

Application Number:	22/01033/HOUS
Location:	157 Queensway, Rochdale, OL11 2LJ
Proposal:	Formation of driveway including dropped kerb
Applicant:	Mr Rizwan Hussain
Case Officer:	Aimee Bovaird
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?	Y

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

Location

The proposal relates to no.157 Queensway, a two storey semidetached dwelling that faces north onto the highway. The property is characterised by a front garden that has been resurfaced. The application is set back from the main highway by a pavement and existing dedicated on street parking bays. The footpath is protected by a pedestrian guardrail which extends up to the boundary of no.157 and leads to a pedestrian crossing circa 10m to the west.

Description of Proposal

This application seeks to create access to the dwelling from the highway (Queensway). This would require the removal of part of the boundary wall with gate to allow for car access and dropping of the kerb.

Relevant History

89/D24535 – Formation of new vehicular access to a classified road - Grant

Township/Member comments

Not Applicable

Consultee responses

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

Unless the Applicant provides some clear details of the Permeable Tarmac, including a cross-section of the materials including suitable sub-base, I am unable to complete this Drainage Consultation. Full details, as recommended by the Supplier of the Permeable Tarmac will need to be forwarded with this application.

It is noted that the Drainage officer has commented that there is insufficient plans to complete the consultation. 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>

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.

Unless the Applicant provides some clear details of the Permeable Tarmac, including a cross-section of the materials including suitable sub-base, I am unable to complete this Drainage Consultation. Full details, as recommended by the Supplier of the Permeable Tarmac will need to be forwarded with this application.

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 of its proximity to a pedestrian crossing, it is close a junction onto the classified road and 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. If you also consider the opposing vehicle movements as vehicles turn in or out of Dicken Green Lane there would be an increase in potential vehicle conflict in this location.

These difficult maneuvers and poor visibility is also likely to have a detrimental impact on the adjacent pedestrian crossing.

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.

Representations

Letters of representation were sent to neighbouring properties and one letter of objection has been received raising concerns over the pedestrian guard rail and stating that the applicant already has a dropped kerb and driveway to their property.

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
EM/7	Development and Flood Risk
EM/8	Protection of Surface Water and Ground Water

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
G8	Managing water resources and flood risk
T2	Improving Accessibility
DM1	General development requirements
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, G8, P3, EM/7 and EM/8

The design of the driveway would increase the width of the space in the low boundary wall from 2.4m to 4.6m to allow a car to fit through. This would result in a similar design to properties further along Queensway.

The Applicant has stated that permeable tarmac will be used to form the driveway, however no further details have been provided. The Lead Local Flood Authority has been consulted and requires details of the permeable tarmac, including a cross-section of the materials including suitable sub-base. Whilst this information has not been provided at application stage, it is something that can be requested via a suitably worded pre-commencement condition.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1, G8 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, saved policies EM/7 and EM/8 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the NPPF

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

It is noted that the formation of the new vehicular access including the hard standing and dropped kerb to the front would not cause any substantive harm to the neighbouring occupiers. The proposed formation of the driveway and dropped kerb would not affect the amenity of the streetscene.

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 proposed site is on Queensway Road, a busy classified road (A664) and sits opposite the junction of Dicken Green Lane and Queensway. The proposed dropped kerb is 10m from a pedestrian crossing which is lined by a pedestrian guard rail extending up to the boundary of no.157. There are also dedicated on street parking bays in front of the property.

The Council's Highway Officer has been consulted on the proposal and raised concerns relating to access and road safety. The Highway Officer confirmed that vehicles must be able to enter and leave in forward gear. In doing so, this requires an adequate internal turning space for a family sized car. However, none of the submitted plans display internal turning facilities which must be in place to allow appropriate access. Therefore, the Highway Officer considered that any additional vehicular access in this location would increase the potential for conflict between vehicles turning in and out of the existing junction. Vehicles lawfully parked in the parking bays situated outside the property would also restrict visibility and increased vehicle conflict with opposing vehicle movements as they turn in and out of the junction of Queensway with Dicken Green Lane.

This application is considered to be unacceptable in terms of safety and practicality. The proposed driveway and dropped kerb is therefore unacceptable and does not accord with policies T2 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refuse

- 1.) By virtue of inadequate internal turning facilities and proximity to a pedestrian crossing and junction onto the A664 Queensway, it is considered that the

proposed development would be a dangerous addition and would result in motorists reversing onto or off the classified highway. This would be detrimental to the safety of users of both the highway and the footway, and the risks would be exacerbated by the existing on street parking bays outside the property where visibility would be further restricted. The proposal is therefore considered to pose an unacceptable threat to the safety of both pedestrians and highway users, contrary to policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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.

INFORMATIVE:

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision related to the following plans:

Location Plan

Existing Elevation, Floor Plan and Site Plan – 1924/1

Proposed Site Plan, Elevations and Cross Section – 1924/2

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	23/11/22	Signed: ABovaird
Authorisation	23/11/22	Signed: SS

Report Author Aimee Bovaird