APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/01489/OUT

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
20/01489/OUT	Ryan Killeen	22 February 2021

Address: Site Of Kingdom Hall Of Jehovahs Witnesses, 8A Taylor Street, Heywood, OL10 1EF

Proposal: Outline application (including access, layout and scale) for the erection of 4 no dwellings following demolition of existing building - Resubmission of 20/00795/OUT

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/A

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

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: AT **DATE: 17.03.2021**

SITE

This application relates to 8A Taylor Street, a late C19, part single-storey, part two-storey detached building which occupies the corner plot between Fox Street and Taylor Street south of Heywood town centre. The property frontage on Taylor Street measures 30m by approximately 18m on Fox Street and is finished in white render. The property faces east towards Taylor Street, opposite Sandon House, a community centre at a distance of 18m. No. 60 Fox Street shares a building line with the north facing elevation of the applicant property, with the rear garden running parallel to, and extending approximately half way along the west facing elevation of no.8A, with the rear garden of no.16 Henry Hill Close in parallel alignment with the remainder of the west facing elevation. Immediately south of the applicant property exists a small cobbled area that appears to have provided historic access from Taylor Street to former uses to the west, with nos. 10-18, a row of mid C20 terraces sited approximately 8m south of the application property. Approximately 65m south, towards the opposite end of Taylor Street, lies St.Josephs RC Church, a Grade II listed church designed by Oswald Hill, listed due to its artistic, architectural and group values.

The building is currently vacant, but has been most recently used as a place of worship for the Kingdom Hall of Jehovas Witness which appears to have ceased approximately 6 years ago. The building was formerly used as public baths up to the mid 1970's.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks outline planning permission for access, layout and scale, with appearance reserved, for the erection of 4 no. three-bedroom dwellings comprising 2 pairs of semi-detached properties, one pair sited to the southern end of the plot fronting Taylor Street, with the other pair at the northern end of the plot fronting Fox Street. Access is to be from Taylor Street for the southern pair, and Fox street for the northern pair, with 7 off-street spaces provided across the scheme.

This application is a resubmission of 20/00795/OUT, which proposed a scheme with a single row of 7 no. terraced dwellings fronting Taylor Street.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – February 2019
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**
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**
EM/7	Development and Flood Risk
EM/8	Protection of Surface and Ground

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):
Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (June 2016)
Oldham and Rochdale Urban Design Guide

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

20/00795/OUT	Outline Application (including Access, Appearance, Layout and Scale) for the erection of 7 Dwellinghouses following the demolition of existing church building. Withdrawn – November 2020
77/D04795	Change of Use of former public baths to place of worship. Granted STC – June 1977

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

United Utilities

Summary: In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site should be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way. Standard conditions and standing advice have been provided.

Gtr Manchester Ecology Unit
No comments received to date

The Coal Authority

The Coal Authority concurs with the recommendations of the Desk Based Coal Mining Risk Assessment; that coal mining legacy potentially poses a risk to the proposed development and that investigations are required, along with possible remedial measures, in order to ensure the safety and stability of the proposed development.

As such, should planning permission be granted for the proposed development, we would recommend that the following conditions are included on the Decision Notice:

1. No development shall commence (excluding the demolition of existing structures) until;
   a) a scheme of intrusive investigations has been carried out on site to establish the risks posed to the development by past shallow coal mining activity; and
   b) any remediation works and/or mitigation measures to address land instability arising from coal mining legacy, as may be necessary, have been implemented on site in full in order to ensure that the site is made safe and stable for the development proposed.

   The intrusive site investigations and remedial works shall be carried out in accordance with authoritative UK guidance.

2. Prior to the occupation of the development, or it being taken into beneficial use, a signed statement or declaration prepared by a suitably competent person confirming that the site is, or has been made, safe and stable for the approved development shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. This document shall confirm the methods and findings of the intrusive site investigations and the completion of any remedial works and/or mitigation necessary to address the risks posed by past coal mining activity.

The Coal Authority therefore has no objection to the proposed development subject to the imposition of the above conditions. This is our recommendation for condition wording. Whilst we appreciate that you may wish to make some amendment to the choice of words, we would respectfully request that the specific parameters to be satisfied are not altered by any changes that may be made.

Highways And Engineering

We have no objections to the proposals.

The applicant provides adequate parking provision.

Very little traffic is generated by this proposal.

No changes are proposed to the highways layout.

I have no concerns regarding servicing or road safety.

Upon completion it will be necessary to renew the kerbline and footway fronting the development. This should be added as a condition to any planning consent offered.

Env Health - Noise/Odours
No comments received to date

Conservation Officer

8 Taylor Street started life as a small Methodist Chapel before being replaced by the public baths which were erected in the late 19th century and presented to Heywood in 1981. Most recently the building has been used as the Kingdom Hall for worship. Given the prominence of the building within the local community in terms of its historical and communal values the building is recognised as a non-designated heritage asset.

As such, the proposed demolition of this building would result in substantial harm being caused to the non-designated heritage asset (NPPF, paragraph 197). This harm must be sufficiently justified, mitigated and outweighed by public benefit to satisfy National Policy and unfortunately, this proposal fails to do this. Subsequently, this application is recommended for refusal.

Update 17/03/2021:

In follow up to the previous response the applicant has commissioned and submitted a Heritage Statement to explore the significance of the property. It is evident that the building, whilst altered, does have some historical interest being associated with a notable individual and providing a communal leisure facility. The report clearly presents how the property has been altered over recent years and demonstrates the degradation taking place within the property since it has fallen vacant.

The Heritage Statement offers the completion of a Level 3 Building Recording Survey, to be submitted to both the LPA and GMAAS along with confirmation that the date stone from the existing building will be retained and reused in any forthcoming scheme.
It is considered that justifications and mitigations offered are now sufficient to outweigh the harm caused through demolition of the non-designated heritage asset.

Subsequently, there are no longer any objections raised in response to this proposal.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

Summary: Drainage conditions similar to those suggested by United Utilities should be applied.

GM Fire Service

The above proposal should meet the requirements for Fire Service access.
The Fire Service requires vehicular access for a fire appliance to within 45m of **all** points within the dwellings.

The access road should be a minimum width of 4.5m and capable of carrying 12.5 tonnes. Additionally if the access road is more than 20m long a turning circle, hammerhead, or other turning point for fire appliances will be required. The maximum length of any cul-de-sac network should be 250m.

There should be a suitable fire hydrant within 165m of the furthest dwelling.

Public Protection – Contamination

Summary: Standard condition requiring the submission of a Preliminary Risk Assessment

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification have been sent to all surrounding properties, a site notice posted in the vicinity of the site and a press notice issued.

One letter of objection was received raising concern over the following matters:

- Impact on access
- Reduce car parking

Officer's response: Addressed in 'Highways' Section

- Noise
- Loss of privacy
- Restrict access to outdoor spaces
- Dust and asbestos

Officer's Response: Addressed in 'Amenity' section

- Financial cost of using drier as opposed to drying clothes outdoor
- Potential structural damages

Officer's Response: These are not material planning considerations to which the Local Planning Authority shall have no regard.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The site is considered to constitute Previously Developed Land (PDL) in accordance with the definition contained within annex 2 of the NPPF and is subsequently considered as 'Brownfield'. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes, additionally, CS policy C1 seeks to achieve a target of 80% of new housing on PDL.

Therefore on the basis that the proposal would make a valuable contribution to housing supply within the borough, whilst being in a sustainable location within good

proximity to local amenities and public transport facilities, it is considered that the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with adopted Rochdale Core Strategy polies C1, C3 and SD1, saved UDP policy G/D/1 and the NPPF.

Impacts on Heritage Assets and Visual Amenity

Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Further to this, Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 124 and 127 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.

The application site is considered as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset due to its communal and historic values and is formally recognised on the Council's list of Non-Designated Heritage Assets. The site is also sited approximately 65m north of the Grade II listed St Joseph's RC Church.

With regard to paragraph 197 of the NPPF, the proposal would cause substantial harm to the significance of the NDHA as the proposal would include the complete demolition of the building.

It has been agreed that in order to mitigate the harm, a building record survey is to be completed to Historic England's Level 3 criteria and submitted to the Greater Manchester Archaeologic Advisory Service for inclusion on the Historic Environment Record, to ensure the historic and communal qualities of the building are captured and recorded.

