

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
22/01365/FUL	Jake Powell	06/02/2023

Address: Ramsden Farm, Roundthorn Road, Middleton, M24 1FT

Proposal: Erection of 2 no. detached dwellings and detached garages including associated access and landscaping - Resubmission of 22/00275/FUL.

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	N/A

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	Y

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N
-----	--	---

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE
----------------	--------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: AT

DATE: 06.02.2023

SITE

The application relates to a wedge of open greenspace, located between Roundthorn Road and St. Dominics Way/Brookbank Close, Alkrington. The parcel of land was formerly occupied by a barn and cottage known collectively as Ramsden Farm, though these buildings have now been demolished and a number of trees which encircled them removed from the site. Four dwellinghouses and associated works have now been constructed on site.

The site falls within an area designated as a Greenspace Corridor on the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map, and forms a peripheral part of the wider corridor which runs between the southern bank of Wince Brook up to the built-up edge of Alkrington Garden Village. The site has previously been developed, to construct 4 detached dwellinghouses (16/01302/FUL). Access to the land is gained via a private road on Roundthorn Road to the southwest corner – between nos. 23 and 25.

The site boundaries are marked by a raised mound which forms an embankment to the southern edge (to the rear of houses on Roundthorn Road), a combination of vegetation and boundary fences to the western perimeter with dwellings on St Dominics Way/Brookbank Close, and a timber post and wire mesh fence atop a banking to the northern end. The site's eastern boundary is open to the Greenspace Corridor beyond, where ground level falls away in a north-easterly direction towards Wince Brook and Grimshaw Lane. The site itself follows a gradual, north-easterly slope, but without any pronounced change in levels.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for the erection of two detached, 5/6-bedroom dwellings on site. The houses would be situated perpendicular to the existing four dwellinghouses on site, with the front elevation facing towards the south-west, onto an extension of the existing access road which facilitates the constructed four dwellinghouses.

Each property would be two storeys in height (though with further accommodation in the roof space). Both properties would benefit from a detached single storey garage, although on opposing sides. The dwellings would be finished externally with facing brickwork (including a low plinth at the base), K-render in soft white, reconstituted stone heads and cills to window openings, anthracite colour interlocking roof tiles and black ash-effect UPVC windows, to match the appearance of the existing dwellings on site.

Access to the proposed dwellinghouses would be via an extension to the existing private access road.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – July 2021

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO2	Creating successful and healthy communities
C1	Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places
C3	Delivering the right type of housing
SO3	Improving design, image and quality of place

P2	Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
P3	Improving design of new development
SO4	Promoting a greener environment
G6	Enhancing green infrastructure
G7	Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity
G8	Managing water resources and flood risk
G9	Reducing the impact of pollution
SO5	Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport
T2	Improving accessibility
DM1	General development requirements

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
G/8	Greenspace Corridors <i>(To be read in conjunction with CS Policy G6 until replaced by Site Allocations or other DPD)</i>
RE/6	Recreational Rights of Way
EM/7	Development and Flood Risk <i>(To be read in conjunction with CS Policy G8 until replaced by Site Allocations or other DPD)</i>
EM/8	Protection of Surface and Ground Water <i>(To be read in conjunction with CS Policy G8 until replaced by Site Allocations or other DPD)</i>

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

02/D39920	Residential development – one dwelling with associated garaging. Granted Subject to Conditions
05/D44915	Renewal of planning permission D39920 for the erection of one dwelling with associated garaging. Granted Subject to Conditions
06/D48153	Rebuilding of former cottage and barn to form one dwelling, erection of one new dwelling and a new garage block with workshop over. Granted Subject to Conditions
07/D49452	Erection of one dwelling – amended proposal D48153. Granted Subject to Conditions
11/D54044	Erection of two detached houses and associated garages and workshops – Refused. Subsequent appeal (APP/P4225/A/11/2160323/NWF) allowed.
14/00127/FUL	Erection of two detached, five-bedroom dwellings including associated access road, landscaping and external works. Granted Subject to Conditions
16/01302/FUL	Proposed residential development of 4 detached houses with private access road Granted Subject to Conditions
20/01175/ANM	Non material amendment to planning permission 16/01302/FUL for alterations to house types on plots 1 and 2

by installing bi-fold doors to replace two window openings on rear elevations instead of approved orangeries. Granted Subject to Conditions.

22/00275/FUL

Erection of two, five bedroom detached houses. Withdrawn.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Environmental Health

The supplied PRA and recommendation for an intrusive is acceptable, suitable condition:

Site Investigation and Assessment

Prior to commencement of the development an investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced and shall have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The report of the findings must include:

- i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination
- ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:
 - human health,
 - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland, and service lines and pipes,
 - adjoining land,
 - groundwaters and surface waters,
 - ecological systems,
 - archeological sites and ancient monuments;
- iii) where unacceptable risks are identified, an appraisal of remedial options and proposal of the preferred option(s)

The development shall thereafter be completed in full accordance with the approved recommendations.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary

The only material change from the previous application is that the ecological report is becoming dated. Ecological issues however likely remain unchanged.

Validity of Ecological Report

The ecological report is now over 18 months old. Current guidance is that reports over 18 months old may require an update. However given the lack of habitats for species such as bats and great crested newts on or near the site it is very unlikely that they could have colonised the site. The only protected species that could be an issue would be badger that theoretically have colonised the site as clans are known to occur in the Irk Valley and its tributaries. Ie there is ecological connectivity between this site and known populations even if distant. I therefore recommend a condition along the following lines is applied to any permission.

Prior to commencement of earthworks a survey of the site and within 30m of the boundaries for badger setts will occur and the findings supplied to and agreed in writing by the LPA.

Nesting Birds

The development appears to result in the loss of scrub and scattered trees, potential bird nesting habitat. All British birds nests and eggs (with certain limited exceptions) are protected by Section 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended. I recommend a condition along the following lines be applied to any permission.

No works to trees or shrubs shall occur between the 1st March and 31st August in any year unless a detailed bird nest survey by a suitably experienced ecologist has been carried out immediately prior to clearance and written confirmation provided that no active bird nests are present which has been agreed in writing by the LPA.

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Section 174 of the NPPF 2021 states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. The development will result in the loss of a small area of low and moderate ecological value habitat, though the habitats were likely more extensive prior to adjacent development, which has resulted in the clearance of this land since 2019. There is also a loss of bird nesting habitat.

Habitat enhancement proposals are proposed in the form of wildflower grassland and native tree planting. I am satisfied assuming these areas were not already set aside for the adjacent development that they are more than adequate to mitigate and enhance for the habitat losses. Bird boxes are also proposed.

I have no issues with the proposed planting schedules. The details of which can be conditioned. The final location of the bird boxes can also be provided via condition.

The Coal Authority

The application site falls within the defined Development High Risk Area; therefore within the application site and surrounding area there are coal mining features and hazards which need to be considered in relation to the determination of this planning application.

More specifically, the site lies in an area where historic unrecorded coal mining activity is likely to have taken place at shallow depth. Voids and broken ground associated with such workings can pose a risk of ground instability and may give rise to the emission of mine gases.

In addition, the potential zone of influence of off-site recorded mine shaft 387405-008 encroaches across the access road to the new dwellings, although we note that it would appear that this road has already been constructed to facilitate recent residential development to the west of the dwellings currently proposed. The zone of influence of this feature does not extend to the site of the proposed dwellings.

The planning application is accompanied by Coal Mining Risk Assessment (22 July 2022, prepared by Worms Eye), which reviews of relevant sources of coal mining and geological information, along with the results of intrusive investigations carried out on land adjacent to the site.

The report considers that there are two coal seams present beneath the site at shallow depth. However, the report author is satisfied that sufficient cover is present above these seams to ensure surface stability. They also point out that the investigations carried out adjacent to the site found no evidence of these seams having been worked. On this basis, the report author concludes that there are no risks from shallow mining and no further action is required in this regard.

<u>The Coal Authority Recommendation to the LPA</u>

The Coal Authority considers that the content and conclusions of the Coal Mining Risk Assessment report are sufficient for the purposes of the planning system and meet the requirements of the NPPF in demonstrating that the application site is, or can be made, safe and stable for the proposed development. The Coal Authority therefore has **no objection** to the proposed development. However, further more detailed considerations of ground conditions and foundation design may be required as part of any subsequent building regulations application.

Mine Gas

It should be noted that wherever coal resources or coal mine features exist at shallow depth or at the surface, there is the potential for mine gases to exist. These risks should always be considered by the LPA. The Planning & Development Team at the Coal Authority, in its role of statutory consultee in the planning process, only comments on gas issues if our data indicates that gas emissions have been recorded on the site. However, the absence of such a comment should not be interpreted to imply that there are no gas risks present. Whether or not specific emissions have been noted by the Coal Authority, local planning authorities should seek their own technical advice on the gas hazards that may exist, and appropriate measures to be implemented, from technically competent personnel.

