

Application Number:	23/00342/HOUS
Location:	86 Queensway Rochdale OL11 1TJ
Proposal:	Engineering works to facilitate the formation of new driveway including retaining wall/boundary treatments and dropped kerb
Applicant:	Imran Ali
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	No
	Contrary to previous decision?	No
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	No

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	No
	Neighbour comments received?	No

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	No
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

86 Queensway is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in the Balderstone and Kirkholt ward of Rochdale. The dwelling itself is sited approx. 3.5m above ground level to which the front garden would be steeply sloped upwards (as are many houses sited along in immediate settings) with a set of access steps to the right of the site boundary. Queensway is considered to be a very busy classified road with designated parking bays outside the rows of houses.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for engineering works to the front garden (currently a flat, soiled slope) to facilitate a new 8.5m x 4.8m driveway. The soil is proposed to be removed and replaced with permeable paving, taking the gradient of the existing slope from 2.6m in height down to 0.5m. In addition, a 2.3m retaining wall is also to be added to the rear and side portion of the front garden. Further permission is sought to drop the kerb in front of the proposed driveway spanning 6m in length.

It is noted minor works have commenced on-site with the minor excavation of the existing grassed area as well as the arrangement of concrete paved slabs. A black timber fence has also been erected adjacent to the front elevation of the dwellinghouse which is not included on the plans however, is not intended to form part of this application.

Relevant History

None Applicable

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Highways have a number of concerns regarding this application the majority of which relate to road safety.

Queensway is a very busy classified road (A664) and a specific requirement of access from a private driveway onto a classified road is that vehicles must be able to enter and leave in forward gear, this requires adequate internal turning space for a family sized car. From the submitted plans it would appear that this property does not have adequate internal turning space which means that cars are likely to reverse in or out of the property onto the classified road which would be contrary to current requirements.

The location of the property enhances our concerns because there are existing dedicated on street parking bays outside the property. Vehicles lawfully parked in these bays would obstruct the visibility of drivers reversing in or out of the driveway and vehicles approaching the driveway would not be able to see these vehicles.

The construction of the driveway would require the lowering of the existing ground level and the construction of retaining walls. These walls are likely to obstruct visibility for pedestrians on the footway and vehicles emerging from the driveway increasing pedestrian/vehicle conflict and having a detrimental impact on road safety.

These difficult manoeuvres and poor visibility are also likely to have a detrimental impact on the safe operation of the classified road.

In conclusion, we cannot support this application as it does not meet current standards in terms of adequate internal turning facilities and if approved it would have a detrimental impact on road safety.

Drainage

A permeable pavement allows rainwater to drain through the gaps or pores in the paving and into the voids within the sub-base (approx. 30%) where water is temporarily stored until it gradually soaks into the sub-soil.

Permeable paving works well for soils with permeability better than 1×10^{-6} m/s but can also work for soil permeability's between 1×10^{-8} and 1×10^{-6} m/s. For a single property, permeability testing on site is not necessary, because voids within the permeable paving reduce nuisance rainfall runoff to other areas.

Permeable paving should not slope more than 5%.

[suggested drainage condition]

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours and a site notice was posted. No letters of representation were received.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

G8 Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk

P3 Improving Design of New Development

DM1 General Development Requirements

T2 Improving Accessibility

Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Policy P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires all new developments, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to a high standard of design. Policy DM1 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 requires "development to be of a high quality design taking the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area."

Located along a very busy and prominent classified highway, the front garden hosted by 86 Queensway currently features a steep sloped grassed patch of land used for the enjoyment of the current occupiers, as does the immediate surrounding dwellings. The steep grassed pitch is considered to be a product of the variation of ground levels in this vicinity with the dwellings themselves sited approx 3.5m above ground level. The steeped pitch is considered to form a vital landscaping feature to these row of dwellings therefore to remove the steep pitch to facilitate a driveway would significantly undermine surrounding land uses and be considered detrimental to the established character of the area.

It is acknowledged dwellings further down Queensway currently host driveways to the front of the dwellings however, this is considered to be a feature of the original build of the sites. The size of these driveways would be slightly larger (7m x 8.2m) than that proposed at no.86 and would host adequate internal manoeuvring arrangements.

It should be noted currently no dwellings located within this row of semi-detached dwellings along this portion of the Queensway highway have changed the use of the existing front garden to facilitate a driveway with each maintaining the grassed lawn.

