

Application Number:	23/00532/HOUS
Location:	300 Middleton Road, Heywood, OL10 2LG
Proposal:	Formation of tarmac driveway, erection of two sets of 1.8m high gates with railings atop the existing boundary wall, application of white render to all elevations at ground floor level, timber cladding to all elevations at first floor level, replacement of existing roof coverings with black tiles and alterations to existing fenestration on front side and rear elevations (part retrospective)
Applicant:	Mr Gavin Lynskey
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
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. 300 Middleton Road, a two-storey, detached dwelling fronting the A6046 and located within land designated as Green Belt. The dwelling, which dates to the 1930s, is located approximately 200m south of the Heywood Interchange and lies at the end of a run of detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying building ages and styles. The dwelling faces the highway to the east and is adjacent to no. 298 Middleton Road to the north with agricultural fields located to the south and west. The curtilage of the application property is enclosed by privet hedging and foliage reaching approximately 2m in height with a low level boundary wall to the front.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective permission is sought for the application of white render to all elevations at ground floor level, the use of horizontally laid timber cladding to all elevations at first floor level, the replacement of the existing rosemary clay roof tiles with black roof tiles and several alterations to the existing fenestration across the front, side and rear elevations. The submitted plans also include the erection of two

sets of 1.8m high timber vehicular access gates along the front boundary, the addition of metal railings atop the existing front boundary wall and the formation of a tarmac driveway with an area of approximately 76m².

Relevant History

13/01042/HOUS Construction of decking within rear garden and formation of balcony to first floor rear elevation - retrospective Grant

Township/Member comments

N/A

Consultee responses

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

Summary of comments:

The current 75sq.m. Impermeable driveway that was recently installed by the Applicant does not constitute sustainable drainage and does not meet planning regulations.

To meet planning guidance, the driveway would need a strip of at least 1m wide at the lower, house edge to be removed and re-done in permeable materials, including open graded sub-base.

Highways And Engineering

Having reviewed the submitted plans it would appear that the proposed dwelling has adequate parking provision in line with Council standards.

The application site is on Middleton Road which is a classified Road therefore vehicles must be able to enter and leave the site in forward gear which means there should be adequate internal turning area for a standard sized family vehicle. The application has two vehicular access points therefore it has adequate internal facilities. We have some concerns regarding the height of the gates and adjoining boundary however and its impact of driver visibility, however taking into account the existing access points and the low level of footway use an objection on this basis may not be sustainable.

The servicing arrangements for the dwelling would remain unchanged.

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

Highways raise no objection to this application, subject to the requested planning condition.

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No representations were received in response to the proposed development.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/2 Green Belt

EM/7 Development and Flood Risk

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
G8	Managing water resources and flood risk
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

Principle of Development - Green Belt: G4

No extra volume has been created as the proposals relate to materials, the formation of hardstanding and the erection of gates. As such, it is considered that the proposal does not conflict with the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it nor does it result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

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 that development is “*sympathetic to local character.*” Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states, “*development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.*”

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.*”

The host dwelling is sited on a prominent end plot and is readily visible from the surrounding public vantage points on the highway, particularly along its south-facing gable elevation. This creates a heightened sense of exposure within the sightlines of Middleton Road, which is a busy thoroughfare.

The immediate locality is characterised by a mixed street scene of modestly-sized detached and semi-detached dwellings. Whilst there is some variation in building style, the use of similar walling and roofing materials on the vast majority of dwellings creates a balance and sense of symmetry, contributing positively to the character and appearance of the street scene.

The proposals would see the introduction of render at ground floor level and timber cladding at first floor level. The existing hanging clay tiles, which extend from the head of the first floor windows to the apex on the front and south-facing side elevations, would remain in situ. The proposed use of three contrasting walling materials would combine to create a visually obtrusive and discordant feature within the street scene. This consideration would be compounded by the loss of the existing rosemary clay roof tiles, which are a notable characteristic throughout the street scene. The replacement of the existing roof tiles with black tiles would correlate poorly with the design values of the host dwelling and street scene and, when read in conjunction with the other external alterations, would result in undue harm to the character of the host dwelling and the appearance of the street scene.