SuDS

Where SuDS are proposed as part of the development scheme consideration will need to be given to the implications of this in relation to the stability and public safety risks posed by coal mining legacy. The developer should seek their own advice from a technically competent person to ensure that a proper assessment has been made of the potential interaction between hydrology, the proposed drainage system and ground stability, including the implications this may have for any mine workings which may be present beneath the site.

United Utilities

Standard response regarding surface and waste water drainage.

Highways

This application is very similar to the previous application for this site (22/00275) and Highways raise no objections at that time.

The access road layout has been previously approved and would support access to this development, the access road will remain as a private access and will not be adopted.

We would not expect that the development would have any impact on road safety or highway capacity.

Servicing of the dwellings will take place from the private access road which is acceptable.

In conclusion Highways raise no objection to this application and request specific planning conditions.

Drainage

The Drainage Officer visited the site on 9th Aug 2022 to meet with the contractor and the site owner to discuss the issues raised by the Officer on earlier Drainage Consultations on the same application – regarding the roof drainage for the buildings and the permeability

construction of the private road. I observed that on the corner near the public Roundthorn road, the kerbing on the new access road is too low and once top-dressed will have almost no drop kerb to retain water within the road surface to allow percolation to occur. This is why permeability of the new road is critical to avoid flood nuisance to others.

The contractor for the adjacent 4no. housing development provided a bill of quantities that included some details of the permeable binder course. It was also explained that sand had been washing off the verge, which has not yet fully grassed over which explains why the pores in parts of the road appear blinded.

The Officer asked that the private road surface be jetted after the main excavation works of the last 2 houses were constructed and before the 'top dressing' permeable tarmac is laid. The site owner appeared to be in agreement with this request.

As Drainage Officer, I am now minded to believe that the road is permeable and has suitable subbase and I removed my objection to the Planning Officer providing Planning Conditions for this application.

Because of the current sand-blinded access road, it is necessary to find an agreeable method of ensuring that:- jet washing of the permeable tarmac on the private access road is undertaken by the Applicant before permeable tarmac top-dressing is carried out.

The use of the words "Prior to occupation..." in a Drainage Condition may not be appropriate; the adjacent 4no. houses have occupants and the tarmac top dressing has yet to be done, because construction traffic will continue to use the road surface. Therefore, I suggest that the Planning Officer discusses the matter with the Applicant, a practical method of ensuring that Item no.2 occurs and is not 'forgotten'.

Prior to the commencement of development, the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:-

Details of soakaway solution(s) for the roofs and driveway paved areas surrounding the two dwellings;

Details including cross-sections of any proposed permeable driveway areas;

Details of the foul connection to the existing adopted foul sewer.

Post construction of the dwellings and before the laying of the final permeable asphalt wearing course, the existing binder course shall be jetted clean to a reasonable standard. The Applicant shall advise the Drainage Officer in advance of the final tarmacking, so that the Officer can briefly inspect the works. The Applicant is recommended to keep a photo record of the construction of the soakaway(s).

Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution. To prevent an increased risk of flooding as a result of the development and to ensure satisfactory disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, saved Policy EM/7 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Drainage infrastructure will need to be implemented prior to commencement of above ground works and a scheme therefore needs to be agreed in advance of the same.

REPRESENTATIONS

The application was publicised by way of neighbour notification letters and a site notice. Three letters of representation were received OBJECTING to the application. Their objections are summarised below:

- ☐ The application threatens to take away a right of way.

- ❑ Result in the erosion of green space.
- ❑ Highway impacts for pedestrians and road users during construction.
- ❑ Inappropriate language used by construction workers on site.
- ❑ Disruption caused by construction work.

The points raised in relation to the loss of a right of way, the erosion of green space and the highway implications of the proposal are valid planning concerns which will be discussed in the analysis of this recommendation.

Whilst it is unfortunate that the proposed development may result in disruption during the construction period, if deemed appropriate a condition can be attached to the permission for a construction management plan to be submitted and approved to ensure this disruption is limited. Finally inappropriate language used by construction works on site is not a material planning consideration, and as such will not be discussed within this recommendation.

In addition four letters of representation were received SUPPORTING the application. These supporting letters made no further points.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development and Impact on Greenspace Corridor

A total of six applications for residential development on the site have been approved since 2002, including application 11/D54044 which was allowed at appeal following the Council's refusal of planning permission on the basis that: (1) residential development on a greenfield site was unacceptable as a matter of principle; and (2) that the development would cause an unacceptable narrowing of the Greenspace Corridor and its better landscape qualities.

Whilst part of the site was previously occupied by buildings associated with Ramsden Farm, these were demolished circa 2007 following repeated acts of vandalism, and no trace of them now remains. The National Planning Policy Framework clarifies that the definition of 'previously developed land' does not include 'land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscaping in the process of time'. The site must therefore be considered as previously undeveloped or 'Greenfield' land.

In addition to forming a Greenfield site, the land in question also falls within an area of Greenspace Corridor as defined on the Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map. UDP Policy G/8 states that the Greenspace Corridors shown on the proposals map will be protected, with developments only permitted where they will enhance the recreational, ecological or landscape and amenity value of the corridor. Criteria (e) and (f) of saved UDP policy G/8(A) state that development will not be permitted within the Greenspace Corridor where it would result in unacceptable harm to:

- (e) "the better landscape qualities and character of the corridor"; and
- (f) "the amenity value of the corridor where it provides welcome visual relief from urban development, including attractive views in and out of the corridor".

Further to this, Policy G6 of the Adopted Core Strategy above all, seeks to sustain and enhance a green network to support growth and regeneration in the borough, with specific reference to enhancing recreational links between urban areas and open countryside for purposes incidental to wildlife and local opportunities for recreation as well as improving visual amenity.

It is acknowledged that the site adjacent benefits from an extant permission relating to four dwellings, as well as two previous permissions and an Inspector's decision relating to the principle of the proposal and the impact on the better landscape qualities of the green corridor. The proposal contained within this application would extend approximately twice as far into the corridor compared to the appeal application.

This proposal would serve as an extension to the site which was the subject of 16/01302/FUL. Whilst it is noted that the proposed development would be seen as within a pocket of development with these existing dwellinghouses, Officers consider that the proposed would form an intrusive feature within the Green Space corridor, harming the character and overall visual amenity of the area due to its siting above the corridor, contrary to the aims of policy G/8 of the UDP and G6 of the adopted Core Strategy and therefore unacceptable in principle.

The impact of the additional properties would be compounded through the siting, size and design of the dwellings, which assert themselves on the landscape as insensitive and dominant features. The orientation facing away from the corridor, and perpendicular to the approved dwellings would present a vast, disconnected rear elevation, and the light coloured finish would contrast the qualities of the landscape, which in addition to boundary treatments, would present a poor standard of visual amenity.

The proposed development is therefore unacceptable in principle and would be in conflict with saved UDP policy G/8 and G6 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Visual Amenity

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

The application proposes two substantially sized, detached houses set in relatively spacious grounds towards the north-west corner of the site. The opening from Roundthorn Road and the proposed access road follow a sharp curve in a north-easterly direction. As a result of this orientation and the screening provided by existing surrounding properties, the proposed dwelling would not be readily visible from surrounding public vantage points. Instead, the site occupies a secluded location which is not read within the same context as the surrounding streets.

The proposed dwellings largely accord with the prevailing two-storey height of the surrounding properties, however, by virtue of their overall scale, are of a different character to the other detached dwellings in the locality. However, the houses would be viewed as individual buildings on a separate, somewhat isolated, parcel of land and the lack of correlation in design language with surrounding houses is not considered to represent an area of undue concern.

As the proposed development would be read in the same context as the existing dwellinghouses on site, and that the proposal would emulate the design of these dwellinghouses, Officers consider that in general the proposed house designs are acceptable.

The proposal is therefore in accordance with the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy policies P3 and DM1 as well as the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential Amenity

Neighbouring Occupiers

Core Strategy policy DM1 requires all development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenity of future residents and occupiers. Policy G9 requires that sensitive new developments such as housing are not adversely affected by existing sources of pollution, including noise, from certain types of industry. Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should result in places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The proposal exceeds the minimum separation distances between any neighbouring properties, as set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, and it is noted that they replicate the two storey height of surrounding buildings.

Occupier Amenity

The application proposes two substantial dwellinghouses, which would provide adequate floor space, private amenity space, and adequate levels of light and outlook to all habitable rooms.

Conclusion

It is therefore considered that the scheme would have no undue impact on the amenity of adjoining residents through loss of outlook, overshadowing, loss of daylight or loss of privacy and would provide a more than satisfactory standard of occupier amenity and therefore meets the requirements of CS policy DM1 and the NPPF.

Highways

Policy T2 of the Core Strategy sets out that development and infrastructure proposals are required to satisfy the Council's accessibility hierarchy and in all circumstances, the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live or have business in the area will have priority, while providing reliable journey times for those travelling through. Developments are required to provide parking in compliance with the Council's Maximum Car Parking Standards as set out in Appendix 5 of the CS.

