

New Homes from Old Places

Draft Residential Conversion and Sub-division Supplementary Planning Document

Statement of Consultation

Revised Draft: December 2010



Contents

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 1.0 Introduction | 1 |
| 2.0 Summary of Consultation Responses and Key Issues Raised | 2 |
| Appendix 1: Schedule of Comments and Responses on Draft SPD | |

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This document presents the outcome of consultation on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document “New Homes from Old Places” which was published in June 2010.

1.2 The consultation exercise took place over a six week period between 24th May and 5th July 2010¹. Consultation involved the following:

- a pre publication presentation to the Fylde Coast Planning Agents Meeting on 27th April 2010,
- publication of the Statement of Matters in the Blackpool Gazette
- dedicated consultation event on the Council’s online consultation portal
- The draft SPD and supporting documents were published on the Council’s web site and deposited in the locations below..

1. Main reception Municipal Buildings, Corporation Street, Blackpool, FY1 1LZ2.
2. Blackpool Central Library, Queen Street, Blackpool, FY1 1PX
3. Anchorsholme Library, Luton Road, FY5 3RS
4. Bispham Library, Devonshire Road, FY2 0HH
5. Boundary Library, Bathurst Avenue, FY3 7RW
6. Layton Library, Talbot Road, FY3 7BD
7. Mereside Library, 4b Crummock Place, FY4 4TP
8. Palatine Library, St Annes Road, FY4 2AP
9. Revoe Library, Revoe Street, FY1 5HN
10. Blackpool Enterprise Centre, Lytham Road, FY4 1EW
11. Solaris Centre, New South Promenade, FY4 1RW

- Emails were sent to all consultees on the Local Development Framework Database on 24th May 2010, and reminders sent in late June 2010.
- Letters also sent to planning agents and LDF database consultees with no email address

¹ The formal closing date for responses was extended by one week until 12th July 2010, owing to technical problems with the Limehouse on-line consultation system

- The document was also a key part of a series of six major public exhibitions arranged as part of a parallel consultation exercise on the Holiday Areas Draft SPD.

1.3 The intention of the consultation was to obtain views on the general approach and usability of the document and as to whether the proposed design requirements were appropriate.

2.0 Summary of Consultation Responses and Key Issues Raised

2.1 Seven external representations were received which are set out in Appendix 1 together with the Council's response and proposed change to the final SPD as appropriate. The key issues raised were

Key Issues Raised

- The document is too ambitious (and prescriptive);
- The proposed internal space standards are too strict and will result in large houses (and flats) for which there is no market;
- External amenity standards cannot be met;
- The requirements are not financially viable without significant public grant aid.
- Some of the proposals set out in the SPD were not based on appropriate DPD policies

3.0 Consultation on Previous Draft SPD-Summer 2009

3.1 The Draft SPD was informed by representations received on a previous draft which was published for consultation during Summer 2009. Details of representations received and the Council's response are set out in a separate report entitled 'Pre-Production Stage Consultation Statement', available to view on the Council's website at: www.blackpool.gov.uk/residentialconversions

Appendix 1: Draft New Homes from Old Places SPD- Summary of Representations Received and Council Responses

May – July 2010

Appendix 1: Schedule of Comments/ Reponses and amendments to New Homes from Old Draft SPD

