

CONSULTATION STATEMENT – Householder Local Development Order (LDO) (March 2017)

In connection with the preparation of the Householder Local Development Order, a Consultation Statement is provided to demonstrate with whom the Council consulted and how they engaged with local people and other interested parties during the preparation stages of the Householder Local Development Order and associated design guide. The statement contains the following information:

- i) a summary of the organisations with whom the Councils consulted;
- ii) how those organisations were consulted;
- iii) a summary of the issues raised; and
- iv) how those issues have been addressed in the LDO and design guide

An eight week consultation on the Householder Local Development Order took place between 6th March 2017 and 5th May 2017.

The following consultees were sent either a letter or email providing a link to the Council's website to view the proposed Householder Local Development Order and comments were invited on the draft proposal and associated design guide:

Statutory organisations and Prescribed bodies under Duty to Cooperate	40
Organisations/developers on Consultee database by email	Approx. 1000
Ward Councillors	72
Residential Properties within the Borough	Approx 130,000

In addition to being published on the Council's website, the following consultation was undertaken:

- Drop in sessions at six main borough libraries
- Proposals were promoted on the council's social media accounts including Twitter, an e-bulletin containing information about the consultation on the document was sent out by the Council's Communication and Public Affairs (CAPA) team which reaches 66000 people.
- Lead officers of Community Forums announced the LDO consultation and Planning officers attended meetings where requested.
- Planning officers, and regular planning agents consultation briefings.

Following the consultation 29 formal responses were received (0.02%). Of these 8 did not provide home addresses, 1 was from an elected member representing a constituent and 6 were from statutory bodies (Network Rail, Environment Agency, Natural England, Highways England, Historic England, theatres trust). Overall 7 of the comments were neutral, 2 fully supported the LDO and 20 raised concerns

Summary of Representations received, with Council Responses:

Please note: references to page numbers are with regard to the Householder Local Development Order Consultation Draft - March 2017

Respondent Organisation or Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response
<p>Frank Thornton 16 The Rise, Kingswinford,</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The planning system is already complicated and this will make it more confusing to householders 2. . Mention of the party wall act should be included in the document 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The LDO is a Government set tool which is available to Local Planning Authorities when considered appropriate. 2. Party Wall Act is included within the informative section of the design guide.
<p>Gary Yeomans (Local Resident)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will destroy local character 2. Will cause an increase in neighbour acrimony 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design guide would reflect local character by ensuring any extension is sympathetic with the existing property. 2. Applicants are advised to discuss any proposal with neighbours.
<p>Christopher Baker (Local Resident)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will destroy local character 2. Will cause an increase in neighbour acrimony 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design guide would reflect local character by ensuring any extension is sympathetic with the existing property. 2. Applicants are advised to discuss any proposal with neighbours.
<p>Mrs L Sheldon 46 The Broadway, Dudley</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will destroy local character 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design guide would reflect local character by ensuring any extension is sympathetic with the

Summary of Representations received, with Council Responses:

Please note: references to page numbers are with regard to the Householder Local Development Order Consultation Draft - March 2017

Respondent Organisation or Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Will cause an increase in neighbour acrimony 3. Will mean that extensions are built too close to neighbouring properties 	<p>existing property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Applicants are advised to discuss any proposal with neighbours. 3. Consideration has been given to extensions in close proximity to neighbouring properties through the design criteria and conditions
<p>Roy Banks Ettymore Close,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neighbours will not be consulted 2. Neighbours will not be able to object 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no requirement under LDO legislation for neighbour notification. 2. Applicants are advised to discuss any proposal with neighbours.
<p>Paul Guest 167 Standhills Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should allow low impact extension to be undertaken to allow planners more time to focus on larger schemes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dudley Council thanks the respondent for their interest and supporting response.

Summary of Representations received, with Council Responses:

Please note: references to page numbers are with regard to the Householder Local Development Order Consultation Draft - March 2017

Respondent Organisation or Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response
Ray Norris (Local Resident)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Light amenity and privacy will not be taken into account 2. Neighbours will feel more aggrieved 3. No two applications are the same and should be individually assessed 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consideration has been given to impact on neighbouring amenity through the design criteria and conditions. 2. Applicants are advised to discuss any proposal with neighbours. 3. The design criteria and conditions will ensure a consistent approach to house extensions proposed under the Local Development Order.
Daniel Casey 18 Joyberry Drive, Stourbridge DY8 2EF	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need more control over people extending not less 2. Two storey side and rear extensions are unacceptable 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Careful consideration was given to the type of extension to be included in the LDO, strict design criteria would applied and compliance with conditions. 2. Consideration has been given to impact on neighbouring amenity through the design criteria and conditions.
Mrs M Perks 44a Cider Ave, Amblecote	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is concerning that neighbours are not consulted and have no option to object. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no requirement under LDO legislation for neighbour notification. Applicants are advised to discuss any proposal with neighbours.

Summary of Representations received, with Council Responses:

Please note: references to page numbers are with regard to the Householder Local Development Order Consultation Draft - March 2017

Respondent Organisation or Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response
<p>Gloria Martin (Local Resident)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two storey extensions should be decided by the council to avoid neighbour disputes 2. People should be able to object 3. Two storey extensions can impinge on neighbours property and privacy 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consideration has been given to impact on neighbouring amenity, through the design criteria and conditions. Applicants are advised to discuss any proposal with neighbours 2. There is no requirement under LDO legislation for neighbour notification. Applicants are advised to discuss any proposal with neighbours. 3. Consideration has been given to impact on neighbouring amenity, through the design criteria and conditions.
<p>Alex Patrick Smith (Local Resident)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support making it easier for residents to extend 2. Need a strengthened design code to include materials so not to lose local character 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dudley Council thanks the respondent for their interest and supporting response. 2. Applicants are required to comply with conditions, which includes matching materials.
<p>Marlon & Frank Hyde (Local Resident)</p>	<p>Object</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dudley Council thanks the respondent for their interest.