The proposed dwellinghouses would be accessed via an extension to the existing private access road along Ramsden Farm. As this access is already in situ, there is an existing arrangement for servicing. Furthermore, the application proposes a sufficient level of parking in line to accommodate the newly proposed dwellinghouses.

Officers therefore consider that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on highway safety and congestion. In addition, the application has been reviewed by the Council's Highway's Engineer who raised no objection to the proposal.

The proposal would have an acceptable impact on highways safety and congestion, and the application would comply with Rochdale Core Strategy policies T2 and DM1, the Residential Development SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Ecology

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity, providing net gains where possible, and contributing to the Government's commitment to halt decline. Policy G6 of the adopted Core Strategy expects development proposals affecting green infrastructure to avoid the loss of existing features such as trees unless suitable alternative provision is made or they have limited value. Core Strategy policy G7 requires that no development should result in a net loss of biodiversity and geodiversity.

The application has been reviewed by the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit, who noted that the submitted Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey (Rachel Hacking Ecology, May 2021), is now outdated. Nevertheless, given the lack of habitats for species such as bats and great crested newts on site, it is unlikely these species have colonised the site. There is however potential for badger habitats to be situated on site. Therefore it is recommended that a condition for a survey for badgers to be carried out 30m away from the boundaries of the site. In the event of an approval, this condition would be attached.

In relation to nesting birds, it is acknowledged that the proposed development would result in the loss of scrub and scattered trees, which are potential bird nesting habitats. To ensure that the proposed development would not detrimentally impact these nesting habitats, another condition would be attached to the permission in the event of an approval to ensure that no works to trees and shrubs shall take place during the nesting period, unless a detailed bird nest survey by a suitably experienced ecologist has been carried out immediately prior to clearance and written confirmation provided that no active bird nests are present.

Finally, in relation to contributing and enhancing the natural environment, it is acknowledged that the development will result in the loss of a small area of low and moderate ecological value habitat. However, the application proposes habitat enhancements in the form of wildflower grassland, native tree planting and bird boxes. These mitigation enhancements are deemed acceptable. In order to ensure this, a condition would be attached to the permission in the event of an approval for planting to be carried out in accordance with the proposed planting schedule. Similarly the proposed bird boxes can be secured via a condition.

With these conditions in mind, the proposal would comply with adopted Rochdale Core Policies G6 and G7, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.

Drainage

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF 2018 states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Policy G8 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's strategy for managing water resources and flood risk more effectively in the interests of public safety, protecting property and infrastructure and the conservation of the natural environment.

The site does not lie within a Flood Zone or Critical Drainage Area. The Council's Drainage Engineer has been consulted, who raised no objection to the proposal, but requested a condition be attached to the permission in the event of an approval for

details of surface and foul water drainage, as well as to ensure that the proposed hardstanding and access is permeable.

With this condition in mind, the proposal would be in accordance with Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.

Contamination

Policy G9 requires that any risks arising from contaminated land are identified and that any appropriate actions are taken.

The application has been supported by a Preliminary Risk Assessment (Worms Eye, 2018) that concludes that taking into account the past use of the site it is likely that contamination will be present on site, exceeding residential thresholds. An intrusive investigation is therefore required, consisting of boreholes/trial holes and tests to confirm the presence/absence and extent of contamination on the site.

This supporting information has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer, who accepted the recommendation for this further investigation. This investigation will be ensured via a suitably worded condition in the event of approval of the permission.

With this condition in mind, Officers consider that the proposed would comply with Policy G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

Right of Way

As part of the previous application ref. 16/01302/FUL a replacement footpath was proposed by the applicant. The proposed development as part of this application will not alter or obstruct this existing footpath, and as such the Right of Way is retained.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed development would form an intrusive feature within the Green Space corridor, harming the character and overall visual amenity of the area due to its siting raised above the corridor. The impact of the additional properties would be compounded through the siting, size and design of the dwellings, which assert themselves on the landscape as insensitive and dominant features. The orientation facing away from the corridor, and perpendicular to the approved dwellings would present a vast, disconnected rear elevation, and the light coloured finish would contrast the qualities of the landscape, which in addition to boundary treatments, would present a poor standard of visual. The proposed development is therefore unacceptable in principle and would be in conflict with saved policy G/8 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, policy G6 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

Notes for Applicant:

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

Location Plan

6383_Site Plans

6383_D1A

6383_P5A

6383_P6A

Site Plans

Site Plan & Drainage

Plot 5: The Rowan (Detached Garage)

Plot 5: The Beechfield (Detached Garage)

Report Author Jake Powell