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|-----|---------------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Brian Johnston | New Homes' Board 5 Too restrictive on particular types, i.e. 1/2/3 bedrooms. Should be down to owner what is best for them and of course what will sell or rent best. | The housing mix is skewed in the inner areas towards smaller dwellings. In order to address the consequent social problems arising from this imbalance, policy HN6 restricts the number of new small dwellings created in a development. | The housing mix requirements have been amended and are now consistent with Policy HN6. Should they be reviewed through the Core Strategy, the final SPD will be reviewed accordingly. |
| 2.1 | Bernard Bryze | The single dwelling 90sq m as first option stands ok, the remainder of space is now generally tight for a second dwelling | Unsure where the 90sq m figure has come from. Flexibility may be allowed within the space standards to accommodate situations where the majority of minimal internal and external space standards are met. | N/A |
| 2.2 | Bernard Bryze | I feel the spaces should be standards with no compromise on the sizes | The Council will expect the minimum total dwelling sizes to be adhered to although accepts that the conversion of existing premises requires a degree of flexibility. | N/A |
| 2.3 | Bernard Bryze | Bedroom spaces. In the past you would allow a nominal corridor usually 1metre/half metre to be included in the calculation for the size of the bedroom. Instead, the sizes should be in rectangular spaces (min sizes ok although chimney breast an exception) | The existing SPD has minimum dimensions for room sizes, but is not clear on whether an area within that room with smaller dimensions can be included towards minimum area calculations. This clarification is considered useful. | There is now a requirement that minimum dimensions must be adhered to for <u>most of the length of a room</u> . Whilst this may allow a very small narrow area to be included, it will prevent a corridor being counted towards the minimum room area. |
| 2.4 | Bernard Bryze | Rear access, usually. Poor, gated back lanes, bins, poorly rendered rear extensions, odd windows badly maintained, no illumination (do not consider a good idea) | Rear access will normally only be appropriate in end of terrace locations. | There is now a requirement for all dwellings to have direct access from the street entrance or shared entrance hallway off the street entrance. Rear access will only be considered in exceptional circumstances. |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|-----|---------------------|---|---|--|
| 2.5 | Bernard Bryze | Amenity space. Small back areas, heavy bins, gated, yes open space used only when the sun is out ok for drying space. So now you have your example, a small area illuminating the front property with no access to bins. Bikes ok real amenity space. Cost. Knock up concrete, grass and fence as required. | This comment refers to the front cover illustration and to issues of bin and cycle storage, and private amenity space provision. The provision of bin and cycle storage is particularly challenging in the typical terraced layout of inner resort streets. | All outdoor space provided must be in addition to parking, cycle or waste storage provision, although there is now a recognition that a balance must be made. More guidance is now provided on the storage of cycles and waste, including opportunities for communal storage and within the building. |
| 2.6 | Bernard Bryze | The high cover 3m balcony sun trap outside amenity space. Great on plan, totally cost ineffective. The works involved for the use will be a major problem in having the works carried out. | Private outdoor space is highly valued and should be provided for any dwelling where possible to provide a good quality home. It may not be possible to create meaningful amenity areas in all cases, particularly in the inner areas. In which case, applicants will be expected to compensate for this with a higher quality internal layout. | There is now an emphasis on maximising all opportunities to provide outdoor amenity space, including the removal of extensions and outbuildings and provision of roof terraces and balconies. Minimum standards relating to ground floor external amenity area and balconies / roof terrace areas have been moved to best practice guidance. |
| 2.7 | Bernard Bryze | The removal of sun lounges bays, good idea. £10k min will widen the feel at ground level. I think the cost will stop the job unless a street layout plan is altered as part of the works. | The removal of sun lounges improves the residential character of a street and reduces the size of a former business property to a more domestic scale. This is often asked for on current planning applications in accordance with Policy HN5 and the supporting text to Policy LQ14. Applicants are normally allowed up to 3 years to remove a sun lounge. | The removal of sun lounges is now a requirement irrespective of whether an adjoining property has one, in accordance with the supporting text to policy LQ14. |
| 2.8 | Bernard Bryze | Removal of roof lifts. Great for the street scene. Cost will make the works none effective. To replace roof say £20k min, a lot of making good. | The removal of poor quality, oversized roof-lifts brings properties and the street back to a more residential scale and character. Removing a roof-lift is a large undertaking so will only require this as part of the work to sub-divide a property. | N/A |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|------|---------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| 2.9 | Bernard Bryze | <p>We are for a strategy. The hotelier is trapped, their only way out is for a developer to buy. If we take an 11 bed hotel, purchase today £80k-£120k. 4 flats planning min alt £25k per flat. Rented £480 per week, £25k year return on £220/180k, Good return and local authority pays [we assume this refers to Housing Benefit payments by tenants]. 2 houses. Purchase £100k alts, £50k per house, rented £300 per week. £15k return, 7.5% ok. If works can be carried out. The risk down from this figure will stop development.</p> | <p>This comment goes to the heart of one of the key issues which the new guidance aims to address. The conversion of former holiday accommodation into multiple small flats with a high rental yield (arising from housing benefits payments) has led to a skewed housing provision in the inner resort areas with consequent social issues. The new guidance will set out modern space and amenity standards to raise the quality of new dwellings created through conversion and sub division. Small poor quality flats are no longer acceptable. The Council's policies are not based on maximising development yield, but on setting out minimum acceptable and deliverable standards for new housing.</p> | N/A |
| 2.10 | Bernard Bryze | <p>Something has to be done, without total redevelopment, the design, has really to incorporate a number of streets and the space to rear becomes the green oasis and this will require the a master plan on how is the best access achieved. The demolition of hotels, some rear demolition and the redesign of these rear spaces could create the community project necessary, introduce green oasis gardens to the poor back lane problem.</p> | <p>The Council accepts that comprehensive redevelopment would be one option to tackling the housing and environmental issues with the inner resort areas. However, the cost of such major intervention and the need for public sector funding assistance means that it is not feasible in the foreseeable future. The Council must therefore encourage owners and developers to work in innovative ways to re-use older guest houses and hotels.</p> | N/A |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|-----|---------------------|---|---|---|
| 3.1 | David Hadwin | The vertical conversion used as an illustration is poor. This shows the rear property having no access off the street and the front property having no access to shared amenity space. Furthermore, there is no consideration of refuse storage. This is not a good design and would be contrary to current policy and the draft requirements in this document. | This concept sketch was intended to show how a vertical conversion could work for illustrative purposes. It shows a rear entrance close to the end of a terrace and in fact each dwelling has access to its own amenity space. We acknowledge that it does not show how waste and cycle storage is dealt with. | Designing entrances to be visible from the street is important, and rear entrances may be considered close to the end of a terrace. This is now acknowledged in the document, which states that all dwellings must have direct access from the street entrance...and that rear access will only be considered in exceptional circumstances. |
| 3.2 | David Hadwin | There is a presumption in favour of vertical sub division, but this is not a good design. The example given in the document would provide a better design if converted horizontally into 3 flats. | Vertical conversions will not be appropriate in all cases, but should be explored at end of terrace locations and as a means of providing a private street entrance to as many properties as possible. | N/A |
| 3.3 | David Hadwin | It might be useful have some examples of good design – see Tim Corry | It is intended that examples of good design will be provided separately on the web page where the document can be found. | A link to a web page containing design examples and best practice will be included in the final document |
| 3.4 | David Hadwin | The proportion of two bed properties is too low, this should be higher. There is little appetite in the private sector for three bed and above flats. People looking for properties of three bedrooms are usually looking for houses. The policy also motivates to include one bed dwellings in the conversion. In order to make the schemes work there would be an incentive to adopt 25% one bed, 50% two bed with the rest 3 bed. This surely is not what you are after, particularly in view of Talbot and Brunswick Ward policy. I suggest that you put a threshold of say 8 units that can be two bed, there after the mix you suggest. | <p>We have revisited the housing mix requirement and found it went beyond the requirements of higher level planning policy, specifically Policy HN6 of the Local Plan, which is beyond the scope of any SPD.</p> <p>Within the inner neighbourhoods it is important to redress the current imbalance in housing provision away from small one and two bed properties towards three plus bed dwellings. Having a greater housing mix is something for the emerging Core Strategy to address.</p> | The housing mix requirements have been amended and are now consistent with Policy HN6. Should they be reviewed through the Core Strategy, the final SPD will be reviewed accordingly. |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|-------|---------------------|--|--|---|
| 3.4.1 | David Hadwin | Would you not want to put a presumption against single bedroom and studio accommodation after previous attempts by the Council to remove this type of accommodation | The document states no dwelling designed for less than 2 people will be permitted. The SPD cannot go beyond the demands of Policy HN6 (see above) | N/A |
| 3.5 | David Hadwin | There is no requirement under the building regulations for level thresholds for conversion work due to space constraints. This should be removed from the policy. Similarly the item regarding lifts is superfluous to requirements as the maximum number of dwellings permitted under the managed house policy is 15. | After revisiting this issue the provision of level access is not a planning issue and has been moved to best practice guidance. The need for lifts to serve properties containing over 15 apartments above four storeys is considered essential to meet modern standards. | The requirements for level access have been moved to Part 3: Best Practice. No change to the lift requirement. |
| 3.6 | David Hadwin | Space standards are not realistic - a good sized two bed flat is 65sqm | The space standards are based on those in the London Housing Design Guide 2010, which have been adjusted to allow for conversion of existing spaces. These are intended to provide quality, flexible, modern space. The space standards have been the subject of a separate architectural feasibility study (on the conversion of former holiday accommodation) on behalf of the Council which has found that in most cases the standards can be met and produce attractive workable living solutions. | Minor adjustments have been made to the space standards after revisiting the London Housing Design Guide and Architectural Feasibility Study, in particular the size of studio flat (now the same as a 1 bed flat) and the size of a 2 bed and 3 bed house (reduced to a more reasonable size). |
| 3.7 | David Hadwin | Room height of 2.4m, standard height in new build is 2350mm – is this standard to be relaxed if the main building has low ceilings, particularly as we have to introduce lowered ceilings for sound proofing? | 2.4m is considered to be an appropriate figure. If the main building has low ceilings then how appropriate it will be to include towards the original floor area will be considered on a case by case basis. | N/A |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|------|---------------------|--|---|--|
| | | Also what about rooms in roof space, useable floor space is 1.5m – a dresser against a 1.5m wall will have standing room in front, i.e. 1.8m height | Floor space in roof space counting towards the original property must be above 2.14m (7'0") over at least half of the measurable floor area. Areas with a floor to ceiling height of 1.52m (5'0") will not count towards this measurement. | Clarification on measurable floor space in the roof space is now included in the revised draft. |
| 3.8 | David Hadwin | Living space appears over large – equates to 6 x 4m for two bed flat, but not much bigger than 7 person accommodation. I would suggest that near 18 -20sqm for 2 person rising to 45sqm for 7 person | Aggregate areas are based on those in the London Housing Design Guide but amended to reflect typical existing local conditions (i.e. reduced by 10%). | The figures have been rounded to a single decimal point. |
| 3.9 | David Hadwin | The amenity space required is excessive and would not be able to be accommodated in the inner wards. The space standard for a one bed flat is 30% of floor area and equates to 4.0mx5.0m area. The typical width of a mid terrace property is 5.0m. Therefore it would not be possible to convert an inner ward hotel into two dwellings due to amenity space. | Private outdoor space is highly valued and should be provided for any dwelling where possible to provide a good quality home. It may not be possible to create meaningful amenity areas in all cases, particularly in the inner areas. In which case, applicants will be expected to compensate for this with a higher quality internal layout. | There is now an emphasis on maximising all opportunities to provide outdoor amenity space, including the removal of extensions and outbuildings and provision of roof terraces and balconies. Minimum standards relating to ground floor external amenity area and balconies / roof terrace areas have been moved to best practice guidance. |
| 3.10 | David Hadwin | DS9 is out of date and unnecessary given the level of sound proofing that is now required in dwellings. This should be omitted. | Mitigation measures i.e. sound proofing are dealt with by building regulations although buffer zones and stacking is still considered to be sensible design practice. | Minor amendment – no longer refers to 'unless appropriate mitigation measures are included'. |
| 3.11 | David Hadwin | The design tips should be omitted; they come across as patronising, and in some instances are incorrect. | Noted. It is intended that further design tips and good design practice notes will be made available on the Council's web site as the document is implemented. | The design tips have been omitted. |
| 3.12 | David Hadwin | The requirement for 5% of the floor area to be given over to storage is useless and conflicts with the aspirations of | The provision of adequate storage in modern dwellings is considered essential and 5% is considered to | N/A |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|------|---------------------|---|---|--|
| | | making best use of space. The space required for a typical flat is the same size as a kitchen. There is no requirement for this level of storage. This policy should be omitted and replaced with 'consideration should be given to storage requirements'. | be an appropriate figure. This can be part of space within a room provided minimum habitable space standards are maintained. | |
| 3.13 | David Hadwin | Policy 11.3 over steps the mark for a planning document and cannot be policed. This is a build issue and not a requirement under any other policy. This should be omitted. | After revisiting this issue the provision of a DDA compliant bathroom is not a planning issue and will be dealt with by building regulations where appropriate. | This has been omitted |
| | | Policy 11.4 a DDA compliant bathroom is overly large and at odds with the requirements of any resident other than a wheel chair bound person. If such a conversion is required by a resident at a later date this could be accommodated by alteration works. It is not reasonable to try to make a building useable to all sectors of society at its inception. | After revisiting this issue the provision of a DDA compliant bathroom is not a planning issue and will be dealt with by building regulations where appropriate. | This has been moved to best practice. |
| 3.14 | David Hadwin | Policy DS12 is wrong. Parking standards are a maximum and dealt with under other policy. The park space sizes are in conflict with the unified policy for extensions amongst others. This needs to comply with the other standards. | On reflection, the parking standards proposed were not consistent with those in the Local Plan, which are maximum standards. It is considered that these aren't particularly useful for this document, and that in view of existing problems with on-street parking, off-street parking should be encouraged more, providing it is appropriate and represents a net-gain over existing on-street provision. A balance must be made between the provision of amenity space and off-street parking. | The parking requirements have been re-written to help reduce on-street parking pressures and to encourage off-street parking where appropriate, whilst balancing the need for outdoor amenity space. |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|------|---------------------|---|---|---|
| 3.15 | David Hadwin | Policy 15 is too much for a typical conversion of a hotel to a single dwelling or a couple of flats. This is taking from code for sustainable homes which is optional and there is no requirement for this in new housing developments. Flooding is covered under separate policy. Bats and owl reports for hotels in Blackpool is not commonsense and only in very special cases should this be a requirement. | Sustainability is an important part of the guidance, however until the Energy Efficiency SPD comes forward which supplements Local Plan Policy LQ8, on reflection the requirements for sustainability cannot be justified and will be moved to best practice. Should the Energy Efficiency SPD come forward then the final SPD will be reviewed accordingly. The advice on flood risk is a requirement of the EA and the advice on protected species is in accordance with Natural England guidance, and is only applicable where the presence of protected species is suspected. | Sustainability requirements have been moved to best practice. Advice on flooding and protected species has been moved to Part 1: Introduction (issues to consider when submitting your planning application). |
| 3.16 | David Hadwin | The requirement to make it compulsory to introduce insulations and renewable energy is not practical and unnecessarily costly. For example you cannot use solar panels on flats, because it is not possible to connect them to a flat, without losing energy collected in the wiring to the flat. Windmills do not work, are ugly and noisy and no one yet has brought into the equation the carbon expended to manufacture one. This leaves ground source heat pumps which are not appropriate due to land take and cost about £8,000 per dwelling, driving the unit cost of a dwelling ever higher. This discourages conversion and will not help regenerate Blackpool. | See above. | Sustainability requirements have been moved to best practice. |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|------|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 3.17 | David Hadwin | <p>Policy 15g is out of date. The Waste Management Act came into force last April. There is no need to have this as policy</p> | <p>The Council has adopted the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework which includes the Minimising and Managing Waste in New Developments SPD. Appropriate requirements in this document should be incorporated.</p> | <p>The 'Waste storage and services' section includes appropriate requirements to minimise waste in accordance with the Minimising and Managing Waste in New Developments SPD. These are also referenced in the best practice guidance section.</p> |