Whilst the proposed 1.8m high vehicular access gates would not necessarily be in-keeping with the surrounding low-level front boundary treatments and lightweight gates, it is not considered that the proposed gates would result in undue visual harm given the substantial width of the front boundary and the height of the adjacent boundary hedging. Moreover, it is considered that the colour of the gates is acceptable and would help to mitigate any potential visual harm.

In respect of the proposed railings atop the existing boundary wall, it is again recognised that these would not be in keeping with the low level boundary treatment that is seen not only to the host property but along the surrounding street scene. Nonetheless, it is recognised that historically (as seen on historic google street view images) there was a mature boundary hedge behind the wall, which reduced the openness of the site. Mature hedges are also seen elsewhere within the street scene. It is noted that the mature hedge has been removed from the site, however it has been replaced by new planting and as this matures it will soften the appearance of the proposed railings. As such, while the railings are a new feature to the street scene, it is not considered that they would be unduly harmful to the visual appearance of the property and this element of the application is considered to be acceptable.

For the avoidance of doubt, no concerns are had with the proposed alterations to the existing fenestration.

Ultimately, the proposal would represent an incongruous and poor design solution that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

As such the proposal would fail to meet the requirements for high quality design contained within policies DM1 and P3. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within the SPD and the aspirations for high quality design as advanced in the NPPF.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Given the nature of the proposals, it is not anticipated that the proposed development would give rise to any undue loss of residential amenity for nearby properties. In addition, the proposals would not affect the current levels of amenity enjoyed by the occupants of the application property.

As such, 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.”*

The submitted site plan indicates that the proposed dwelling would have adequate parking provision in line with Council standards.

The application site is on Middleton Road which is a classified road. Therefore, vehicles must be able to enter and leave the site in forward gear which means there should be adequate internal turning area for a standard sized family vehicle. The proposed dwelling has two vehicular access points. Therefore, it would benefit from adequate internal turning facilities.

Whilst some concerns were raised regarding the impact of the height of the proposed gates and adjoining boundary treatment on driver visibility, given the existing access points and low level of footway use, a refusal on this basis would not be sustainable.

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

Flood Risk and Drainage

Saved policy EM/7 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy require development proposals to prevent an increased risk of flooding and to ensure the satisfactory disposal of surface water. This includes the incorporation of appropriate measures for the management of surface and flood water, including Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).

The application submitted seeks permission for a tarmac driveway with an area of approximately 76m². On this basis, the Council's Drainage Engineer was consulted.

The Officer has advised that the driveway, which has been installed using impermeable tarmac, would not constitute sustainable drainage. Moreover, the drainage solution proposed would involve discharging rainwater runoff into the public combined sewer. It is considered that this would lead to an increased risk of flooding.

The proposed driveway and drainage solution are therefore unacceptable and contrary to policy G8, saved policy EM/7 and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. The introduction of new materials to the external walls of host property and replacement of the roof tiles with a new material would result in a discordant appearance that would fail to complement either the host property or the surrounding street scene. This would result in harm to the visual amenity and character of the area and be contrary to 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. The proposed driveway and associated drainage system would not constitute sustainable drainage and would contribute to an increased risk of flooding by discharging rainwater runoff into the public combined sewer. As such, the proposal would not accord 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.

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. Drg no. 051ROC-100B
- Existing Site Plan. Drg no. 051ROC-101C
- Proposed Site Plan. Drg no. 051ROC-102D
- Existing Plans. Drg no. 051ROC-102
- Existing Elevations. Drg no. 051ROC-103
- Proposed Plans. Drg no. 051ROC-104
- Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 051ROC-106A
- Proposed Boundary Treatment. Drg no. 051ROC-107A

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	15/12/2023	Signed: BM
Authorisation	19/12/2023	Signed: RC

Report Author Bob Melling