Summary of Representations received, with Council Responses:

Please note: references to page numbers are with regard to the Householder Local Development Order Consultation Draft - March 2017

Respondent Organisation or Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response
Chris Nash 34 Worcester Lane, Stourbridge,	1. Already too many extension that are of poor quality and the LDO would lead to more.	1. The design guide would reflect local character by ensuring any extension is sympathetic with the existing property.
Diane Clarke (Network Rail)	1. General consultation comments e.g. need to agree all excavation within 10m of railway	1. Dudley Council thanks the respondent for their interest.
Tom Newman (Environment Agency)	1. Extensions in flood zones 2 or 3 should be no lower than existing levels of flood proofing.	1. Dudley Council thanks the respondent for their interest.
Sharon Pearson 7 Victoria Street, Wall Heath	<p>1. First floor extensions could block out light.</p> <p>2. There is no option to object</p> <p>3. .Nothing about party wall</p>	<p>1. Consideration has been given to impact on neighbouring amenity, through the design criteria and conditions.</p> <p>2. There is no requirement under LDO legislation for neighbour notification. Applicants are advised to discuss any proposal with neighbours.</p> <p>3. Party Wall Act is included within the informative section of the design guide.</p>
Mrs J Guest 48 Kingsway, Stourbridge	1. Enquired if a particular proposal would meet the criteria	1. Response provided.

Summary of Representations received, with Council Responses:

Please note: references to page numbers are with regard to the Householder Local Development Order Consultation Draft - March 2017

Respondent Organisation or Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response
Stephen Checketts (Local Resident)	1. Against	1. Dudley Council thanks the respondent for their interest.
Ross Szabo (Local Resident)	1. Thinks it will be extremely beneficial to residents and save the council time and money	1. Dudley Council thanks the respondent for their interest and supporting response.
Carl Wright Natural England	1. Does not consider the LDO to pose any likely risk or opportunity in relation to their statutory purpose so do not wish to comment	1. Dudley Council thanks the respondent for their interest and supporting response.
Paul Watson 77 Heath Street, Stourbridge,	1. Welcome the LDO 2. Areas of high historic townscape value should be excluded- as could have significant detrimental impacts of character of townscapes	1. Dudley Council thanks the respondent for their interest and supporting response. 2. Consideration was given to Listed Building and Conservation Areas which are excluded from the LDO.
Matthew Taylor Highways England,	1. Unlikely to have any impact	2. Dudley Council thanks the respondent for their interest and supporting response.
RTV and B Evans 18 Priory Close Dudley,	1. Strongly object as PD is already too weak and leads to poor quality homes that have a detrimental impact on Dudley	1. The design guide would reflect local character by ensuring any extension is sympathetic with the existing property.
Miss Y J Thomas 21a The Alley, Lower Gornal,	1. Understands that it is quicker and cheaper however has concerns	1. Dudley Council thanks the respondent for their interest.

Summary of Representations received, with Council Responses:

Please note: references to page numbers are with regard to the Householder Local Development Order Consultation Draft - March 2017

Respondent Organisation or Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Neighbours have no way of raising concerns 3. Extensions could affect privacy and block out light of neighbouring properties 4. Extensions may be of poor appearance 5. Guttering could overhang neighbouring properties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There is no requirement under LDO legislation for neighbour notification. Applicants are advised to discuss any proposal with neighbours. 3. Consideration has been given to impact on neighbouring amenity, through the design criteria and conditions. 4. The design guide would reflect local character by ensuring any extension is sympathetic with the existing property. 5. Any extension which would overhang the boundary would not comply with the conditions under the LDO.
<p>Planning Officer (Response from internal consultation briefing)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why are Mucklow Semi's unable to extend at ground floor? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There was never an intention to restrict the Mucklow house type from benefits from single storey extensions under the LDO. This was clear in the statement of reasons which was published to the web, but was not made clear

Summary of Representations received, with Council Responses:

Please note: references to page numbers are with regard to the Householder Local Development Order Consultation Draft - March 2017

Respondent Organisation or Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response
	<ol style="list-style-type: none">2. The document does not clarify if plans are required when also applying for Building Regulations and where development would affect a Public Sewer.3. The flow charts appear to be confusing.4. Definitions for NPPF, habitable rooms, and obscure glazing need to be added / expanded upon.5. Definition of habitable rooms windows and obscurely glazed windows is not clear throughout the whole document.	<p>in the draft design guide. A sentence was added to the design guide for clarification.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Paragraph added to advise applicants to check if proposals are affected by a Public Sewer, and where affected plans would be required.3. The decision was made to remove the flow charts altogether, and block plans inserted within the document to assist interpretation of design criteria.4. Definitions added and expanded upon for clarity.5. Despite being including in the original definitions list, where appearing in the document, further clarity provided.

Summary of Representations received, with Council Responses:

Please note: references to page numbers are with regard to the Householder Local Development Order Consultation Draft - March 2017

Respondent Organisation or Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response
Regular Planning Agents Response from Agent consultation briefing)	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Agents would be uncomfortable submitting applications without the submission of plans, can be plans be submitted? Should it be suggested to applicants, that this is strongly advised?2. Is there a right of appeal?3. Is there a time limit on the decision?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Decision made that the submission of plans would not be a necessity. As recommended by agents, a sentence added to strongly advise applicants to submit plans.2. Under the LDO legislation there is no right of appeal. A sentence added to the design guide to advise applicants.3. This was not originally proposed, upon consultation with the legal team, it was considered good practice to add an end date to any approval. 3 years selected as this aligns with current planning decisions.