| 3.18 | David Hadwin | <p>The policy is over prescriptive and too restrictive to allow imagination and progressive design. It aims at a common level, which is not a shared aspiration of prospective owners i.e. not everyone wants a garden.</p> <p>The policy is in conflict with national legislation on a number of issue, and seeks to be an all encompassing design guide, which of cause it cannot be because it only deals with planning and pays no attention to other aspects of good design, such as economics, buildability safety.</p> <p>This SPD will discourage the conversion of hotels into accommodation and will not help regenerate Blackpool.</p> | <p>The document sets out the minimum guidance considered necessary to ensure that high quality residential dwellings are created. It recognises that the conversion of existing buildings requires a degree of flexibility, although expects all proposals to demonstrate an innovative, high quality design solution – indeed the Council will encourage innovative interpretations of the guidance to produce high quality living spaces. A separate study has shown the guidance to be technically feasible.</p> <p>The document does not conflict with national legislation although it does need to complement the building regulations requirements.</p> | <p>Many of the fundamental design requirements have been revised, in particular the changes will make it easier to convert an existing building into a single family home. The new standards are still asking for a high quality design but are more realistic to achieve. Any requirements that fall outside the control of planning and may be picked up by other regulations, including building regulations, have either been omitted or moved into the best practice guidance where appropriate.</p> |
| 4 | Crystal Lodge Holiday Apartments: | <p>Whilst the aims of these policies are laudable, there is no clear indication of how the council will police the planning to achieve quality conversions and stop HMOs. The Council's record in preventing HMOs is terrible and planning control has been non existent. How will this change?</p> | <p>Robust enforcement action is important to prevent further unlawful change of use to HMO. Following surveys of the Inner Resort areas, the Council now has comprehensive information on existing uses which will be used to closely monitor any unlawful change of use or development.</p> | N/A |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|-----|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 5 | Keighley House: | Keighley House has been our home and business for the past 27 years, and my parents before that. During that time we have spent far more on the property than it is actually worth, and as a result I feel that we are being backed into a corner. If when the time came we would like to turn our business into a private home, the requirements would be far beyond the expense that we could afford, and it would be more beneficial to continue living there and just pay the business rates. Alternatively, it would be cheaper to just trade when the season is at its most profitable and remain empty for the rest of the year. The specifications required to turn back to a house are fine for a property that is in need of repair but not for good properties that have been looked after. | Owners who cease trading as a guest house and continue to live in the property, require planning permission to do so since a material change of use has taken place. The Council accept that the conversion of former guest house business properties may require owners to incur expense to meet the standards set out in the SPD. That is a matter of individual viability for owners to address. The Council would have no objection to guest house owners who maintain their properties to a high standard to trade seasonally. | Previous versions of the document proposed easier design standards for existing hotel owners, making it simpler for those who wanted to de-register their business and continue to live there as a family home. However, legal advice has confirmed that policy requirements should be written for a general audience to avoid the risk of challenge and therefore this latest document does not include separate requirements for existing hotel owners - who have to meet the same requirements as everyone else wanting to convert a property into a single dwelling. Having said that the changes introduced in the document will make the requirements for conversion into a single dwelling easier. |
| 6 | Alan Greenghalgh: | There is a requirement that waste bins are screened from view but in practice how can this be enforced by the Council? On numerous roads where properties have been converted from holiday use to flats, rows of properties have many bins in the front garden. The southern end of Warbreck Drive is a good example of this. | The document requires bin storage areas to be screened from view at the side or rear of the property where possible. Applicants will need to demonstrate on a plan where the designated storage is. Any infringement from the design solution agreed as part of individual planning applications will be investigated where appropriate. | N/A |
| 7.1 | Chris Penderleith – Leith Planning | The guidance on relevant floor space and amenity standards to be achieved in residential conversions and sub-divisions has been drafted to update the currently “saved” Local Plan Policies HN5, HN6 and RR9 and in accordance | Noted. | The introductory text in the policy background section now clearly identifies relevant saved Local Plan Policies as well as relevant emerging Core Strategy Policies. |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|-----|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>with the future replacement policies in the Blackpool Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council need to clearly define which policies in the Core Strategy are referable. There is also the concern that these standards are premature in advance of the debate concerning the soundness of the Core Strategy.</p> | | |
| 7.2 | Leith Planning | <p>It is considered that the SPD imposes different and more onerous standards than those encapsulated in the Local Plan Policies. By way of example Policy HN6 refers to Housing Mix which provides a sliding scale in relation to the provision of one bedroom units whereas the SPD provides an either or approach. In short the SPD is not 'consistent' with the policies it is intended to supplement; there is an inherent conflict that should be addressed by means of a DPD.</p> | <p>SPDs must be consistent with higher level planning policies and cannot go beyond the requirements set out in these policies. Having revisited the proposed housing mix requirement we did find that it went beyond the requirements of Local Plan Policy HN6 by proposing to alter the mix of one bedroom/studio dwellings and introducing a limit on two bedroom units. This has been amended.</p> | <p>The housing mix requirements have been amended and are now consistent with Policy HN6. Should they be reviewed through the Core Strategy, the final SPD will be reviewed accordingly.</p> |
| 7.3 | Leith Planning | <p>Page 1.1 of the SPD states:</p> <p>“Blackpool has a substantial number of older properties, many of them former guest houses, where there is potential demand for conversion and sub-division. The Council recognises that the conversion of redundant premises including floor space above shops and former guest houses provide an important source of additional housing.”</p> <p>We would support this assertion.</p> | Noted | N/A |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|-----|---------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 7.4 | Leith Planning | <p>Page 1.1 continues that:</p> <p><i>“Conversion, refurbishment and sub-division of existing buildings can be a sustainable and economic way of providing new dwellings. It reduces the emissions and waste associated with demolition and the embodied energy associated with new-build.”</i></p> <p>It is noted that the Council accept that refurbishment and sub-division is a sustainable and economic way of providing new dwellings and that it reduces emissions and waste associated with demolition.</p> <p>We would support this assertion.</p> | Noted | N/A |
| 7.5 | Leith Planning | <p>The document goes on to say:</p> <p><i>“Poorly designed conversions can result in dwellings of inadequate size and quality leading to their inhabitants being exposed to a number of potential problems such as overcrowding, lack of amenity space, noise and inconvenient or unsafe access.”</i></p> <p>It is unclear how this situation has arisen given the substance of Policy HN5 and SPG10 which establish the criterion for conversions; presumably the poorly designed conversions are unauthorised. The Council should support development incorporating a mix of accommodation (including 1 and 2 bedroom units).</p> | <p>The statement referred to is based on the most up to date evidence available to the Council, including work undertaken for the Core Strategy and in preparing Neighbourhood Plans for Foxhall, North Beach and South Beach.</p> <p>The housing mix requirements set out in Policy HN6 limit the amount of one bedroom accommodation. There is an opportunity for the Core Strategy to review this housing mix, which may result in this SPD being reviewed in the future in order to be consistent with future policies.</p> | |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|-----|---------------------|--|---|---|
| 7.6 | Leith Planning | Whether or not there is an over-supply of small dwellings is a matter that should be debated in the context of the Core Strategy and requires interpretation of an up-to-date survey. It would appear that the Council's approach to Housing Mix has changed from that encapsulated in Policy HN6 - this would appear to represent a misuse of the SPD process. | Please refer to 7.2 above | Please refer to 7.2 above |
| 7.7 | Leith Planning | DS1: Can I convert or Subdivide my Property for Permanent Residential Use? We are concerned that there is an inherent conflict between the design/amenity requirements encapsulated in the saved policies (HN5, HN6 and RR9) of the Local Plan and those in the SPD; furthermore the SPD would appear to pre-empt the debate in the Core Strategy. | Policy DS1 was consistent with Saved Policies HN5, HN6 and RR9. There is no intention to pre-empt the Core Strategy. | Following a re-structure of the document, most of DS1 has been moved into Part 1: Introduction which explains the policy background (including HN5, HN6 and RR9). |
| 7.8 | Leith Planning | DS3: Can I sub-divide my Property? Clearly not all smaller dwellings are of a 'low standard'; what is important is that the renovation of properties incorporates a mix of accommodation. Policy HN6 is concerned with Housing Mix and as such it is presumed that the above problems have been caused by unauthorised development. There remains the concern that the Council are changing policy 'by the back door'; put another way that the SPD incorporates changes to policy without proper independent scrutiny in accordance with the statutory procedures and as such should not be set out in an SPD. | Other than the housing mix requirement (already covered in 7.2 above) Policy DS3 was consistent with Saved Policies HN5, HN6 and RR9. | The housing mix requirements have been amended and are now consistent with Policy HN6. |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|-----|---------------------|---|--|---|
| 7.9 | Leith Planning | <p>DS8: External Space Standards Bearing in mind that we are dealing with an established urban area where amenity space is at a premium Policy PO1 and BH3 are sensible and sound. If the Council's intention is to change Policy PO1 and BH3 it should be done so in a DPD not an SPD.</p> <p>Clarification is sought from the Council in relation to their policy approach for parking, amenity space and cycle storage and how this will be applied to large Victorian properties (which are characteristic within the inner resort neighbourhoods) where the existing properties have very small gardens and little or no gardens to the front and on road parking restrictions. The Council have not distinguished between those standards which would apply to new development and those applied to the conversion of existing buildings which are subject to more constraints. This is a fundamental flaw within the SPD particularly where refurbishment is deemed to be sustainable.</p> | <p>Amenity Space Policy PO1: Planning Obligations is concerned with the provision of community facilities, including public open space. Policy BH3 is concerned with residential amenity and is therefore more pertinent.</p> <p>Policy BH3 recognises that provision of an adequate sized private amenity space is essential to creating a high quality residential environment. For houses this would be expected to take the form of a rear or side garden; in flat developments private amenity space can take the form of a shared courtyard/garden or, in appropriate locations, private balconies or roof terraces. It states that exceptions may be made for high quality flat developments in highly accessible locations which would have wider regeneration benefits and where the site characteristics preclude the provision of private amenity space.</p> <p>Policies HN5 and RR9 also support the provision of adequate private amenity space, including the need to remove existing extensions.</p> <p>SPDs must be consistent with higher level planning policies and cannot go beyond the requirements</p> | <p>There is now an emphasis on maximising all opportunities to provide outdoor amenity space, including the removal of extensions and outbuildings and provision of roof terraces and balconies in accordance with Policies BH3, HN5 and RR9. Minimum standards relating to ground floor external amenity area and balconies / roof terrace areas have been moved to best practice guidance.