

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
22/01251/FUL	Jake Powell	16/12/2022

Address: Land Adjacent 38 Durnford Street Middleton Rochdale M24 5UD

Proposal: Erection of single storey side extension to provide additional two bedroom ground floor living accommodation

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

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: LA

DATE: 04/01/23

SITE

The application relates to a vacant area of land to the eastern side of Mirfield Drive in close proximity to the junction with Durnford Street.

The site is located within a predominately residential area of the borough, in the defined urban area, and is situated within the Middleton Town Centre Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for the construction of a single storey extension to the adjacent property at 38 Durnford Street, to provide an additional two bedroom ground floor residential unit.

The residential unit would act as an entryway for both the new flat, and existing accommodation at 38 Durnford Street. Furthermore, the proposed extension would provide a residential unit which would include a kitchen/lounge area, two bedrooms and a bathroom.

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, contamination and land instability
SO5	Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport
T2	Improving accessibility
DM1	General development requirements
SD1	Delivering sustainable development

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
-------	--------------------

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

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

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

The site itself has no relevant planning history. However the adjacent site at 38 Durnford Street has recent history that is relevant to this application as outlined below:

21/01300/PRA56 Prior approval for change of use of former dental surgery to 4 self-contained flats. Withdrawn.

21/01563/FUL Change of use of dental surgery (Use Class E) to 4 no. one-bedroom flats (Use Class C3) including first floor rear extension. Grant subject to conditions

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Drainage and Flooding

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site should be drained in the most sustainable way. The drainage scheme for the development shall be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPG) hierarchy, in the following order of priority:

- ☐ into the ground (infiltration);
- ☐ to a surface water body;
- ☐ to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;
- ☐ to a combined sewer.

Before a surface water connection to the public sewer is deemed acceptable to United Utilities, they may request evidence that the drainage hierarchy has been fully investigated and why more sustainable options are not achievable. THUS, IT MAY BE NECESSARY FOR THE APPLICANT TO DEMONSTRATE THAT INFILTRATION FOR THIS SITE IS NOT FEASIBLE BY CARRYING OUT PERMEABILITY TESTS ON SITE - IN ACCORDANCE WITH BRE 365 GUIDANCE {issued by the Building Research Establishment}. This has become the standard methodology for soakaway design in the UK. Some details are also provided in Chapter 25 of the CIRIA SuDS manual 2015. You can email the Drainage Officer if you need a copy of the BRE Digest 365.

DRIVEWAY GUIDANCE

On the 1st October 2008 the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) in England was amended by the Government (Statutory Instrument 2008 No. 2362). One of the changes introduced by the GPDO amendment is the removal of permitted development rights for householders wishing to install hard surfacing in front gardens which exceeds 5sq. metres (i.e. 1m x 5 m) without making provision to ensure permeability.

The use of traditional materials, impermeable concrete or tarmac, now requires an application for planning permission. UK Government guidance on this is <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/pavingfrontgardens>

REDUCING RUNOFF FROM DRIVEWAYS - TO MEET PLANNING REGULATIONS

There are several ways to provide a permeable driveway:

- Using gravel or a mainly green, vegetated area.
- Using “grasscrete” or similar reinforced grass driveway
- Directing water from an impermeable surface to a rain garden, or grass, or soakaway.
- Using permeable block paving, permeable resin driveway, or porous asphalt – all use open graded gravel for sub-base.

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. Permeability testing on site is necessary; this should be carried out in accordance with BRE digest 365. This document may be available online, but can also be requested from the Drainage Officer (details below). An alternative method of sizing soakaways is provided in NHBC Standards 2021 - Soakaway.

SUGGESTED DRAINAGE CONDITIONS

Prior to the commencement of development, details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage schemes must include:

- (i) an investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This investigation may need to provide evidence of an assessment of ground conditions.
- (ii) details of a restricted rate of discharge of surface water agreed with the local planning authority (if it is agreed that infiltration is discounted by the investigations);
- (iii) details of levels of the proposed drainage systems including proposed ground and finished floor levels in AOD;
- (iv) a diagram showing foul and surface water draining on separate networks, at least to the final chamber, in accordance with Building Regulations Part H.
- (v) details of permeable paving, including a cross-section of the sub-base if this forms part of the sustainable drainage system.

Regarding item (i) above, the extent of the investigative work can be ascertained by the Applicant's discussion with UU's Developer Services.

Reason: 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.

United Utilities

Summary: Noting this is a Full application, we request that the applicant provides a detailed drainage plan, and that United Utilities has the opportunity to review and comment on this plan PRIOR TO DETERMINATION of this application.

Should planning permission be granted without the provision of this information we request the following condition is attached to any subsequent Decision Notice:

CONDITION

Prior to the commencement of development, details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage schemes must include:

- (i) An investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This investigation shall include evidence of an assessment of ground conditions and the potential for infiltration of surface water in accordance with BRE365;*
- (ii) A restricted rate of discharge of surface water agreed with the local planning authority (if it is agreed that infiltration is discounted by the investigations);*
- (iii) Levels of the proposed drainage systems including proposed ground and finished floor levels in AOD;*
- (iv) Incorporate mitigation measures to manage the risk of sewer surcharge where applicable; and*
- (v) Foul and surface water shall drain on separate systems.*

The approved schemes shall also be in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacement national standards.

Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the drainage schemes shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution.

Conservation

The application site forms the rear garden of 38 Durnford Street, a semi-detached house on the corner of Durnford Street and Mirfield Drive, within the Middleton Town Centre Conservation Area. The properties along Durnford Street including no 38, date from the late 19th century and early 20th century and retain some original features.

This part of Durnford Street is characterised by regular red brick terraces of properties, with a uniform building line dating from the turn of the 20th century. While there is some variation in house types and detailing, the overall composition of two storey red brick terraces is an attractive one, which contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Along Mirfield Drive there is a change in character, with properties dating from the post war period. The majority of properties are semi-detached although there are some terraced properties further along the road. Immediately to the north of the application site, there are two detached modern bungalows. These are set well back from the highway boundary, broadly in line with the flank elevation of 38 Durnford Street.

Planning permission was granted in February 2022 for the conversion and extension of the former Dental Surgery at no 38 to create four apartments. Works appear to be substantially complete on the site.

The current proposal seeks to construct a single storey two-bedroom unit, within the existing side garden of 38 Durnford Street. It would be connected to the house by a link to the new extension.

In accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Conservation Areas are designated heritage assets for the purposes of NPPF chapter 16 and Rochdale CS policy P2, which identifies Middleton Town Centre as one of the Borough's Outstanding Conservation Areas. Saved UDP policy BE/17 is also applicable, which deals with new development in Conservation Areas. This states that development proposals will be permitted provided that they preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. Matters for consideration include:

- The relationship of the proposal to existing buildings, the site and its surroundings
- Its design – including elevations, roof form, materials, finishes and detailing.

As noted above, the surrounding area is dominated by two storey properties. While there are bungalows immediately adjacent to the site, these are set well back from the road, reducing their prominence within the streetscene.

The proposed extension would take the form of a bungalow style property, and while it would be physically connected to the house by way of a link, it would read as a separate dwelling. It would extend up to the highway boundary with Mirfield Drive, increasing its prominence in public viewpoints. This positioning would be at odds with the general building line along Mirfield Drive, which sees the front of properties set back from the road boundary, creating a sense of spaciousness. This would not be the case with the proposed development, which would largely fill the plot and would project up to the highway boundary.

The single storey building would also appear poorly related when compared to the two storey 19th century terrace to which it would be so closely sited.

As a result of its siting, form and design, it would read as an incongruous and cramped addition, which would relate poorly to the host dwelling and the prevailing character of the surrounding area. It would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. It would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. This harm has not been adequately justified and there do not appear to be any public benefits to outweigh this harm.

The proposal would fail to comply with the aims of NPPF Chapter 16, Rochdale CS policy P2 and saved UDP policy BE/17. It would also fail to meet the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Considerable weight should be given to this harm in the planning balance.

Highways 27/10/2022

The proposed development would create additional on street parking demand in an area which already has on street parking issues so this would be our main consideration.

The conversion of the former dental surgery to apartments (21/01563) was considered appropriate at that time as the existing and proposed uses would be similar in terms of traffic generation and parking. Although the apartment is ancillary to the main building this application is new development which will bring extra parking and traffic generation and its this impact that must be considered.

From the Council's parking standards this application would require 1.25 off street parking spaces to be provided and this application does not provide any. As the parking demand is low and the site is very close to Middleton Town Centre with access to public transport and local amenities it may be that an objection on the lack of parking is not sustainable.

We do not envisage there would be any detrimental impact on servicing requirements as a result of development.

Although we do have concerns about parking provision we raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

Highways 23/11/2022

We have reviewed the amended plans submitted by the applicant and at this stage they would not change our previous stance on this application.

The size of the dwelling as shown on the amended plan would still only require 1.25 off street parking spaces to be provided. As the parking demand is low and the site is very close to Middleton Town Centre with access to public transport and local amenities it may be that an objection on the lack of parking is not sustainable.

We do not envisage there would be any detrimental impact on servicing requirements as a result of development.

Although we still have concerns about parking provision we raise no objection to this application and request no specific planning conditions.

REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised with neighbour notification letters, site notices and a press advert. 18 representations were received OBJECTING to the application, and their points can be summarised below:

- ☐ Proposed development too close to the boundary
- ☐ Endanger school children
- ☐ Invasion of privacy
- ☐ Removal of trees
- ☐ Impact on parking within the area.
- ☐ Not in-keeping with the area.
- ☐ Disruption caused by building works.
- ☐ Impact on the conservation area.
- ☐ Visual impact of the proposed development

The points raised in relation to the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and heritage assets, the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, the impact on highway safety and congestion, and the removal of trees are all valid planning concerns which will be discussed in the 'Analysis' section of this recommendation.

In relation to the point raised regarding the disruption caused by building works, the Council does have formal powers to control noise and nuisance under The Control of

Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other relevant legislation, and that any works undertaken which impact unreasonably upon the surrounding area may be subject to action by the Councils Environmental Health Department.

Three letters were received SUPPORTING the application, and their points can be summarised below:

- ☐ Good to see the existing building bought back into use.
- ☐ Will provide needed housing, especially within the current housing crisis.
- ☐ Will improve the look of the area.
- ☐ Does not believe there would be any issues related to parking.
- ☐ Impressed with the quality of finish
- ☐ Would have bike storage and convenient public transport.

The acting agent for the application has also provided a response to the received objections and letters of support as outlined below:

"In response to the objections you have received, as well as the letters of support, to the proposed application, we wish to address the comments relating to the car parking.

Firstly several of the objections relate to the 'assumed' use of this land as parking for the proposed 4no flats. This not only was never the intention, but also never formed part of the approved application, so where has this assumption come from? It was never discussed during the planning stage.

I would also point out that the use as flats and this additional extension would have a lesser requirement for parking than the previous use of the building. This is backed up by the officer's report for the approved application which stated:

'The site has most recently benefited from use as offices for a dentists, which during working hours, would have a higher parking requirement than the proposed residential units. It is considered that the proposed would therefore be unlikely to result in additional highways impact.

The Council's Highways Engineer has been consulted on the application and considers the site to be in a sustainable area in transport terms with good access to local amenities and public transport and residents may not be reliant on access to a private vehicle.

Accordingly it is considered that the omission of any formal parking arrangements would not adversely impact public and highway safety and the application would accord with the requirements of policy DM1 and T2 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework."

Having consulted the planning website on this current application, there are no further comments from the Highways Engineer. There is also reference made to the implementation of a parking permit scheme, which seems to be confusing that there is/will/will not be one!

In line with some of the comments the applicant is willing to invest in a secure cycle store, which could be included as a condition of the decision notice.

As regards other matters, there are several comments relating to the site being on a corner plot, when in fact this is not the corner. The corner plot is in front of the site and is an electrical substation.

There are also many letters of support for the application, one of which comments on the chronic lack of rental properties within the area for young families. The applicant has already invested over £200,000.00 in upgrading the property and has

considerably improved the tired and neglected building that was there and would look to continue the improvement of the site with this proposal.

