ROCHDALE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED

APPLICATION REFERENCE: 18/01199/FUL

Name and address for correspondence:	Applicant name:
Mr Garry Griffiths HNA Architects Ltd Hollinwood Business Centre Albert Street Hollinwood Oldham OL8 3QL	Mr Mark Sexton

Part I - Particulars of Application

Date of Application: 5 December 2018 Application No: 18/01199/FUL

Proposal:	**Demolition of existing dwelling and the erection of 8 detached dwellings with access road and associated parking**
Location:	**687 Bury Road, Rochdale, OL11 4AU**

Part II - Particulars of decision

The Rochdale Borough Council hereby give notice in pursuance of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that planning permission has been **REFUSED** for the carrying out of the development referred to in Part I hereof for the following reason(s).

Reasons:

1 The proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order, namely T8, T9, T10 and T13 adjacent to the west of the site entrance. The scale of proposed tree clearance is excessive and the proximity and layout of plots 6-8 would result in increased pressure for pruning and removal of the remaining protected trees by the future occupants. Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the impacts of the proposal on trees that could be affected by the development adjacent to the site including both within the River Roch Greenspace Corridor, which is a designated site of ecological and geological importance including the Meadowcroft Woods Grade A Site of Biological Importance, and within Tree Preservation Order TP0176 (Bunkers Hill). As such, the application both fails to comply with, and demonstrate accordance with, the requirements of Core Strategy policies P3, G6 and G7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 The proposed layout would result in separation distances of up to only 8.2m from the two storey rear elevations of plots 2-5 to the rear boundary shared with Nos. 60-64 Camberley Drive which result in undue overlooking and loss of privacy for the occupiers of these dwellings. In addition, a satisfactory standard of residential amenity would not be afforded to the future occupiers of plots 6-8 through overshadowing of the rear outdoor amenity space by the dwellings themselves and by the close presence of tree canopies to the first floor habitable room windows,

which would harm outlook and restrict light to the widows. Accordingly the application is contrary to Core Strategy policy DM1, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (2016) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3 The proposal, by virtue of the layout of the development, includes the loss of a large number of trees, including trees the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. This which constitutes poor design and would result in harm to the character of the landscape setting and the street scene of Bury Road. Furthermore, the design, scale and massing of the proposed dwellings fails to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of the area or achieve high quality design. The application is therefore contrary to policies P3, C3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4 Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate adequate servicing arrangements in respect of manoeuvrability for refuse collection vehicles within the site, or an alternative refuse collection strategy that conforms to the guidelines set in the Manual for Streets. As such it is not possible to conclude that the proposal fully meets with the requirements of Core Strategy policies T2 and DM1 and the requirements of the National Policy Framework.

5 The application is accompanied by insufficient information to demonstrate the potential impacts of the development on bats. The Council's ecological consultant lacks confidence in the findings of the submitted Phase I Habitat Survey and Daytime Bat Survey and as such it is not considered that an appropriate level of information has been provided to adequately assess the potential for the presence of bats or their roosts on site or the impact on foraging habitat. It cannot therefore be concluded that the requirements of Core Strategy policy G7 and the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of preventing or mitigating harm to a protected species or its habitat have been met.

Procedure Statement:

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

Date Decision Issued 8 March 2019



.....
Signed on behalf of the Council

IMPORTANT
PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE READ AND FULLY UNDERSTOOD THE CONTENTS OF THIS DECISION NOTICE. YOUR ATTENTION IS DRAWN TO THE ATTACHED NOTES.

INFORMATIVE:
The Local Planning Authority's reasons for its decision are set out in the accompanying officer's report.

INFORMATIVE:
For the avoidance of doubt, this decision notice relates to the following list of submitted plans / drawings:

- 1523/LP Location Plan
- 1253/001 Rev. C Proposed Site Layout - SK7
- 1253/002 Proposed Site Layout - Roof plan

- 1253/101 Rev B House Type A - Plot 1 & 7
- 1253/102 House Type B - Plots 2, 3 & 4
- 1253/103 House Type C - Plots 5 & 6
- 1253/104 House Type D - Plot 8
- Buildings to be Demolished (unreferenced) dated May 2018
- Topographical Survey (unreferenced) dated May 2018
- 5932.01 Landscape Proposal
- Tree Survey (unreferenced)
- UG_11933_ARB_TCP_01 Rev. P01 Tree Constraints Plan
- UG_11933_ARB_TRP_01 Rev. P01 Tree Removal Plan
- UG_11933_ARB_TPP_01 Rev. P01 Tree Protection Plan