Regard has been given to paragraphs 193-196 of the NPPF and the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act where it is considered that the proposal will have a neutral impact on the character of the nearby Church. The proposed development is sited 55m north of the curtilage of the Grade II listed St Joseph's RC Church (the Church hereafter). The listing text of this property reads:

> *The Roman Catholic church of St Joseph and associated presbytery, Heywood, of 1913-16 by Henry Oswald Hill, with later additions, is listed at Grade II for the following principal reasons: * Artistic interest: the apsidal sanctuary dominates with an impressive scheme of mosaic designed by Eric Newton of Ludwig Oppenheimer Ltd, a specialist mosaic company, which demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of the use of mosaic in the designs, and high degree of craftsmanship and use of high-quality materials*

*in their construction; * Architectural interest: as an urban Catholic church designed in a Romanesque style representative of the interest in early Christian architecture in the late C19 and early C20 and particularly successful in the harmonious use of internal space; * Architect: Henry Oswald Hill was a promising architect with a clear interest in contemporary church-building trends, as shown by his Byzantine design for the listed St John the Baptist, Rochdale, who was tragically killed in action in the First World War * Group value: the presbytery has functional group value with the church and both were designed by Hill, who achieved a visual unity through the use of the same materials while choosing a more domestic Queen Anne style for the presbytery.*

The Church attributes much of its significance to internal artistic features in addition to its external architecture. The property is best viewed from Mary Street to the west, which leads directly to the front entrance, and is possible to experience the main architectural features. The property is certainly appreciated from Taylor Street to the North of the church, where it is possible to experience the full side profile of the Church, in addition to the later added northern transept. However, due to the siting of buildings on the eastern side of Taylor Street, such views are only possible up to the southern end of the application site.

Additionally, the proposed dwellings would occupy a similar siting to the existing structure and would be of a reduced massing, it is therefore not considered to interfere with views of the listed building, and the applicant building does not contribute to the historic significance of the Church. The view is therefore taken that the proposal would amount to neutral harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset.

Further to this, the Conservation Officer has stated that the harm to the NDHA would be suitably mitigated through the aforementioned condition for a building record survey, and raises no objection with regards to the impact to the setting of the Church.

Layout and Scale and Crime Impact

As the application is outline only, with appearance a reserved matter, it is not appropriate to comment on detailed design matters at this stage. The application seeks consent for the access, layout and scale of two blocks of 2no. semi-detached dwellings of two-storey height, completed with a dual-pitched roof.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with the application site abutting the site of a recently completed scheme of 65 residential properties under approved planning permission 16/00053/FUL.

The proposed layout would accord with the existing urban grain, with the dwellings being of a similar footprint and proportions to surrounding dwellings, with similar sized gardens, and parking provisions. The two storey built form would accord with the surrounding built form.

The proposed layout is also considered to broadly respect building lines on Fox Street and Taylor Street, but would fail to include an adequate defensible space or buffer to the front of each dwelling in an attempt to maximise the quantum of built form at the site, and as such, would appear at odds with the adjacent dwellings on Fox Street and Taylor Street which both include a landscaped buffer between the public footpath and front elevations. Consequently the scheme is considered to be of an inadequate standard of design.

Further concerns are raised with regards to the proposed parking arrangements; the car parking arrangements for plot 2 would result in up to two vehicles being visible parked end-to-end when approaching the junction of Fox Street and Taylor Street from the east. The failure to provide a satisfactory buffer would prevent any harm being mitigated through a successful planting scheme to obscure any parked vehicles.

Further poor design features arise in the form of the awkwardly stepped front elevation of plot 4. Although this would be of limited harm to the character and appearance of the street scene on its own, it is considered to compound the visual harm already identified.

The application is supported by a Crime Impact Assessment, which notes the typical crime risks to a development of this nature as access by unauthorised persons, burglary, damage to property, Anti-Social Behaviour and theft during the construction phase. This document sets out counter-measures to design-out potential crime, with layout considerations to promote natural surveillance in addition to engineered solutions comprising a 2.0m high boundary treatment and security rated fenestration finishes.

The proposed measures are considered to be appropriate, and reasonable for the development, and would not present opportunity for crime above what would be typical for a residential dwelling.

Overall, whilst a building record survey is considered to mitigate the substantial harm caused to the Non-Designated Heritage Asset, the proposed layout is considered to be of an unsatisfactory standard of design and would result in an undue impact to the character and appearance to the street scene. As such, the proposals would fail to accord with policies P1 and P3 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity

Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy requires that proposals do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. Also, impacts including noise, air, dust, light and odour pollution are required to be mitigated where necessary.

The “Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development” SPD contains a number of guidance parameters for the design and layout of new housing in order to preserve the amenity standards for surrounding residents.

Space Standards

Section 4.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development 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 SPD requires:

i. 21m between directly facing principal windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level AND 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage;
ii. 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room
iii. 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room

All plots are provided with a 'substandard' rear garden with plots 1 & 2 approximately 8m in length and plots 3 & 4 9m, falling short of the 10.5m distance between first floor habitable room windows and directly facing boundaries as required by the SPD.

As such, the introduction of four habitable room windows at first-floor level with substandard spacing is considered to result in an undue loss of privacy to the occupants of no.16 Henry Hill Close.

Although shorter rear gardens are present in the adjacent row of terraces to the south, considerate design in the adjacent housing development has mitigated any potential harm through siting the front gardens and parking areas immediately to the rear of these properties.

Plots 1 & 2 would include rear facing first floor habitable room windows at a distance of 8m to the direct facing rear boundary which would allow unacceptable views into the most intensively used part of the rear curtilage of plot 3 and ultimately fail to provide an adequate standard of privacy for its future occupants.

Plot 2 would fall 3m short of the 14m requirement between the first floor rear facing habitable room windows and the direct facing two-storey gable-end of plot 3, with only 11m of separation. The detrimental impacts of this relationship are exacerbated through the siting of plot 3 directly south of the rear garden and rear facing windows of plot 2.

It is noted that section 4.3 of the SPD states that exceptions to these standards may be acceptable in some circumstances, such as where the character and density of the surrounding urban grain would be preserved through reduced distances.

With respect to this, it is appreciated that the rear gardens of the adjacent row of terraces to the south of the application site fall well short of the described standards, however this is considered to be an isolated instance and would not be typical of the prevailing urban grain, particularly so in light of the adjacent housing development which has been designed with due regard to these minimum distance standards.

Light and Outlook

The demolition of the existing building which abuts the rear gardens of no.60 Fox Street and no.16 Henry Hill Close in addition to the proposed form and layout would result in a positive impact to the light and outlook enjoyed by properties immediately west.

Noise and Disturbance

The application site is vacant at present but has a lawful use as a place of worship. The existing layout of the site includes no parking and requires users of the site to park on-street. The use as a place of worship would see both human and vehicle traffic be minimal throughout the majority of the week, and see intense periods of use which would not be confined to the site, where users would generally be required to park on surrounding streets and finish the journey on foot.

It is considered that the proposed C3 residential use and the activities reasonably expected from such use would represent a flattening out of the intensity profile of the site, where use would be continuous, but would be restricted to activities of a residential nature that are considered to be compatible with the surrounding land use. Notwithstanding the assessment of impacts to the highway network, associated vehicle movement would be low and would not cause an undue level of disturbance.

Occupier Amenity

Notwithstanding the above assessment with regards to the Council's minimum distance standards and the unacceptable level of outlook from the rear windows and rear garden of plot 2, it is expected that the internal layout of the properties would permit a satisfactory level of light and outlook to all habitable rooms and garden areas. Further to this, the proposed gardens are considered appropriate in layout and size for a dwelling of this size.

Overall, it is considered that as a result of the proposed layout and form of buildings, the proposal would fail to result in a satisfactory standard of amenity for all future occupiers and the occupiers of no.16 Henry Hill Close and would fail to accord with the requirements of Policy DM1 of the Adopted Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD.

Highways

Core Strategy policy T2 seeks to ensure that development is located where there is good access to public transport and where the need to travel by car is minimised. Policy DM1 seeks to ensure there is not an over-dominance of parked cars on residential streets. The proposed development would comprise of 4 dwellings which would be served by 7 car parking spaces accessed from Taylor Street and Fox Street.

Appendix 5 of the Adopted Core Strategy stipulates a maximum of 2 spaces per dwelling at this location, as such included parking spaces represent 87.5% of the maximum. The Councils Highways Officer has raised no objection to the proposal, considering parking to be adequate for dwellings of this size in this location. It is acknowledged that the parking provisions of plot 4 are of a particularly poor standard of design, however it is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact to highway and pedestrian safety.

The proposal would make use of existing access via Taylor Street and Fox Street and does not propose any changes to the highway layout.

The proposed parking and access arrangements are therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the relevant parts of adopted Rochdale Core Strategy policies T2 and DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Drainage and Flood Risk

The NPPF establishes that inappropriate development in areas at risk at flooding should be avoided and that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. The site falls within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at a low risk of flooding (less than 1 in 1000 or 0.1% annual probability of river or sea flooding in any year). The site is therefore suitable for residential development in this respect. 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. Saved UDP policies EM/7 and R/4(g) are also relevant, with the latter requiring the provisions of the former to be satisfied. In this particular case, it is a requirement that appropriate sustainable drainage systems ae installed to as the site falls within the Heywood Critical Drainage Area.

The application has been accompanied by brief a drainage strategy and Flood Risk Assessment but not with any detailed drainage proposals. The supporting document states that the underlying geology is likely peat, overlaying clay and gravel, and that following the demolition of the building it is the intention of the applicant to perform a percolation test which would drive the detailed drainage design. This document has considered that surface water flooding is unlikely to present an issue to the site.