In conclusion I would request that these comments be considered in the determination of this application.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The proposed application site is located within the Defined Urban Area as designated under the Proposals Map of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). New development, wherever possible and appropriate, should be concentrated within the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside.

Policy C1 of the Core Strategy outlines that the Council will promote the reuse and regeneration of vacant and underused previously developed sites, seeking to provide 80% of new housing on PDL.

The latest published information suggests that the Council can demonstrate more than a five year supply of housing land based on the Core Strategy target; however this does not preclude the promotion of sustainable development where this can assist in delivering additional housing to meet local needs.

The principle of redevelopment of the site for residential use would be compatible with the surrounding residential area. The site is very close to Middleton Town Centre. It is therefore considered that the site is well located in terms of access to jobs, shops and services by modes of transport other than the private car. The site is therefore in a sustainable location.

Furthermore, the proposal would make efficient use of land within the Defined Urban Area and would contribute to the supply of housing in a sustainable location within the borough. The principle of the development is therefore acceptable and in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy, saved policies within the Unitary Development Plan and the NPPF.

Visual Amenity and Impact on Heritage Assets

Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy states that the Council will protect the Borough's heritage by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory, including consideration of their wider settings. Saved UDP Policy BE/17 only permits development that preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (as amended) requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

Policy P3 of the adopted Core Strategy requires all new developments, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to high standards of design. Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy states that all development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they are of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area, in addition to requiring a number of other basic planning considerations.

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, which is largely reflected within

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy, which requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design.

The application site forms a vacant area of land adjacent to 38 Durnford Street, a semi-detached house on the corner of Durnford Street and Mirfield Drive, within the Middleton Town Centre Conservation Area. Planning permission was granted in February 2022 for the conversion and extension of the former Dental Surgery at no 38 to create four apartments. Works appear to be substantially complete on the site.

The properties along Durnford Street including no 38, date from the late 19th century and early 20th century and retain some original features. This part of Durnford Street is characterised by regular red brick terraces of properties, with a uniform building line dating from the turn of the 20th century. While there is some variation in house types and detailing, the overall composition of two storey red brick terraces is an attractive one, which contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Along Mirfield Drive there is a change in character, with properties dating from the post war period. The majority of properties are semi-detached although there are some terraced properties further along the road. Immediately to the north of the application site, there are two detached modern bungalows. These are set well back from the highway boundary, broadly in line with the flank elevation of 38 Durnford Street.

The application proposes the construction of a single storey two-bedroom unit, with an extension linking the proposed unit to the property at no. 38 Durnford Street.

Whilst house designs vary surrounding the site, the area is dominated by two-storey properties. It is noted that there are some bungalows adjacent to the application site, however these are set back from the road.

The proposed development attempts to mimic this bungalow style, however would not be set back from the road, and instead would extend to the highway boundary with Mirfield Drive. Due to its siting, the proposed development would appear unduly prominent within this streetscene. This concern is compounded, as the proposed extension would be at odds with the general building line along Mirfield Drive, where properties are set back from the road boundary.

Furthermore, whilst it is noted that there are some bungalows in the vicinity of the application site, the proposed single storey unit would be viewed in the context as an extension of the existing dwellinghouse at No. 38 Durnford Street. The juxtaposition of a single storey extension attached to the side of a two storey dwellinghouse to provide additional separate living accommodation ensures that the proposed development would not relate well to the site or surrounding area.

Therefore, by reason of its siting, form and design, the proposed development would read as an incongruous and cramped addition, which would relate poorly to the host dwelling and the prevailing character of the surrounding area, which would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Subsequently, the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. This harm has not been adequately justified and there do not appear to be any public benefits to outweigh this harm.

Overall, the proposed development would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the site and area, and would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Middleton Town Centre Conservation

Area, contrary to Policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential Amenity

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' which states that new developments "*should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.*"

Space Standards & Privacy

Section 4.1 of the SPD sets out minimum distance standards which all new residential developments should adhere to in order to ensure a satisfactory standard of amenity for surrounding, existing and future occupiers.

The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document '*Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development*' (2016) contains a number of guidelines and requirements for the design and layout of new housing in order to preserve the amenity standards for surrounding residents.

Due to the siting of the proposed windows at ground floor level away from neighbouring properties, Officers consider that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact on the privacy of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Similarly, due to the siting and scale of the proposed development, the proposal would also not result in a detrimental impact on the outlook or levels of light to neighbouring properties.

Occupier Amenity

The Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) is a technical standards document produced to ensure internal space within new dwellings is suitable for application across all tenures. Table 1 of this document sets out the minimum gross internal floor area requirements for dwellings, and setting out the requirements for dwellings which include a variety of room numbers, bed spaces and storeys.

Number of bedrooms (b)	Number of bed spaces (persons)	1 storey dwellings	Built-in storage
2	3p	61sqm	2.0sqm

In assessing this application, the table below sets out the GIA of each unit. It is noted that no details on the intended number of occupants have been submitted. However due to the sizing of the proposed units, it is likely that each would accommodate three individuals.

Unit	No. of occupiers	Gross Internal Area (M²)	Required GIA (M²)	Difference (M²)
Unit 1	3	68	61	7

The proposal would provide adequate floor space in line with the requirements of the Nationally Described Space Standards, and each of the provided two bedrooms be satisfactory in line with paragraphs 10B-10E of the NDSS. Whilst it is noted that no built in storage is provided, adequate additional space is available and Officers

therefore consider that the occupier amenity would be satisfactory. The proposal would provide adequate light and outlook for all habitable rooms.

Additionally, whilst it is also noted that the proposal neglects to provide a suitable outdoor space for the occupiers to enjoy, this would on balance be acceptable as the proposal would not accommodate families, and there are locations within the vicinity that could provide a similar function.

The proposed development would therefore comply the aims of policies DM1 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Paragraph 127 of 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 application has been reviewed by the Council's Highways Engineer who raised no objection to the proposed development. It was noted that from a Highways perspective the main issue arising from this application is parking provision.

In line with the Council's parking standards, the proposal would require 1.25 off street parking spaces to be provided, whilst the application proposes none. Whilst this is not ideal, the site is located within a sustainable location close to Middleton Town Centre, with good access to public transport and local amenities. Therefore, the lack of parking proposed would not warrant refusal alone.

Furthermore, the servicing arrangement on site in addition to the existing residential use of no. 38 Durnford Street would be satisfactory.

Therefore the proposed development would be considered acceptable in accordance with policies T2 and DM1 of the Adopted Core Strategy, along with the objectives of 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 and has provided guidance to the applicant in relation surface and foul water runoff as well as permeable paving.

It would be considered suitable, that a pre-commencement condition requiring the submission and written approval of a detailed drainage scheme prior to any development taking place in the event that permission is granted for the proposed development.

Trees

Policy G6 establishes that development should protect and improve green spaces and where trees are to be removed they should be replaced at a ratio of 2:1. Policy G7 of the Core Strategy requires developments to protect existing biodiversity including trees and vegetation. The NPPF also requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.

The application has not been supported by an arborocultural assessment, and no indication has been given that there were trees on site. However, originally on site a number of trees stood, which appear to have been removed. As these trees were sited within a conservation area, these were protected and their removal would have required planning permission. The removal of these trees was therefore unauthorised, and as such the applicant is liable to enforcement action.

Similarly, the application has not proposed any replacement trees in place of the removed ones, which made a positive impact to the streetscene and surrounding area.

The application is therefore in conflict with policies G6 and G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reason(s):

1. By reason of its siting, form and design, the proposed development would read as an incongruous and cramped addition, which would relate poorly to the host dwelling and prevailing character of the surrounding area, which would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Middleton Town Centre Conservation Area, resulting in less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset, that is not outweighed by public benefit. Therefore the proposal is in conflict with Policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. Protected trees within the Middleton Town Centre Conservation Area have been removed on site without planning permission. The removal of these trees was unauthorised. Similarly, the application has not proposed any replacement trees in place of the removed ones. Therefore the application is in conflict with Policies G6 and G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, as well as 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:

Site Location Plan

DS/PL/22/001C Rev C

Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations