

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	9 October 2019
Portfolio	Councillor Carol Wardle Cabinet Member for Planning, Development & Housing
Report Author	Michael Atkinson-Smith
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 19/00693/FUL	Township: Rochdale South	Ward: Bamford
Applicant: Mr Mark Sexton		Agent: Mr Garry Griffiths
Site Address: 687 Bury Road, Rochdale OL11 4AU		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing dwelling, and the erection of 7No detached dwellings with access road and associated parking - Resubmission of 18/01199/FUL	

SITE LOCATION



DELEGATION

- 1.1 The application has been called up by Councillor Angela Smith on the grounds that the proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site.

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of seven detached dwellings with access road and associated parking following the demolition of the existing dwelling (resubmission of 18/01199/FUL).

RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Planning and Licensing Committee resolves to **GRANT planning permission** subject to conditions.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 The proposed development would provide seven large detached dwellings, resulting in a net increase of six following the demolition of the existing dwelling on site, therefore contributing to the supply of larger and higher value housing within the Borough in accordance with Core Strategy policy C3. The scheme for consideration has been extensively amended over the original submission ref. 18/01199/FUL to provide dwellings of good design in an appropriate layout, minimise the impact on the trees lining Bury Road protected by Tree Preservation Order 251a and minimise the amenity impacts for surrounding occupiers. Environmental impacts, including on the adjacent SBI and protected and invasive species can be satisfactorily mitigated or controlled through condition.
- 4.2 On this basis the application is considered to be acceptable in matters of principle and detail and the application duly accords with the relevant policies contained within the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

SITE

The application relates to a large two storey detached dwelling at 687 Bury Road in Rochdale and its curtilage (measuring circa 0.38 hectares). Access to the site is via a gated driveway directly off Bury Road which runs to the north of the site. Along this front boundary is a 2m high stone wall and directly behind this wall is a row of mature trees which are protected under Tree Preservation Order 251a.

The north eastern boundary of the site adjoins a valley which runs down to the River Roch. The valley is within the River Roch Greenspace Corridor and is a designated site of ecological and geological importance (Grade A SBI) and is heavily wooded. On the other side of the valley are the four large dwellings known collectively as 'Ryefields'.

To the south east and south west of the site are the dwellings on Camberley Drive. Those to the south east are bungalows and those to the south west are two storey dwellings. Numbers 58 – 64 have rear gardens of between 29 metres and 37 metres in length, leading up to the boundary shared with the application site. The gardens of numbers 66 and 68 Camberley Drive do not adjoin the application site and are enclosed by the gardens of 64 and 70 Camberley Drive. The gardens of 70 and 72 Camberley Drive are approximately 26 metres in length. At present the boundaries shared with the properties on Camberley Drive are well screened by trees; however these trees are not protected. Directly to the west is an area of undeveloped wooded land known as 'Bunker's Hill' and the trees on this site are protected by Tree Preservation Order 176.

In August 2007, planning permission was granted, subject to conditions, to demolish the existing dwelling and erect 6 semi-detached houses and a block of 10 apartments (ref: 07/D49282). An extension of time application for implementation of the previously approved proposal was granted in June 2010 (ref: 10/D53018). A further planning permission to replace the extant 2010 permission was granted in January 2014 (ref: 13/00652/FUL). A further outline planning permission (ref. 16/01357/OUT) for the erection of 3 detached dwellings and associated garages including access was granted in February 2017, which did not include the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse on site.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse on site – Midge Hall - and the erection of seven detached two storey residential dwellings. The proposed dwellings would include two 4-bedroom dwellings and five 5-bedroom dwellings. The development would utilise three house types which would blend elements of traditional and contemporary form, including the use of asymmetric gables to the front with vertically emphasised feature windows in two of the house types. The primary building materials would be red facing brickwork and grey concrete tiles.

Access into the development make use of the existing entrance from Bury Road and then an access road would be laid out through the centre of the site, including a turning head. The access road would remain un-adopted by the

Council and take the form and design principles of a private driveway. Two parking spaces would be provided for each dwelling, although Plot 7 could easily accommodate a third.

All properties would include front garden areas with more substantial gardens to the rear. Bin storage has been indicated for each dwelling to the rear, with direct external access from the rear garden areas to the street provided. A communal paved bin collection area would be provided adjacent to the site entrance to be utilised on collection day.

A number of trees would be removed within the site to facilitate the proposed development, including fourteen individual trees and five groups. However, all of the trees protected by Tree Preservation Order 251a would be retained, with the exception of T17 (Sycamore) which would be removed for arboricultural reasons and T1 (Holly) which is a category C tree adjacent to the site entrance. Replacement planting would be provided throughout the site, including along the western perimeter and in the front garden areas of some dwellings.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
EM/7	Development and Flood Risk
EM/8	Protection of Surface and Ground Water

Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

C1	Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places
C3	Delivering the right type of housing
P3	Improving design of new development
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
T2	Improving accessibility
DM1	General development requirements
SD1	Delivering sustainable development

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (June 2016)
Oldham and Rochdale Urban Design Guide

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – February 2019
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

RELEVANT HISTORY

18/01199/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling and the erection of 8 detached dwellings with access road and associated parking. Refused March 2018 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of Trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order, namely T8, T9, T10 and T13 adjacent to the west of the site entrance. In addition, the scale of proposed tree clearance is excessive and the proximity and layout of plots 6-8 would result in increased pressure for pruning and removal of the remaining protected trees by the future occupants. Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the impacts of the proposal on trees that could be affected by the development adjacent to the site including both within the River Roch Greenspace Corridor, which is a designated site of ecological and geological importance including the Meadowcroft Woods Grade A Site of Biological Importance, and within Tree Preservation Order TP0176 (Bunkers Hill). As such, the application both fails to comply with, and demonstrate accordance with, the requirements of Core Strategy policies P3, G6 and G7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed layout would result in separation distances of up to only 8.2m from the two storey rear elevations of plots 2-5 to the rear boundary shared with Nos. 60-64 Camberley Drive which result in undue overlooking and loss of privacy for the occupiers of these dwellings. In addition, a satisfactory standard of residential amenity would not be afforded to the future occupiers of plots 6-8 through overshadowing of the rear outdoor amenity space by the dwellings themselves and by the close presence of tree canopies to the first floor habitable room windows, which would harm outlook and restrict light to the windows. Accordingly the application is contrary to Core Strategy policy DM1, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (2016) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposal, by virtue of the layout of the development, includes the loss of a large number of trees, including trees the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. This which constitutes poor design and would result in harm to the character of the landscape setting and the street scene of Bury Road. Furthermore, the design, scale and massing of the proposed dwellings fails to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of the area or achieve high quality design. The application is therefore contrary to policies P3, C3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate adequate servicing arrangements in respect of manoeuvrability for refuse collection vehicles within the site, or an alternative refuse collection strategy that

conforms to the guidelines set in the Manual for Streets. As such it is not possible to conclude that the proposal fully meets with the requirements of Core Strategy policies T2 and DM1 and the requirements of the National Policy Framework.

5. The application is accompanied by insufficient information to demonstrate the potential impacts of the development on bats. The Council's ecological consultant lacks confidence in the findings of the submitted Phase I Habitat Survey and Daytime Bat Survey and as such it is not considered that an appropriate level of information has been provided to adequately assess the potential for the presence of bats or their roosts on site or the impact on foraging habitat. It cannot therefore be concluded that the requirements of Core Strategy policy G7 and the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of preventing or mitigating harm to a protected species or its habitat have been met.

16/01357/OUT	Outline application (including access) for the erection of 3 detached dwellings and associated garages. Granted STC February 2017.
13/00652/FUL	Application for a new planning permission to replace extant planning permission D53018 for residential development (6 semi-detached and 1 x 3 storey block of 10 apartments). Granted STC January 2014.
13/00505/WTTPO	Application for works to various trees subject to TPO No. 176 which includes:- Remove the twin-stemmed Ash along the north boundary. Granted STC July 2013.
10/D53018	Application For A New Planning Permission To Replace Extant Planning Permission D49282 For Residential Development (6 Semi-Detached And 1 X 3 Storey Block Of 10 Apartments). Granted STC June 2010
08/D50489	To Undertake Development Of 16 Dwellings Approved Under Planning Permission D49282 Without Compliance With Condition 5 Relating To Affordable Housing.
07/D49282	Residential Development - 6 Semi-Detached Dwellings And 1 X 3 Storey Block Of 10 Apartments – Granted STC.
00/D38303	Widening Of Existing Vehicular Access To A Classified Road And Increase In Height Of Existing Boundary Wall To 2.0 Metres – Granted STC.
00/D37661	Demolition Of Existing Garage And Outhouses And Erection Of Two Storey Extension To Side And Conservatory Extension To Rear With First Floor Balcony To Rear Of Dwelling – Granted STC.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - The GMEU commented on these ecological documents which are still valid as part of the previous application 18/01199/FUL. No significant ecological issues were identified by the developer's ecological consultant. Ecological issues relating to bats, nesting birds, invasive species, proximity to Meadowcroft Wood SBI and Net gain can be resolved via condition and or informative.

Bats

The building was assessed as having negligible bat roosting potential in 2018, but following comments by the GMEU an emergence survey was also carried out in May 2019, when no evidence of roosting activity was found. I now have no reason to doubt the findings of the report based on the level of survey. As bats turn up in unexpected locations and the high risk location of the property I recommend an informative along the following lines is applied to any permission: 'Whilst the building to be demolished has been assessed as negligible risk for bats, the applicant is reminded that under the Habitat Regulation it is an offence to disturb, harm or kill bats. If a bat is found during demolition all work should cease immediately and a suitably licensed bat worker employed to assess how best to safeguard the bat(s). Natural England should also be informed.'

Nesting Birds

The development site has significant bird nesting potential both within outbuildings and the garden landscape. All British birds nests and eggs (with certain limited exceptions) are protected by Section 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981. No works to trees or shrubs shall occur or demolition of outbuilding commence between the 1st March and 31st August in any year unless a detailed bird nest survey by a suitably experienced ecologist has been carried out immediately prior to clearance and written confirmation provided that no active bird nests are present which has been agreed in writing by the LPA.

Invasive Species

Monbretia and rhododendron were identified on the site. Species such as monbretia and Rhododendron ponticum are included within this schedule 9 part 2 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended. It is an offence to introduce or cause to grow wild any plant listed under this schedule. It is possible that the rhododendrons on site are not the wild type i.e. ornamental varieties and therefore not subject to this schedule. To ensure no offence is committed through movement of these species off-site in to a semi-natural location I recommend a condition along the following lines: Prior to any earthworks a method statement detailing control measures for monbretia and Rhododendron should be supplied to and agreed in writing to the LPA. The agreed method statement shall be adhered to and implemented in full unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.

Proximity to Meadowcroft Wood SBI

The consultants note the proximity of the development and lack of direct impact and concluded there was no risk because of the retention of boundary planting.

However I note from the landscape plan that the eastern most dwelling appears to be located very close to the SBI boundary with the risk during construction of debris and run-off entering the SBI. I therefore recommend that a condition along the following lines is applied to any permission: Prior to any earthworks a method statement detailing measures to protect Meadowcroft Wood SBI from debris, accidental incursion and run-off during construction shall be supplied to and agreed in writing by the LPA. There is also the risk post construction of surface water run-off being diverted in to the SBI. (Noted as a possibility in the utilities statement) I therefore recommend that clarification is sort on the drainage proposals for the site prior to determination as this would cause temporary negative impacts that that would require mitigation.

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Section 170 of the NPPF 2018 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. The site is generally of low ecological value. I am satisfied that there is adequate scope within the soft landscape proposals to ensure no net loss, the indicative landscape plan including retention of boundary trees and new planting. I would recommend the addition of bird boxes to mitigate for loss of bird nesting habitat. The detail can be conditioned.

Highways and Engineering - We have no objection to a residential development at this location but a number of amendments should be made to the proposals prior to consent being granted. The site has ample parking for a development of this nature and I do not expect problematic traffic volumes at this location. Access to the site is at an existing location and appears to be adequate. A development of this size should be an adopted but the highways layout is not adoptable. The road width should be increased to 5.5m. The current road is too narrow and with the curve of the road vehicles will struggle to pass. This will be particularly difficult if visitors cars are parked on the highway. 2m footways should be on both sides of the highway all the way to the site entrance to avoid pedestrians having to walk on the road. The turning head could not accommodate a refuse vehicle and given the narrow roads I do not believe a refuse vehicle could navigate the roads. I note the bin store on the plans but a development of this size and nature should be adopted and refuse vehicles should be able to access the site. The narrow roads could cause issues for emergency services accessing the site. Whilst we have no major road safety concerns I have issues with pedestrian safety due to the lack of footway. The narrow roads could be cause of vehicle conflict this would not be an issue were it not for the curve of the road. In its form I object to these proposals. I would however invite the applicant to amend their plans as outlined and resubmit. We have no objections to a residential development but not with this layout.

Additional response received in relation to revised private driveway layout: On the understanding that the site is not adopted I do not object to the proposal.

Landscaping/Tree Officer – I have reviewed the amended site plan and amended tree protection plan. All is satisfactory except for the location of the pre-cast concrete slabs (bin stores) within RPA, of plots 2, 6 and 7; particularly plot 7. As bins are not the most attractive of items, I can understand the desire

to locate them away from the potential viewpoints of lounge and dining areas, however, because they are sited in the RPA areas, I have concerns about the detail of the concrete slab bases. Bin bases should be of a no-dig constructional detail in these plots too, just like the communal bin store area on the driveway, to protect the tree roots.

Lead Local Flood Authority / Drainage - Summary: No Drainage Proposals were submitted. 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 NPPG's 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; or to a combined sewer. Guidance on soakaway suitability can be found in BRE digest 365, available online or from the Authority's Drainage & Flooding Engineer. In the event of surface water discharging to sewerage:- the rate of discharge shall be restricted to the lowest possible rate; prior to connection to the combined sewer in Bury Rd, the flow rate shall be agreed with United Utilities, who own this sewer; and foul & surface water system shall be separate and only combined at the site's final outfall manhole i.e. in accordance with Building Regulations Part H5 (2010). Most of the site is greenfield, apart from the main building and ancillary buildings. Therefore, any calculations on existing rainfall runoff should be based on greenfield runoff, with an allowance for the existing buildings' brownfield footprint. UU & RBC wish to target a reduction in accordance with national standards on sustainable drainage which seek to reduce run-off to greenfield rates. Our minimum expectation for brownfield site areas is a 50% reduction in the rate of discharge. To minimise surface water attenuation requirements, the council's officer suggests that permeable asphalt for the access road/ and or parking may be suitable. For detailed design, the Applicant can consult further with the Drainage Officer.

Public Protection (Environment) – The previous report recommended a site investigation so the recommendation for an intrusive investigation should be conditioned.

The Coal Authority - I have reviewed the proposals and confirm that the application site falls within the defined Development High Risk Area; therefore within the application site and surrounding area there are coal mining features and hazards which need to be considered in relation to the determination of this planning application. The Coal Authority records indicate likely unrecorded coal mining at shallow depth beneath the application site. However, the part of the site where the development is proposed lies outside of the defined High Risk Area. Therefore we do not consider that a Coal Mining Risk Assessment is necessary to support this proposal and we do not object to this planning application. Although the development proposed is outside of the defined Development High Risk Area as the site lies within an area where coal mining activity has taken place it is requested that the following wording is included as an Informative Note on any planning permission granted: The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal

mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Coal Authority.

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 (in accordance with the NPPG hierarchy). Without effective management and maintenance, sustainable drainage systems can fail or become ineffective. As a provider of wastewater services, we believe we have a duty to advise the Local Planning Authority of this potential risk to ensure the longevity of the surface water drainage system and the service it provides to people. We also wish to minimise the risk of a sustainable drainage system having a detrimental impact on the public sewer network should the two systems interact. We therefore recommend the Local Planning Authority include a condition in their Decision Notice regarding a management and maintenance regime for any sustainable drainage system that is included as part of the proposed development. If the applicant intends to obtain a water supply from United Utilities for the proposed development, we strongly recommend they engage with us at the earliest opportunity. If reinforcement of the water network is required to meet the demand, this could be a significant project and the design and construction period should be accounted for.

TOWNSHIP PLANNING PANEL

The application will be discussed at the meeting of the meeting of the Rochdale Township Planning Panel on Tuesday 8th October 2019 and an update report duly provided.

PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours and a site notice posted in the vicinity. Four unique letters of representation were received citing the following concerns:

- Seven houses is too great a number for the site.
- Insufficient parking spaces have been provided to serve the potential number of residents. With these being marketed as 'high value' houses, the number of cars per household is likely to exceed two and there is no parking provision for visitors.
- The excessive density of the development has not been meaningfully addressed since the previous application.
- The side elevation of plot 3 would be visually intrusive to the occupiers of Nos. 58 and 60 Camberley Drive.
- Too many large and mature trees would be removed affecting visual amenity.
- The house types proposed are significantly larger and of a different character to neighbouring houses that are low dormer bungalows.

- The retained trees along the western boundary would overshadow the affected plots resulting in pressure for future removal. If approved, these trees should be protected by a Tree Preservation Order.
- Replacement planting to mitigate for the loss through felling within the front gardens of the proposed dwellings and the limited space available would likely lead to early future removal to make the front gardens usable.
- The earlier refusal reason in respect of design and visual appearance has not been adequately addressed.
- The separation distance between habitable room windows and the western boundary is less than the 10.5m required by the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD.
- The proposed dwellings are too close together and will have the appearance of a terraced row which would fail the Council's test of 'high quality design'.
- Previous approved schemes for the site were more appropriate.

The matters raised above that are material planning considerations are discussed in the Analysis section below.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

1. 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.
2. It is noted that the principle of development of the site for residential purposes has already been established in the issuing of previous planning approvals 07/D49282, 10/D53018, 13/00652/FUL and 16/01357/OUT. Weight is afforded to the fact that planning permission has previously been granted for the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse on site and redevelopment with a higher number of homes and greater density of development. The demolition of the existing dwelling is therefore considered to be acceptable.
3. Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework defines 'previously developed land' as land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes, amongst others, land in built-up areas such as private residential gardens. The site would predominantly therefore, with the exception of the footprint of the dwelling and its outbuildings, be considered to comprise previously un-developed, or Greenfield, land. Policy C1 of the Core Strategy outlines that the Council will promote the reuse and regeneration of vacant and underused previously developed sites and focus only on sustainable

Greenfield sites which provide the best access to a range of services, jobs and facilities and have limited impact on green infrastructure and amenity.

4. The latest published information suggests that the Council can demonstrate more than a six 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.
5. As such, the principle of development of a Greenfield site such as this in the urban area for residential purposes can be acceptable; however, this factor must be balanced against all other material considerations, as outlined below. The development of under-used Greenfield and backland sites can help to make more efficient use of land within the urban area, however, proposals involving the development of residential gardens require careful consideration to ensure the development is appropriate, there is no loss of amenity for existing residents, that there are proper means of access and parking and that adequate space can be retained between new and existing dwellings. Sensitive design and good landscaping are also key considerations, to ensure that new buildings fit successfully into existing sites.
6. On the basis that the proposal would make a valuable contribution to housing supply within the Borough, whilst being in a sustainable location within reasonable proximity to local amenities and public transport facilities, it is considered that the principle of development is therefore acceptable in accordance with saved Policy G/D/1 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, Strategic Policies C1, C3 and SD1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of housing supply and sustainability.

Layout, Design and Appearance

7. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with a mix of large detached houses set in generous plots lining Bury Road and smaller dwellings in a fairly standard low density suburban housing estate layout to the south. Whilst the layout proposed is denser than that of the immediate area, it is noted that the site is well screened from the highway; with a dense line of trees, protected by preservation orders, located on the northern boundary of the site, limiting views from Bury Road. There are also similar forms of development along Bury Road itself. The visual impact of the increased density in contrast to existing surrounding developments would not be read from key public vantage points outside the site and the density of the development would make efficient use of land.
8. The existing dwelling on site is a large detached property of an attractive appearance that sits well within its context and its loss would undoubtedly

result in some harm to the character of the wider area. However, it is noted that the principle of its demolition and redevelopment of the site with a greater number of units and a higher density form of development has been established through the grant of earlier planning permissions attached to the site; a fact to which some weight must be afforded.

9. The proposed development would result in two facing linear rows of variously designed dwellings centred on a central curved spine road that winds into the centre of the site from the access point from Bury Road. Whilst the development would be reasonably dense with close gaps between the buildings, the slightly staggered relationship and various architectural features utilised across the house types would break up the massing of built form somewhat and add visual interest.
10. The provision of reasonably sized front garden areas and landscaping features such as trees and hedgerows would soften the overall appearance of the development. That the majority of the protected trees would remain will screen the development from Bury Road, and it is noted that the closest dwelling to Bury Road would be formed with the side elevation closest to the boundary, thus reducing the potential pressure for a rear extension in the future which would be harmful to that street scene.
11. Highways and parking issues are discussed in greater detail below, but it is acknowledged that parking provision for the size and marketing intention of the dwellings is likely to lead to parked cars on street within the development, contrary to the requirements of the SPD. However, given that the development would be centred on a private driveway layout and the visual impact would not be apparent from outside the site, this considered, on balance, to be acceptable in this particular location.
12. The proposed house types have undergone extensive revisions and substitutions to improve the elevational detailing and overall visual appearance, especially from the key vantage point from the driveway when entering the site. Overall it is considered that the revisions to the dwellings have resulted in a good quality development which will not be out of character with the more recent developments in the area. The use of red facing brick and grey concrete tiles is considered to be acceptable in this location, and grey windows and detailing panels will add visual interest.
13. The position and materials detailing of the internal boundary treatments is broadly satisfactory and the use of a brick pier / timber panel wall softened by hedgerow planting along the side boundary of Plot 1 where it is visible from Bury Road is acceptable. Full details will be required condition, including consideration of the treatment of the boundary fence separating the front and rear garden of Plot 7 where it meets the retaining wall alongside Bury Road within the area covered by TPO251a.

14. It is noted that each dwelling will be provided with an accessible space within the private rear garden area to store waste bins but full details of the communal bin collection area should be secured through condition and it be required that installation takes place prior to first occupation of the dwellings to avoid an excessive amount of waste bins being left out on the pavement of Bury Road on collection day. This is to ensure compliance with the SPD which requires that waste bins do not dominate the street scene.
15. The lower part of the south to the site will remain largely at the existing levels with the finished floor levels of the dwellings raised only marginally above. The higher area on which the existing dwelling is sited would be reduced to provide roughly a 1m downward slope from north to south across the site. This raises no substantive issues in respect of layout or visual appearance.
16. Therefore, subject to the suggested conditions, it is considered that the proposed development will represent a well-designed contemporary development of satisfactory design detailing, density in this location and layout and the application is therefore considered to accord with policies DM1, P3 and C3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. Amongst other things, these require developments to be sympathetic to local character and visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and effective landscaping.

Impact on Surrounding Occupiers

17. 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. Included within the above document are the expected space standards for new residential development.
18. Within the site the proposed dwellings would accord with the required minimum separation distances, with at least 21m achieved between facing dwellings which is sufficient to provide an adequate level of privacy. The linear positioning of the dwellings would also result in the dwellings complying with all other standards contained within the SPD in relation to one another.
19. A neighbour objection has been received in relation to the visually intrusive and dominant impact of the two storey side elevation of Plot 3 for the occupiers of Nos. 58 and 60 Camberley Drive. It is noted, however, that in relation to the rear facing windows of these dwellings, the separation distance would be 35m in relation to No. 60 Camberley Drive and 31m at an angle in relation to No. 58 Camberley Drive. This is significantly in excess of the 14m minimum separation distance required by the SPD. No overshadowing of the rear garden areas of those

dwelling would occur due to the orientation of the site and the 4m separation distance from the vegetated boundary at the very rear of the lengthy gardens of those dwellings is sufficient not to result in an impact that could be reasonably be considered to be unduly overbearing. On this basis, the impact of the proposed development on the amenities of Nos. 58 and 60 Camberley Drive is considered to be acceptable.

20. The relationship outlined above would be near-identical in relation to Plot 4 and the impact on Nos. 62 and 64 Camberley Drive, again resulting in an acceptable relationship with these dwellings.
21. The separation distance to the rear boundary from the rear facing habitable room windows of Plots 5 and 6 would be 10.9 and 10.7m respectively in respect of the main rear elevation. However, the distance would be reduced by 1.4m to 9.5 and 9.3m in respect of the first floor habitable room window in the projecting gable features. These latter distances would be below the minimum guideline separation distance of 10.5m contained within the SPD, with Nos. 70 and 72 Camberley Drive affected as a result. However it is noted that the tall trees growing along the boundary would be retained and the landscaping condition will require the retention of these trees for at least five years post development. It is also noted that the rear garden area of No. 72 Camberley Drive is densely planted and does not constitute the main usable garden area at the point where the separation distance is at its lowest. Whilst the patio area of No. 70 Camberley Drive is close to the boundary, the projecting gable window of Plot 7 would look more directly towards No. 72 due to the position of the dwelling, reducing the impact to what is considered to be an acceptable degree. Boundary fencing and tree screening will continue to provide a suitable degree of privacy to offset the impact.
22. That the proposed dwellings having the greatest impact on surrounding properties would be constructed at the lowest existing natural ground level within the site will further reduce the overall impacts of the proposed development.
23. Representations received have correctly pointed out that the trees growing along the western boundary will overshadow the rear gardens and windows of Plots 4 and 5, with potential pressure from future occupiers to seek to remove at least some of the trees. Of the relevant trees, only T29 is a category B tree and the remainder are category C. Category C trees would not be worthy of protection by a Tree Preservation Order and the amenity value in terms of the wider area of T29 could not be considered significant owing to its position away from the public highway. Whilst some future tree removal is to some extent unavoidable, given the locational context in which trees are a defining feature it would be unlikely that full loss would occur.
24. In terms of the separation distances between facing habitable room windows of Plots 4 and 5 and those of Nos. 70 and 72 Camberley Drive, distances of between 33m and 35m would be achieved which is

significantly in excess of the minimum separation distance required by the SPD.

25. The rear facing windows of Plots 6 and 7 would look towards the presently undeveloped land at Bunkers Hill at minimum distances of 9.4 and 10.7m respectively. Such separation distances are unlikely to prejudice any future development of the site, which it is noted is covered by Tree Preservation Order TPO176, and would not result in undue amenity impacts at the present time.
26. A condition is recommended removing permitted development rights for two storey rear extensions and enlargements to the roof of Plots 4 and 5, for example through dormer extensions, to protect the amenity of the occupiers of Nos. 70 and 72 Camberley Drive.
27. For the reasons outlined above, it is considered, on balance, that the proposed development would provide a satisfactory standard of residential amenity for the future occupiers of the development whilst adequately protecting the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers. On this basis, the application is considered to accord with Core Strategy policy DM1, the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways, Parking and Access

28. The site would be accessed via the existing access off Bury Road and whilst the proposal would result in an intensification of its use, the Council's Highways Officer is satisfied that the access is suitable for a development of this nature. It is not considered that the volume of traffic generated by the development will have a materially negative impact upon the surrounding highways network which could adequately accommodate vehicle movements associated with the development.
29. The previous application (ref. 18/01199/FUL) was refused for reasons including that whilst the proposed access road included a turning head insufficient information was provided through a swept path analysis to demonstrate that it was of sufficient size to facilitate the manoeuvring and turning of a refuse vehicle. It remains that this has not been provided within the re-submission but it has been confirmed that the road will not be adopted and will instead take the form of a private driveway. An area for bins to be stored on collection days close to the adopted highway has been indicated on the submitted plans to allow ease of access for collection and ensure that an excessive number of bins are not concentrated on the pavement of Bury Road immediately outside the development.
30. The Council's Highways Officer would generally expect that a development of this size be served by an adopted road. The highways officer initially noted that the proposed road was not designed to an

adoptable standard and vehicles may have difficulty passing on the curved section of the road, particularly if visitor's cars are parked on the highway. A pedestrian safety risk was been identified by the lack of provision of suitable footways on either side of the carriageway.

31. Revisions have been sought to the highway layout to secure level surfacing throughout which will encourage drivers to drive more carefully and adapt to the conditions. This is a small development proposal and providing an adoptable highway with a 5.5m carriageway and 2m footways either side would alter the character of the development significantly. The highways officer has confirmed that providing the road will not be adopted, they have no objection to the proposal.
32. It is noted that the applicant has demonstrated that at least 2 dedicated parking spaces are to be provided for each dwelling. The proposed garages are not of a sufficient width to be counted as parking spaces as the SPD requires a minimum width of 3.5m for internal parking spaces. Plot 7 could easily accommodate three vehicles, which exceeds the maximum standard contained within Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy but it is acknowledged the Paragraph 106 of the revised NPPF has amended the guidance in relation to the imposition of maximum parking standards. Given the lack of any reasonably sited additional on-street parking in the immediate vicinity, and the high likelihood of residents of the proposed dwellings owning more than one car per household it would be considered of benefit to the scheme to include more parking; not less. On this basis, the proposed parking numbers are considered to be acceptable.
33. On this basis, it is considered that the access and parking impacts of the development are acceptable and the application duly accords with Core Strategy policies DM1 and T2 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on Trees

34. Policy G6 of the adopted Core Strategy expects development proposals affecting green infrastructure to avoid the loss of existing features such as trees unless suitable alternative provision is made or they have limited value. Trees that are removed should be replaced at a ratio of 2:1 to mitigate for the loss of their amenity value and environmental benefits. Core Strategy Policy G7 (Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity) states that the Council will ensure that features of biodiversity and geodiversity importance are given full and appropriate recognition and protection, and no development should result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity interest.
35. The northern boundary of the site is subject to Tree Preservation Order 251a, as shown on the below map excerpt, comprising mixed trees of Sycamore, Lime and Beech. The trees along the western boundary in adjoining land are also protected.

36. The proposal seeks to retain all trees that are protected by Tree Preservation Order 251a, with the exception of T17 (Sycamore) which is to be removed for arboricultural reasons. T1 (Holly) which is growing adjacent to the site entrance is not covered in the TPO schedule and would be removed. An addition twelve individual trees and five groups would also be removed from within the site and around the perimeter. The Council's arboricultural advisor is satisfied that the proposed tree removals are acceptable and welcomes the retention of the near-entire group of trees that are protected. Replacement planting should be required by condition to result in a net increase in tree coverage across the site as a whole. The main concern raised by the Council's advisor relates to the position of paved bin storage areas within the Root Protection Areas of retained trees. The details of no-dig construction in those areas, including the communal bin storage area, can be secured through condition.
37. Therefore, subject to a satisfactory detailed landscaping scheme that includes replacement planting at a 2:1 ratio or the inclusion of native hedgerow planting at a level suitable to compensate for the loss of trees, the proposal is considered to be satisfactory in respect of arboricultural impacts and compliant with Core Strategy policy G6 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Ecology and Biodiversity Impacts

38. Core Strategy Policy G7 (Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity) states that the Council will ensure that features of biodiversity and geodiversity importance are given full and appropriate recognition and protection, and no development should result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity interest. Paragraph 175 of the NPPF states that when determining applications, Local Planning Authorities should apply a number of principles, including that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.
39. Consultation has been undertaken with the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) which has noted that no significant ecological issues were identified by the developer's ecological consultant. However, to the east of the site lies the northern extent of the Meadowcroft Woods Site of Biological Importance, designated Grade A, and GMEU states that measures to protect the woods during construction would require conditions. A further condition requiring clarification on the proposed surface water run-off strategy post-construction is also recommended to prevent run-off into the SBI, as any temporary negative impacts would also require mitigation.
40. In respect of protected species, the building was assessed as having negligible bat roosting potential in 2018, but following comments by the

GMEU an emergence survey was also carried out in May 2019, when no evidence of roosting activity was found. On this basis, GMEU now have no reason to doubt the findings of the report based on the level of survey, thus overcoming the previous refusal reason in respect of this matter. However, as bats can turn up in unexpected locations and the high risk location of the property an informative is recommended advising that under the Habitat Regulation it is an offence to disturb, harm or kill bats. If a bat is found during demolition all work should cease immediately and a suitably licensed bat worker employed to assess how best to safeguard the bat(s).

41. The development site has significant bird nesting potential both within outbuildings and within the garden landscape. A condition requiring that no clearance or works to trees and shrubs or demolition should take place between the 1st March and 31st August in any year unless further survey work was carried out could be applied to safeguard protected bird nests and eggs. Bat and bird boxes are further recommend to mitigate for loss of bird nesting habitat, the details of which should be required by condition.
42. Monbretia and Rhododendron were identified on the site. Species such as Monbretia and Rhododendron Ponticum are included within this schedule 9 part 2 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, though it is possible that the Rhododendrons on site are not the wild type i.e. ornamental varieties. To ensure no offence is committed through movement of these species off-site in to a semi-natural location it is recommended that a method statement detailing control measures for Monbretia and Rhododendron should be required by condition.
43. In summary, no significant ecological issues have been identified and ecological issues relating to bats, nesting birds, invasive species, proximity to Meadowcroft Wood SBI and net gain can be resolved via condition and or informative. Therefore, subject to the suggested conditions and informatives the requirements of Core Strategy policy G7 and the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of preventing or mitigating harm to a protected species or its habitat will have been met.

Drainage and Flood Risk

44. 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 NPPF also 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.
45. 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, subject to appropriate wastewater and surface water disposal to reduce the risks of flooding or aquatic pollution elsewhere.

46. Full details of the proposed drainage scheme have not been provided with the application and would therefore need to be secured through condition. However, a detailed consultation response from United Utilities sets out a number of requirements in relation to foul and surface water separation and drainage of surface water in the most sustainable way in accordance with the NPPG hierarchy.
47. Therefore, subject to an acceptable drainage scheme being submitted to and approved by the LPA as required by a suitable condition, the requirements of Policy G8 of the Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework would have been met.

Land Contamination

48. 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.
49. Consultation has been carried out with the Council's Public Protection Officer and a condition is recommended to ensure contamination is identified and remediated where necessary to accord with the requirements of Policy G9 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to land contamination.

Coal Mining Risk

50. The application site falls within the defined Development High Risk Area; therefore within the application site and surrounding area there are coal mining features and hazards which need to be considered in relation to the determination of this planning application.
51. The Coal Authority records indicate likely unrecorded coal mining at shallow depth beneath the application site. However, the part of the site where the development is proposed lies outside of the defined High Risk Area. On this basis the Coal Authority does not consider that a Coal Mining Risk Assessment is necessary to support the proposal has not raised any objections to the proposed development subject to the imposition of an informative advising that the proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards and that if any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Coal Authority.
52. On this basis, subject to the above advisory note, it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable in respect of coal mining risk and the requirements of Core Strategy policy G9 and the National Planning Policy Framework will have been satisfied.

Conclusion

53. Core Strategy policy C3 seeks to improve the supply of larger and higher value housing in the Borough. Policy C1 states that the development of greenfield sites within the urban area should have a limited adverse impact on green infrastructure or amenity value in and around the site and that green infrastructure is, wherever possible, incorporated into the scheme.
54. The proposed development would provide seven large detached dwellings, resulting in a net increase of six, therefore contributing to the supply of larger and higher value housing within the Borough. The scheme for consideration has been extensively amended over the original submission (ref. 18/01199/FUL) to provide dwellings of a contemporary and good quality design in an appropriate layout, minimise the impact on the trees lining Bury Road protected by Tree Preservation Order 251a, and minimise the amenity impacts for surrounding occupiers. Environmental impacts, including on the adjacent SBI and protected and invasive species can be satisfactorily mitigated or controlled through condition.
55. On this basis the application is considered to be acceptable in matters of principle and detail and the application duly accords with the relevant policies contained within the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Planning and Licensing Committee resolves to **GRANT planning permission subject to the following conditions:**

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. This permission relates to the following plans:-
 - Location Plan
 - Topographical Survey including Buildings to be Demolished
 - Proposed Site Layout – SK9, Drawing No. 1253/SK9-001 Rev. H (Amended Plan Received 30.09.19)
 - Proposed Site Layout – Roof Plan, Drawing No. 1253/SK9-002 Rev. A (Amended Plan Received 30.09.19)
 - Proposed Site Layout – Curtilage Plan, Drawing No. 1253/-CT Rev. A (Amended Plan Received 30.09.19)

- House Type A – Plans and Elevations, Drawing No. 1253/101 Rev. G (Amended Plan Received 27.09.19)
- House Type A2 – Plans and Elevations, Drawing No. 1253/107 Rev. B (Amended Plan Received 27.09.19)
- House Type C1 – Plans and Elevations, Drawing No. 1253/105 Rev. B (Amended Plan Received 27.09.19)
- Tree Protection Plan, Drawing No. UG_11933_ARB_TPP_01 Rev. P02

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the Core Strategy, the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. No development shall take place until an investigation and risk assessment (in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall investigate the nature and extent of any contamination on the site (whether or not it originates on the site). The assessment shall be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development takes place.

The submitted report shall include:

- i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination
- ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:
 - human health,
 - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland, and service lines and pipes
 - adjoining land,
 - groundwaters and surface waters,
 - ecological systems,
 - archaeological sites and ancient monuments;
- iii) where unacceptable risks are identified, an appraisal of remedial options and proposal of the preferred option(s) to form a remediation strategy for the site.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the duly approved remediation strategy and a verification report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any of the building(s) hereby approved are first occupied.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the environment and to ensure the safe development of the site in the interests of the amenity of future occupiers in accordance with Policies G8 and G9 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Further investigation will be necessary prior to commencement of any building or engineering works on site.

4. No development shall take place (including any demolition) until a Construction Method Statement (CMS), has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which shall include the following:
 - a. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - b. loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - c. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - d. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding;
 - e. measures for the protection of the natural environment from accidental spillages, dust and debris including dedicated protection measures (including high visibility fencing) for the protection of the adjacent SBI of Meadowcroft Woods both during and after construction;
 - f. a lighting plan designed to direct any temporary lighting away from the SBI of Meadowcroft Woods; and
 - h. hours of construction, including deliveries (which should not take place outside of the hours of 08:00-18:00 Monday to Friday and 09:00-14:00 Saturday, with no work taking place on Sundays or Bank Holidays).

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CMS.

Reason: To minimise detrimental effects to the neighbouring amenities, the amenities of the area in general, detriment to the natural environment through the risks of pollution and dangers to highway safety, during the construction phase in accordance with Policies DM1, T2, G7, G8 and G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: As the proposals require ground works and engineering works an understanding will therefore be necessary of what measures will be put in place to protect the amenity of nearby residents and the SBI prior to commencement of any building or engineering works on site.

5. Notwithstanding any detail shown on the approved plans or provided with the application submission, no development shall take place until a scheme for the discharge of foul and surface water from the site (including surface water from the site access road and parking areas), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage scheme shall be based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance, shall be accompanied by evidence of an assessment of the site

conditions and shall accord with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacement national standards. Details of how the drainage scheme will be maintained and managed after completion shall be provided. The duly approved scheme shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted and retained as such thereafter

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, policy EM/7 of the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: No drainage information has been submitted. 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.

6. No development or works of site preparation shall take place until all trees that are to be retained within or adjacent to the site have been enclosed with temporary protective fencing in accordance with BS:5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations'. The fencing shall be retained throughout the period of construction and no activity prohibited by BS:5837:2012 shall take place within such protective fencing during the construction period. The Arboricultural Method Statement hereby approved by Urban Green dated 23.05.19 shall be adhered to at all times.

Reason: In order to protect the existing trees on the site in the interests of the amenities of the area and in accordance with Policies P3, G6 and G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Protection measures for retained trees are required to be in place prior to commencement of any works on site to ensure no damage is caused.

7. No development or works of site preparation shall take place until a detailed method statement for the removal or long-term management/eradication of Monbretia and Rhododendron Ponticum on the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The method statement shall include measures to prevent the spread of Monbretia and Rhododendron Ponticum during any operations such as mowing, strimming or soil movement, and measures to ensure that any soils brought to the site are free of the seeds/roots/stems of any invasive plant covered under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: In accordance with policy G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and to ensure the satisfactory treatment and disposal of invasive plant species which, under the terms of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) it is an offence to be caused to be spread in the wild.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Construction activity increases the risk of invasive species spreading.

8. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specifications of materials to be used externally on the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy P3 of the Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. No above ground works shall take place until a scheme of biodiversity enhancements for the site including, but not limited to, bird boxes, bat bricks and bat boxes to be integrated to the fabric of the buildings and elsewhere within the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The duly approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the dwellings and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of enhancing biodiversity and habitat provision within the site in accordance with Policy G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. No clearance of trees and shrubs or demolition of the existing buildings on site in preparation for (or during the course of) development shall take place during the bird nesting season (March - August inclusive) unless an ecological survey has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to establish whether the site is utilised for bird nesting. Should the survey reveal the presence of any nesting species, then no development shall take place during the period specified above unless a mitigation strategy has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to prevent any habitat disturbance to nesting birds in accordance with policy G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

12. No part of the development shall be occupied until a detailed specification for the design and construction of the associated parking areas and site access, including detail of the surface water drainage strategy, surfacing

materials, lighting strategy and a scheme for tactile paving and dropped kerbs at the site access point, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access and parking areas shown on the approved plans shall be constructed in accordance with the duly approved details before the associated buildings are first occupied, and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

Reason: In order that there is adequate provision for vehicles to be parked clear of the highway in the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic and to ensure the suitable disposal of surface water in order to comply with the requirements of policies T2, DM1 and G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

- 13.(a) Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the formation of any banks, terraces or other earthworks, hard surfaced areas and materials, planting plans, specifications and schedules (including planting size, species and numbers/densities), existing plants / trees to be retained and a scheme for the timing / phasing of implementation works.

(b) The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme for timing / phasing of implementation or within the next planting season following final occupation of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner.

(c) Any trees or shrubs planted or retained in accordance with this condition which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or become seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped having regard to its location and the nature of the proposed development and in accordance with policies P3, DM1 and G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

14. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved Proposed Site Plan ref. 1253/SK9-001 Rev. H (Amended Plan Received 30.09.19) and the requirements of condition 2 of this permission, the dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until such time as a detailed design for the construction of waste/recycling storage areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, the design shall include full details of no-dig construction methods where the bin storage areas are within the root protection areas of retained trees. The duly approved facilities shall be

provided and made available for use before the first occupation of any dwelling and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory facilities for the storage of refuse and in the interests of visual amenity and in the interests of safeguarding the root systems of retained trees in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016), policies DM1, P3 and G6 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

15. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) prior to first occupation of Plot 3 hereby permitted the window in the first floor side elevation facing south shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

16. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), or any equivalent Order following the revocation and re-enactment thereof, the dwellings hereby approved at Plots 3 and 4 shall not be altered or extended, under Schedule 2, Part 1 Class A of the above order, insofar as it relates to windows in the side elevations facing south, unless planning permission has been granted for such works on application to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

17. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), or any equivalent Order following the revocation and re-enactment thereof, the dwellings hereby approved at Plots 4 and 5 shall not be altered or extended, under Schedule 2, Part 1 Class A of the above order, insofar as it relates to permitted development rights for two storey rear extensions, unless planning permission has been granted for such works on application to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

18. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), or any equivalent Order following the revocation and re-enactment thereof, the dwellings hereby approved at Plots 4 and 5 shall not be altered or extended, under Schedule 2, Part 1 Class B, of the above Order unless planning permission has been granted for such works on application to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in compliance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.