The driveway itself, together with the addition of the retaining walls would appear visual dominant to the dwelling and appear at odds with the

surrounding landscape. The proposed works are considered an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and would not visually respect the dwelling in its current state nor those in immediate and adjacent settings.

The removal of the stone panels to the front of the garden along the footway is considered detrimental to the streetscene given these panels run the full length of this row of semi-detached dwellings and crucial for retaining the character of this area.

Principally, to change the use of the existing garden from garden space to a driveway could be acceptable however given the surrounding constraints, in respect of principal, it is not considered a driveway would be suitable in this location.

The dropped kerb is not considered to impact upon the character of the area and would be acceptable.

In light of the above assessment, the proposed works would pose a detrimental impact upon the established landscape within this row of semi-detached dwellings and would not visually respect the existing coherent aesthetic of steeply sloped front gardens within this vicinity.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Policy DM1 of the Council's Adopted Core Strategy (2016) sets out general development requirements for all proposals that take place across the borough. Point (e) states developments are expected to demonstrate that they *"Provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location"*. Furthermore, Appendix 5 sets out the Scheduled Parking Standards for the provision of car, cycle, motorcycle and disabled spaces in new developments and change of use proposals.

Further to this, Paragraph 111 of the NPPF relates to the impact to highways and is therefore relevant to which it states "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe"

Sited along Queensway, existing parking arrangements are sited to the front of the dwelling, facilitated by on-street designated parking bays outside the properties. Post-development, the dwelling would retain satisfactory parking arrangements to which Appendix 5 requires two spaces per dwelling for 2+ bed houses outside the town centre. The two spaces are to be facilitated on the new driveway.

In line with the comments received from the highways officer, this development has raised numerous concerns with the impact to road safety. The dwelling is situated along a very busy classified highway (A664) with heavy traffic conditions throughout the day. With reference to the highways requirement of vehicles being able to enter and leave in a forward gear,

including adequate internal turning space for a family sized car, the development would fall short. The 8.5m x 4.8m modest size would not leave sufficient space for internal manoeuvring to which cars are likely to reverse in and out of the driveway onto the Queensway highway therefore not meeting Council requirements and posing safety concerns for both other road users and the users of the driveway itself.

Given existing designated parking bays are sited along the road, when other road users are lawfully parked in these bays, it is considered these parked cars would pose reduced visibility when reversing out the driveway to which vehicles approaching the driveway would not be able to see therefore posing further road safety concerns.

Together with the obstructing of visibility and inadequate manoeuvring arrangements, the proposal would pose further concerns with the construction of the retaining walls which may increase pedestrian / vehicle conflict for pedestrians on the footway and vehicles emerging from the driveway.

In line with the above assessment and comments received by the highways officer, the development would pose significant detrimental impact to the operation of the Queensway classified highway and would therefore not be acceptable.

Drainage: G8

Policy G8 of the Rochdale Core Strategy states that “We will ensure that new development (including flood risk mitigation measures) does not lead to any form of increased flooding locally or further downstream, does not impede natural water and flood risk management, is not detrimental to existing or potential flood storage areas, contributes where possible to alleviating existing flood risk, is itself well protected from flood risk and ensures prudent use of water resources”.

Pending a full assessment of drainage specifications and details submitted to the Council, imposed by condition on an approved planning application, the proposed works could be acceptable following agreement from the drainage officer and providing the proposed slope of the driveway was decreased to a gradient of 5% in order to be effective in capturing rain runoff and alternative “MOT Type 1” gravel was installed as informed by the received drainage consultation comments.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design and siting, the proposed works are considered to pose a detrimental impact upon surrounding land uses and appear discordant to the established character of the area. The works would also appear visually harmful and not in keeping with the streetscene and a driveway is not considered appropriate in this setting. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework
2. By virtue of its siting and scale, the proposed engineering works to facilitate a driveway together with the addition of a retaining wall would pose an unacceptable impact to the safe operation of the very busy classified road as

well as pedestrian safety along the footpath. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with Policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

Article 35 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	Officer
Report Completed	24.05.2023	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	09.08.2023	Signed: TH

Notes for Applicant:

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

- LOCATION PLAN
- 1999/2 PROPOSED SITE PLAN, PLAN, FRONT ELEVATION AND SECTION A-A

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo