

Application Number:	23/00523/HOUS
Location:	42 Gainsborough Drive Rochdale OL11 2QT
Proposal:	Erection of boundary fence and sliding gate together with a dropped kerb
Applicant:	Elzbieta Drabikowska
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

42 Gainsborough Drive is a two-storey semi-detached residence in the Balderstone and Kirkholt ward of Rochdale. The property hosts high hedges as well as metal railed fences to the front and side boundaries and is sited next to a vacant patch of land to the east. The house adjoins to 44 Gainsborough Drive and sits adjacent to 13 Gainsborough Drive. The estate to which the house is sited within is characterized by approx. 1m high steel rail fences, vacant parcels of land on many corner plots and architecturally similar properties.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a 2m high fence and electric sliding gate to the front boundary spanning approx. 5m in width. The fence is to be constructed in timber, composite or aluminum panels with metal posts and frames. Permission is also sought for a dropped kerb adjacent to the dwelling as well as the addition of permeable paving to form a driveway to the front of the dwelling.

It is noted the works to form the driveway has already been carried out in full. However, as the driveway has been constructed from permeable paving, this does not require planning permission therefore is not assessed in this application.

Relevant History

20/00382/HOUS Two Storey Side Extension
Granted May 2020

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The main highway consideration in regards to this application is the impact on visibility the proposed fence and gate would have for both drivers and pedestrians.

From the submitted plans it would appear that the proposed gate is set back from the footway and would therefore not impact on the existing available visibility. It would also appear that the proposed electric gate opens internally which would be a standard requirement.

Having considered the gate and fence proposals and having considered the amount of traffic and pedestrians using Gainsborough Drive itself Highways would say that the fence and gate are acceptable.

The proposed access crossing would require a separate approval from the Council as Highway Authority which must be in place prior to the development being brought into use.

The current servicing arrangements for the dwelling would remain unchanged.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity on the wider highway network.

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

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No letters of representation were received regarding the proposed works.

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

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning

decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, in addition to being sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting and maintaining a strong sense of place.

In principle, to erect a fence with a greater height than those found locally to the front boundary could be acceptable pending an appropriate standard of design and scale for this location. Where the estate features cohesive architectural features which gives distinct character to the area as a whole, to erect a 2m high fence and gate in an estate where fences to the front boundary do not exceed 1m in height is deemed inappropriate in this location. Further to this, the dwellings within the estate feature a relatively open frontage by virtue of moderately low boundary treatments. Whilst some dwellings do host high hedges to the front and side boundaries, as is the case as no.42, the dwellings would maintain the 1m fence therefore the proposal cannot be justified in this light.

By virtue of its overall design, scale and positioning, the overall design of the fence is considered to appear incongruous in this location. Where the primary design of fences in this location is 1m black railed fences, the application proposes a 2m fence and electric sliding metal gate with wooden panels. Whilst it is noted wooden panelled fences are found locally, these are accompanied by fixed concrete posts whereas this application proposes metal frames and a sliding gate. It is also noted a sliding gate could be acceptable subject to a reconsideration of the overall scale and design.

To drop the kerb adjacent to the dwelling in order to formalise the existing driveway is considered to be an acceptable addition in design terms and is not considered to compromise the visual amenity of the dwelling or streetscene given dropped kerbs are a common feature of many dwellings along this estate.

In view of the above assessment, the proposed fence and sliding gate is considered to be an unacceptable addition in this location by virtue of its design and siting. The fence and gate would pose as an incongruous and out-of-character addition and is not considered to be sympathetic to the established local character.

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

The plans indicate the provision for 2+ parking spaces facilitated by the driveway sufficient space on the existing creation of hardstanding permeable paving therefore in exceedance of Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards requirement of two spaces per dwelling for dwellings outside the town centre.

In line with comments received from the highways officer, the fence and gate are not considered to impact on the visibility for both drivers and pedestrians by virtue of it being sited back of the footway.

The proposed parking arrangements are therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design, scale and siting, the proposed fence and sliding gate to the front boundary is considered to form an incongruous addition to the plot and would appear at odds with the established local character of the immediate and wider estate. The works fail to visually respect the existing scale and design of existing boundary treatments found locally and as such, would fail to 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.

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	24.08.2023	Signed: CP
Authorisation	26.09.2023	Signed: TH

Notes for Applicant:-

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

- TP2.1 Location Plan
- TP 2.3 Site Plan – Proposed
- TP5.1 Elevations – Existing and Proposed

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo