

Consultation Statement: Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

June 2026

Introduction

1. The Council adopted the Residential Design Guide in June 2018. The Residential Design Guide SPD was subject to a partial statutory public consultation on minor matters between 23rd April 2025 – 11th June 2025. These minor changes were necessary to provide clarity on matters that have arisen in appeal decisions.
2. This statement details the consultation on this document and lists the responses received during the consultation.

Background to the changes in the SPD

3. The changes to the Residential Design Guide were:
 - to clarify that the 45 Degree Guideline is taken from the nearest window in an extension where a neighbouring property has been extended, rather than the original rear window;
 - to clarify that a Unilateral Undertaking is required where joint extensions are proposed that would breach the 45 Degree Guideline if constructed independently; and
 - to omit Appendix B on refuse and recycling storage requirements.
4. The changes to the 45 Degree Guideline will not alter the way in which the policy is implemented. Rather, they clarify how the policy has always been implemented.
5. The omission of Appendix B is necessary because the provisions in relation refuse and recycling storage requirements are out of date following the implementation of the new waste contract. There is a more up to date version of this document published on the Council's website that will be referred to instead.

Partial Public consultation on the SPD

6. The Council undertook partial consultation on Residential Design Guide for six weeks between 23rd April 2025 – 11th June 2025 as per the requirements set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

7. Notification of this consultation was sent to everyone who had signed up to the Council’s Local Plan email updates and individuals and organisations on the Local Plan consultation database. This included statutory consultees, residents and developers.
8. The documents were available online via links on the Council webpage. Paper copies were also available to view at Leamington Town Hall, Warwick District Council Offices at that time which were at Riverside House in Leamington, Brunswick Healthy Living Centre and the main libraries including Kenilworth, Leamington Spa, Warwick, Lillington and Whitnash.
9. The Council encouraged people to respond electronically using the consultation portal [Warwick District Council - Changes to Residential Design Guide SPD](#). Representations were also accepted via email and by letter.

Responses to the Residential Design Guide SPD

10. There were 18 responses received, of which 10 were categorised as supporting the proposals; 4 indicated that they had no comment to make; 1 provided further comments on the proposals; and 3 were categorised as objecting to the proposals.

Table 1: Summary of responses to Residential Design Guide SPD Consultation

Respondent Name (Organisation)	Part of SPD	Representation	Council Response
Paul Duncombe (Individual)	45 Degree Guideline	This appears to be a sensible and more easily understood and described requirement.	Support: Noted
Andrew Close (Individual)	45 Degree Guideline	This seems a sensible clarification.	Support: Noted
Cllr Sidney Syson (Councillor)	45 Degree Guideline	This seems a sensible proposal.	Support: Noted
Peter Southgate (Individual)	45 Degree Guideline	This is a recipe for over-development of sites plus greatly reduced residential amenity for anyone who has	Object: This is noted. However, the recent ombudsman case that resulted in this proposed

		<p>already extended. An existing extension establishes a reasonable scale and size of development. For example, a client recently completed an extension 4m deep and 5m wide. Drawing a 45 deg angle from the middle of that would allow one of their neighbours to erect an extension approx 8m deep, which is longer than their existing house! The extant guidance is simple to operate & interpret (I am an architect working on domestic work in WDC area) and to police for WDC officers.</p>	<p>change identified that the existing drafting of the policy is not simple to operate or interpret. Furthermore, the current drafting could be interpreted as being different from the way that the Council has always implemented the policy. To leave the policy unchanged would therefore result in a more restrictive approach to house extensions, at a time when national planning policy is taking an increasingly less restrictive approach.</p>
Bruno Eurich (Individual)	45 Degree Guideline	I support the refining of the policy wording on extensions, as directed by the local gov ombudsman.	Support: Noted
Warwick Town Council (Town / Parish Council)	45 Degree Guideline	Support the proposed changes in the Residential Design Guide supplementary Planning Document.	Support: Noted
The Coal Authority (Statutory Consultee)	45 Degree Guideline	No comment	No Comment: Noted
Kenilworth Town Council (Town / Parish Council)	45 Degree Guideline	Members NOTED the changes made to the Residential Design Guide	No Comment: Noted

