

Application Number:	22/01347/HOUS
Location:	10 Turf House, Pennine View, Shore Road Littleborough Rochdale OL15 8EP
Proposal:	Boundary treatment including installation of gate and new boundary wall and fence (2.0m) following demolition of existing boundary wall - Part Retrospective
Applicant:	Mr Ryan Heard
Case Officer:	Sam Yuen
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

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

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

Location

The application relates to no. 10 Turf House, also known as Pennine View, a two-storey detached dwelling located on Shore Road in Littleborough. The dwelling is adjacent to no. 8 Turf House to the south-east, adjacent to no. 2 Turf House Close to the north-west, and faces the highway to the south-west. The dwelling has undergone numerous prominent modern alterations, most notably the application of light grey render to the elevation walls.

Description of Proposal

Part-retrospective planning permission is sought for the installation of a front boundary treatment, measuring approx. 17.77m wide with a minimum height of 1.8m and a maximum height of 2m. It comprises of an approx. 1.3m-high boundary wall, an approx. 0.71m-high gate and fence following the demolition of the existing boundary wall. The boundary wall would be cladded in light grey slate tiles and the gate and fence would be constructed from dark grey composite boards.

Relevant History

N/A

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

Highways' main concern regarding this application is the potential impact on road safety that the proposed fence and gates would create.

The proposed boundary is 1800mm in height which would restrict visibility for both vehicles emerging from the driveway and pedestrians on the footway who would not be able to see vehicles emerging. Also as there is no internal turning facility within this property there is the additional danger that vehicles will be reversing in or out onto the highway further restricting driver visibility. Therefore the height of the wall will have a detrimental impact on road safety in this location on a busy road. It is for this reason that Highways cannot support this application.

Representations

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties. No comments 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:

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

N/A

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

- ❑ Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires new development to be *“visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping”* in addition to ensuring they are *“sympathetic to local character.”*
- ❑ Paragraph 134 seeks to encourage *“innovative designs which... help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.”*
- ❑ Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to be *“of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area”* and to *“enhance the borough’s identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general.”* In addition, section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be *“in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”*
- ❑ Properties along the building line of the host dwelling comprises of stone or brick-built front boundary walls with an average height of approx. 0.7m. Adjacent no. 2 is bounded by horizontal timber fences which also abuts the side curtilage boundary of the host property. Neighbouring boundary walls of greater heights typically relate to dwellings sited on a higher level to the highway as retaining structures. Based on available evidence, the application property previously comprised a brick-built boundary wall measuring approx. 1m high. Despite the diversity in the materiality of boundary treatments, the character of the street scene generally feels cohesive, with the former brick wall appearing one of the more obtrusive features visible.
- ❑ The proposal seeks to construct a 2m high boundary wall, gate and fence across the entire length of the front curtilage boundary. The resulting development would appear substantially larger in scale and height than the other boundary treatments to which it would be viewed in context with. Given its visual prominence from the highway, the proposed boundary treatment would constitute a wholly dominant and obtrusive form of development, to the detriment of the appearance of the street scene.

- ❑ Significant concerns are also had regarding the use of dark grey composite boards and render, which whilst contemporary in appearance and would only serve to complement the rendered host dwelling which itself is an unfortunately conspicuous feature, and would appear incongruous and unsympathetic to the materiality of the street scene.
- ❑ Taken as a whole, the proposed development would fail to be well-designed within the meaning established through National design guidance with particular respect to the requirement to respond positively to local character and would subsequently cause adverse visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.
- ❑ The design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

- ❑ Protection of residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which states development proposals should ensure they *“do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.”*
- ❑ Given the proposal relates only to the front curtilage boundary of the host dwelling, and the presence of existing high timber fencing around the adjacent properties, it is considered the proposed works would not result in significant overshadowing and overbearing harm to neighbouring occupiers.
- ❑ Considering the approx. 4.85m distance between the proposed boundary treatment and the front elevation of the host property, it is considered the proposed works would retain acceptable levels of outlook and natural light into the ground floor habitable room windows.
- ❑ 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 adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *“provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.”*
- ❑ Section 3.14 of the SPD also notes *“on busy roads it will normally be necessary for turning space to be provided within the site to allow cars to enter and leave in a forward gear.”*
- ❑ The proposed works would leave an intervening space from the host dwelling of approx. 4.85m from the north-western end of the gate and approx. 4.61m from the south-western end. Notwithstanding the limited resultant car parking space, the proposed parking arrangements would marginally comply with the minimum requirements set out in section 3.15 of the SPD and would be acceptable on balance.
- ❑ Significant concerns are had over the 2m height of the boundary treatment which would significantly restrict visibility for vehicles emerging from the

driveway and for pedestrians on the footway. Given the lack of internal turning facility within the host property, it is considered vehicles are likely to reverse in or out onto the highway, posing a threat to the highway safety for both pedestrians and drivers. For this reason, the proposed development would not be acceptable and would not be in accordance with policies T2 and DM1.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its siting, scale, design and materiality, the proposed boundary treatment constitute an unsympathetic and obtrusive form of development which would appear incongruous and cause undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, the proposed development would not be well-designed or result in a satisfactory standard of visual amenity and would be contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By virtue of its height and inadequate internal turning facilities, the proposed boundary treatment would significantly reduce visibility for users of the highway and the footway, and would result in vehicles reversing in or out onto the highway resulting in an unacceptable risk to pedestrian safety. The proposal is therefore considered to pose an unacceptable threat to highway safety, and would be contrary to policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Location Plan, Existing and Proposed Site Plans – Drawing No. JCBD-22-308 - 5. Rev00
- Existing and Proposed Front Elevation - Drawing No. JCBD-22-308 - 2. Rev00
- Proposed Front Elevation, Section View and Plan View - Drawing No. JCBD-22-308 - 1. Rev00

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	23/03/2023	Signed: SY
Authorisation	23/03/2023	Signed: RK

Report Author Sam Yuen