</p> <p>The parking requirements have been re-written to help reduce on-street parking pressures and to encourage off-street parking where appropriate, whilst balancing the need for outdoor amenity space.</p> <p>All outdoor space provided must be in addition to parking, cycle or waste storage provision, although there is now a recognition that a balance must be made. More guidance is now provided on the storage of cycles and waste, including opportunities for communal storage and within the building.</p> <p>The document now distinguishes between standards that apply in all cases (i.e. houses and flats) and standards that only apply to flat developments. None of the standards apply to new build and it is intended to produce a separate SPD for design guidance on new build.</p> |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|-----|---------------------|--------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| | | | <p>set out in these policies. Having revisited the proposed amenity standards whilst they do not go beyond the requirements of Policy BH3, it is considered more flexibility is required as it may not be possible to create meaningful amenity areas in all cases, particularly in the inner areas. In which case, applicants will be expected to compensate for this with a higher quality internal layout.</p> <p>Car Parking: On reflection, the parking standards proposed were not consistent with those in the Local Plan, which are maximum standards. These aren't particularly useful for this document and in view of existing problems with on-street parking, off-street parking should be encouraged more, providing it is appropriate and represents a net-gain over existing on-street provision. A balance must be made between the provision of amenity space and off-street parking.</p> <p>Cycle Parking: The provision of bin and cycle storage is particularly challenging in the typical terraced layout of inner resort streets. It is accepted that cycle parking as set out in the draft document presents design challenges</p> | |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|------|---------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| 7.10 | Leith Planning | <p>The starting point in the evaluation of a Supplementary Planning Document is section 17 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Planning Act 2008). The following sub-sections in Part 2 Local Development is noted:</p> <p>(3) the local planning authority's local development documents must (taken as a whole) set out the authority's policies (however expressed) relating to the development and use of land in their area.</p> <p>(5) if to any extent a policy set out in a local development document conflicts with any other statement or information in the document the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy. For the avoidance of doubt it is considered that the SPD conflicts with the adopted plan as detailed above.</p> <p>(7) regulations under this section may prescribe...(b) the form and content of the local development documents.</p> | Please refer to 7.2 above | Please refer to 7.2 above |
| 7.14 | Leith Planning | <p>Supplementary Planning Documents are dealt with in section 6 of PPS 12 and paragraph 6.1 states:</p> <p>"the planning authority may prepare supplementary planning documents to provide greater detail on the policy in its DPD's. SPD's should not be prepared with the aim of avoiding the need for the examination of policy which should be examined.</p> | <p>This SPD supports and expands on the following key local plan and LDF policies by providing guidance on the Council's design, space and amenity standards for residential conversions and sub-divisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ HN5, HN6, RR9 (saved Local Plan policies) ▪ R20, G1, G4 (draft Core Strategy policies) | N/A |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|-----|---------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>As explained in this submission the SPD goes further than providing detail on policy encapsulated in the Adopted Plan and does not explain which policies in the Core Strategy it is supposed to embellish. In short the SPD changes policy while avoiding the need for the examination of policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.4 deals with the preparation of supplementary guidance by other bodies and reads:</p> <p>“District/borough/city council's should not produce planning guidance other than SPD where the guidance is intended to be used in decision-making or the coordination of development. This could be construed as wishing to circumvent the provision for consultation and sustainability appraisal which SPD's have....</p> | <p>Following the revision to housing mix, it does not introduce new policies which would otherwise need to be examined.</p> | |
| | | <p>There is a concern that the New Homes from Old Places Draft Supplementary Planning Document does not fit comfortably with the sustainability appraisal associated with the Core Strategy. The overly prescriptive approach is in itself 'unsustainable' because it frustrates regeneration and re-use of existing properties in favour of wholesale redevelopment which is simply not viable.</p> | <p>The sustainability appraisal for the Core Strategy Preferred Option supports the Council's ambition to promote high quality single family homes, require residential proposals to comply with the Council's new housing standards and reducing the over-concentration of poor quality rented stock in inner areas. T</p> <p>The degree of prescription is considered essential and appropriate to raise standards.</p> | <p>The separate Sustainability Appraisal produced for this SPD has been updated to reflect the revised draft.</p> |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Revised Draft SPD |
|------|---------------------|---|----------|-----------------------------|
| 7.15 | Leith Planning“ | <p>Paragraph 2.43 of the old PPS 12 has been revoked however it is worth quoting because it sets out the principles which applied to supplementary planning documents, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it must be consistent with national and regional planning policies as well as the policies set out in the development plan document contained in the Local Development Framework • it must be clearly cross-referenced to the relevant development plan document policy which it supplements • it must be reviewed on a regular basis; • the process by which it has been prepared must be clear and the statement of conformity with the statement of community involvement be published with it <p>The fact that SPD's rely on DPD documents for the sustainability appraisal and statements of community involvement mean that they are genuinely 'supplementary' in that they should simply expand on policy or provide further details of policy in a Development Plan Document.</p> | Noted. | N/A |
| 7.17 | Leith Planning | <p>Asked to be notified of developments with the evolving Local Development Framework in due course and when further public consultation takes place.</p> | Noted | N/A |

Internal Comments

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Final SPD |
|-----|---------------------|--|---|--|
| 8 | Internal Comment | DS3 does not clearly explain what design requirements will apply to conversions to single dwelling below 156m2 | Noted | The revised draft now separates the requirements to be met in all cases (i.e. creation of single dwelling or flats) and the requirements for flat developments only. |
| 9.1 | Built Heritage Team | The use of materials appropriate to the age of the building is encouraged in order to raise the quality of the final product to the highest standard | Noted | This is referenced in the text |
| 9.2 | Built Heritage Team | All signage, awnings, shutters and canopies must be removed if they are not part of the material fabric of the original building unless they are important architectural or heritage features | Noted | This is referenced in the text |
| 9.3 | Built Heritage Team | Original shop fronts are increasingly rare in Blackpool and should be preserved wherever possible to enable its former use to be legible to future generations. When converting a former retail premises, if the design of the frontage is original, it should as far as possible be incorporated in any new design for its future use. Signage, shutter boxes and fascias may be removed, but where features are an intrinsic part of early historic use (e.g. gold lettering on fanlights) they should be retained. Form should be respected, for example inset doorways and architectural features such as pilasters and stall risers should be incorporated wherever possible. | Shopfronts will vary in terms of quality. The retention of a good quality traditional shopfront may be appropriate in some contexts and therefore it will be important for each proposal to be considered on its own merit. | The revised draft now specifies that when converting former retail premises the removal of shopfronts will be considered on a case by case basis. |

| Ref | Name / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response | Change to Final SPD |
|------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 10.3 | David Simper Transport | Cycles may be stored vertically using readily available hooks or racks. | Noted | The option for vertical hanging storage or lockers is now referenced in the background text. |
| 10.4 | David Simper Transport | When requiring adequate storage space for waste, suggest specifying 3 bins per dwelling. | Currently waste recycling storage requirements differ within Blackpool reflecting collection practices. In many inner neighbourhoods waste sacks are still used. It is not appropriate to specify an appropriate number, | N/A |