application Report should be publicised alongside the Application Documents and	In relation to the publication of Pre-Application Advice, an SPD cannot provide the basis to require publication of a document. There is no statutory requirement for an LPA to publish pre-application advice and therefore	John Heath on behalf of WGAS and ITPAS

redacted for sensitive information if deemed necessary.	it is not anticipated that the LPA would undertake this action when a planning application is submitted.	
In general, PSVT supports the guidance presented in this SPD within the wider policies adopted in the Local Plan for heritage and the Port Sunlight Conservation Area. In particular, PSVT supports Section 3.19 Boundary Treatments and 3.20-3.24 Outbuildings. It would be helpful if the SPD could clarify that is meant by 'street scene'. The respondent queries whether Port Sunlight's access roads would count as the 'street scene', or does this guidance relate to building frontages only.	Support for SPD noted. The term "street scene" is well recognised in planning and therefore does not require any further clarification. The local authority considers that there is always scope for planning judgement to be applied on a case-by-case basis on this matter. No changes considered necessary.	Heather Alcock
Regarding Section 2, the respondent raises concerns that the requirement for external materials to match or complement those of the existing property is too subjective, noting that what is considered to "complement" may vary between officers.	The local authority is satisfied that the proposed approach in the SPD is appropriate and reflects the requirement of Policy WD5 in the Local Plan. In addition, the local authority considers that there is always scope for planning judgement to be applied on a case-by-case basis on this matter. No changes considered necessary.	Nick Belderbos
Regarding the fourth bullet point of Paragraph 3.1, the respondent questions the requirement that primary habitable rooms should not be served solely by rooflights, noting that well-	These comments are noted but the local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate. The guidance is not prescriptive and includes "should normally" to allow flexibility on a case-	Nick Belderbos

proportioned and well positioned rooflights can provide reasonable outlook. In relation to Paragraph 3.3, there are properties that have less than 10 metre gardens, which should not be prohibited from first floor extensions. The respondent states that this guidance does not align with permitted development. They consider that Paragraph 3.5 stifles good design opportunities, noting that fenestration can be different and complement an existing property and that such decisions should not be determined by planning officers. Regarding Paragraph 3.6, the respondent considers that the 1 metre setback requirement and the limitation on the width should not be fixed and should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. They also state that the inclusion of “not more than half the width” in Paragraph 3.8 is too defined and should be assessed on a case-by-case basis.	by-case basis. This is now the fifth bullet point in Paragraph 3.1 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority considers that Paragraph 3.3 in the Draft SPD does not prohibit such development and allows for planning judgment to be applied on a case-by-case basis. This is now Paragraph 3.4 in the final version. No changes considered necessary. The local authority has amended the wording in Paragraph 3.5 in the Draft SPD to clarify that new windows and doors should reflect or complement the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, especially where they are visible in the street scene. This is Paragraph 3.6 in the final version. The local authority is satisfied that the proposed approach is appropriate and consistent with established decision-making practice. This is Paragraph 3.7 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate and includes “should” to allow planning judgment to be applied on a	
--	--	--

They consider the guidance in Paragraph 3.12 to be subjective, particularly in relation to materials matching or complimenting the existing property. They also state that the 1.5 metre projection limit should not be fixed and should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The respondent requests better alignment between the SPD guidance and permitted development rules for dormer and roof extensions. They note that material choice should not be subjective or dependent on the individual opinion of a planning officer.	case-by-case basis. This is Paragraph 3.9 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority is satisfied that the proposed approach in the SPD is appropriate and reflects the requirement of Policy WD5 in the Local Plan. In addition, the local authority considers that there is always scope for planning judgement to be applied on a case-by-case basis on this matter. This is Paragraph 3.13 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in the SPD is appropriate includes “should” to provide flexibility to allow these matters to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. No changes considered necessary. The local authority considers that planning applications are determined through the application of planning judgement. Permitted development rights apply in circumstances where planning permission is not required. The SPD provides guidance to inform the assessment of dormer and roof extensions where planning permission is required. No changes considered necessary.	
--	--	--

Regarding Paragraph 3.22, the respondent states that it is often appropriate to build forward of the host dwellings and that this should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. They state that openness of the Green Belt in Paragraph 3.29 is subjective and may be viewed differently by planning officers. They also raise concerns that the 50% floorspace threshold in Paragraph 3.30 is too rigid, stating that proposals should be assessed on a case-by-case basis having regard to their impact on Green Belt rather than based on a percentage. Regarding ancillary accommodation, the respondent queries whether it is necessary to include this clause, noting that any change from ancillary accommodation to a separate dwelling will need planning approval and can be assessed on its own merits.	The local authority has added to Paragraph 3.22 in the Draft SPD that garages will not normally be acceptable unless appropriate to the size and scale of the plot and the prevailing character of the area. This is Paragraph 3.23 in the final version. The local authority considers that the assessment on the openness of the Green Belt involves an element of planning judgement but in the context of national planning guidance and case law. This is now Paragraph 3.30 in the final SPD. In addition, the 50% floorspace threshold is consistent with established practice and is not a rigid limit. This is now Paragraph 3.31 in the final SPD. No changes considered necessary. The local authority does consider it necessary to retain this clause to provide additional guidance when considering planning applications for this form of development. The local authority has amended the first sentence of Paragraph 3.35 in the Draft SPD to read “Ancillary accommodation, usually for family members, should retain a clear relationship with the host dwelling in order to be considered ancillary.”. This is Paragraph 3.36 in the final version.	
Regarding Paragraph 4.1, the respondent welcomes pre-application discussions for complex projects but states that they should not	These comments are noted but the local authority is satisfied that the proposed wording in Paragraph 4.1 in	Nick Belderbos

be expected as a general requirement for householder applications, noting that this would be time consuming and expensive. They express a preference for proactive engagement during the planning application process for more straightforward proposals.	the SPD is appropriate as it states that pre-application discussions are encouraged rather than required. No changes considered necessary.	
No comments on the SPD.	Noted.	Mining Remediation Authority, National Highways, Natural England, Environment Agency, Homes England