		SPD and had nothing further to add.	
Historic England (Statutory Consultee)	45 Degree Guideline	No comment	No Comment: Noted
Baginton Parish Council (Town / Parish Council)	45 Degree Guideline	<p>We have concerns that 'consenting neighbours' who agree to JOINT EXTENSIONS (which may not fully meet the 45-degree rule) may create unacceptable situations when the properties are sold and is open to abuse from developers who purchase adjoining properties.</p> <p>We have concerns that the proposed changes to the NEIGHBOURING EXTENSION policy may again create conflict when properties are sold and is open to exploitation by developers.</p> <p>Baginton Parish Council OBJECTS to these proposed changes.</p>	Object: These concerns are noted. However, the proposed changes do not allow for any relaxation in the policy in practice. They merely provide clarity in the way that the policy has always been implemented in assessing planning applications. To leave the policy unchanged would therefore result in a more restrictive approach to house extensions, at a time when national planning policy is taking an increasingly less restrictive approach.
Paul Duncombe (Individual)	Appendix B – Refuse and recycling storage requirements	Good to remove the requirement to maintain a duplication of the requirements, so long as it is stressed that this is still a requirement and on any	Support: Noted

		website that there is a link between the main guide and this requirement.	
Andrew Close (Individual)	Appendix B – Refuse and recycling storage requirements	Since the altered refuse guidance and recycling sizes are, I’m assuming, already being used for development control purposes, it seems slightly unnecessary to alter the wording or numbering of other appendices. But perhaps simply regularises the issue.	Support: Noted
Cllr Sidney Syson (Councillor)	Appendix B – Refuse and recycling storage requirements	This should keep us up to date with the changing scenarios of refuse collecting, provided the guidance note is kept up to date. Will the requirements be those in force at the time the application is approved, or at the time the building is built? There could be a difference in the requirements.	Support: Noted
Bruno Eurich (Individual)	Appendix B – Refuse and recycling storage requirements	I support the updating of the waste policy to reflect the new arrangements.	Support: Noted
Warwick Town Council (Town / Parish Council)	Appendix B – Refuse and recycling storage requirements	Support the proposed changes in the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.	Support: Noted

Kenilworth Town Council (Town / Parish Council)	Appendix B – Refuse and recycling storage requirements	Members NOTED the changes made to the Residential Design Guide SPD and had nothing further to add.	No Comment: Noted
Baginton Parish Council (Town / Parish Council)	Appendix B – Refuse and recycling storage requirements	<p>We have concerns with REFUSE AND RECYCLING STORAGE becoming linked to Government requirements, when individual Councils have their own rules, refuse bins, licences and requirements etc. which need to be aligned with Local services, not Government regulations, to work effectively and maintain recycling and refuse collection success.</p> <p>Baginton Parish Council OBJECTS to these proposed changes.</p>	Object: These concerns are noted. However, the omission of appendix B is necessary in order to ensure that the Council's own updated requirements are now referenced going forward.
WCC Flood Risk Management	Appendix B – Refuse and recycling storage requirements	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above document.</p> <p>From having reviewed the document I can see that flooding/drainage is mentioned sporadically throughout the document. Given the increased interest in flooding since 2018 due to</p>	Comments: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

		<p>climate change and more frequent/violent thunderstorm, it may be worth considering whether flood risk and drainage is given its own dedicated section as a design requirement for residential development in Warwick District. If such a section is included, I have suggested some pointers below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All residential developments over 10 dwellings would be classed as a major development and any subsequent application would be subject to comment from Warwickshire County Council (WCC) as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).• A flood risk assessment (FRA) should be provided as part of any development proposed if any of the below criteria are met:<ul style="list-style-type: none">o in flood zone 2 or 3o within flood zone 3bo within Flood Zone 1and the flood map for planning shows it is at	
--	--	--	--

		<p>increased risk of flooding from rivers or sea during its lifetime</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o with Flood Zone 1 and the flood map for planning shows it is at risk of flooding from surface watero in areas with critical drainage problemso within Flood Zone 1 where the LPA's strategic flood risk assessment (SFRA) shows it will be at increased risk of flooding during its lifetimeo that increases the vulnerability classification and may be subject to sources of flooding other than rivers or sea<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All development proposals should ensure there is no increase in the rate of surface water runoff from the site as a result of development and should seek to reduce the rate of surface water runoff generated from the development to the equivalent Greenfield runoff rates.	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Above ground Sustainable Drainage Features (SuDS) should be incorporated on all new developments within Warwick District to a scale which is proportionate to the size of the development.• Surface water should be discharged from the site to a location in line with the drainage hierarchy with a preference given to infiltration based drainage wherever possible.• Applicants should ensure foul and surface water from new development and redevelopment are kept separate. <p>It is noted that page 20 includes a section regarding appropriate easements between all watercourses to allow access and maintenance. I am pleased to see this has been included however this could be expanded to state that any works that affect the flow of an ordinary watercourse or are carried out within the</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>channel profile, would be subject to Ordinary Watercourse Land Drainage Consent (OWLDC) from the LLFA. I have attached a link below to our OWLDC guidance as well as our Local Planning Guidance for Developers which includes further guidance on watercourse easements.</p> <p>Local Planning Guidance for Developers Land Drainage Consents</p>	
--	--	---	--