United Utilities have confirmed no objection to the proposals, and recommended conditions for a detailed drainage scheme and separate systems for the drainage of foul and surface water. The Council's Drainage Officer has been consulted and has recommended conditions for a detailed surface water drainage proposal prior to commencing development, as well as a separate condition for the separate drainage of foul and surface water.

Should the LPA wish to support the application, it would be considered appropriate to recommend a condition that, following demolition of the existing building, and prior to any above ground works details of foul and surface water drainage are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

Further to this, the proposal would replace an existing building with a smaller built footprint with areas that can be controlled to be permeable to provide a net decrease in surface runoff at the site. As such it is considered that sustainable drainage solutions can be achieved through condition and therefore the proposal would accord with the requirements of Policy G8 and DM1 of the Adopted Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework.

Biodiversity impacts and gains

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF 2019 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity, providing net gains where possible, and contributing to the Government's commitment to halt decline. Core Strategy policy G7 requires that no development should result in a net loss of biodiversity and geodiversity.

The developer's ecological consultant the structure to hold 'negligible' bat roost potential, recommending no further surveys at this time, however recommended that as a precautionary measure, a program of Risk Avoidance Measures is to be required to provide a suitable scheme of works that mitigates all harm to any potential roosting bats through the demolition phase.

The developer's ecological consultant also considered a selection of suitable bird nesting opportunities to exist at the site and wider area, recommending that operations are to be undertaken outside the bird nesting season unless it can be conclusively demonstrated that nesting birds are absent, notably within the roof structure of the existing building.

Other recommendations related to the installation of appropriately ecologically sensitive lighting schemes.

GMEU has been consulted and has no objections to the development. It is considered necessary that demolition be restricted to those months outside of nesting season via condition. Informatives are to be attached relating to the protection of Bat and Bird species.

Further to this, it is considered necessary to secure a net gain in biodiversity, which should be provided in the form of a suitable landscaping scheme and artificial nest provision such as a bat or bird box, or swift brick.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposals are acceptable and accords with policy G7 of the Core Strategy and the requirements of the NPPF.

Ground Conditions

Coal Mining

The planning application is accompanied by a Desk Based Coal Mining Risk Assessment report (December 2020, prepared by LK Group), this report was unable to conclusively discount the absence of unrecorded shallow coal mine working beneath the site which could affect the proposed development, further making

recommendations for intrusive ground investigations following the demolition of the existing building to inform any mitigation measures.

The Coal Authority has been presented with the application for consultation, and has welcomed the recommendation of further intrusive ground investigations as detailed within the supplied desk based assessment, requiring a condition for the investigations to be carried out prior to above ground works in addition to a separate condition requiring the submission of a verification report to the LPA to confirm the extent of the works. It is considered that a single, appropriately worded condition could achieve both objectives should the LPA to support the application.

Contamination

Core Strategy Policy G9 states that the Council will ensure that any risks arising from contaminated land or land instability are identified, and that any appropriate actions to address these risks are taken, prior to development taking place.

Given that the application proposes the demolition of an existing building, the footprint of which covers the extent of the site, no preliminary risk assessment has been supplied. The Council's Public Protection Officer has been consulted on the application and has recommended a condition be attached requiring the submission and written approval of a preliminary risk assessment which would inform the next steps to a suitably safe development.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1 The proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupiers of no.16 Henry Hill Close in addition to plot 3. Furthermore, the proposed layout would not permit an adequate standard of light and outlook for the future occupiers of plot 2. Overall, the proposal would result in an unacceptable standard of amenity for future occupiers and surrounding neighbours. The proposal therefore fails to accord with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's 'Standards and Guidelines for Residential Development' SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 The proposed development would introduce an imposing form to the street through the absence of a suitable buffer, presenting a hard edge to the public highway and unduly detracting from the character and appearance of the street scene. This visual harm of the development would be compounded through additional elements of poor design through unsatisfactory siting of car parking at plot 2, in addition to the stepped front elevation used on plot 4. Ultimately, the proposal would fail to constitute a satisfactory standard of design and inflict undue harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal therefore fails to accord with policy P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and 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:

In the Avoidance of Doubt, this decision relates to the following list of plans:

Location Plan
Existing Floor Plans
Existing Elevations
3418:07/A – Proposed Site Plan
3418:08/A – Proposed Ground and First Floor Plan
3418/09/A – Proposed Site Section
3418/11 – Street Scenes

Report Author Ryan Killeen