

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	18 th December 2019
Portfolio	Councillor Wardle Cabinet Member for Planning, Development & Housing
Report Author	Mark Caine
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 19/01132/FUL	Township: Pennines	Ward: Smallbridge Firgrove
Applicant: Mr Paul Stone		Agent:
Site Address: Land at Moorhouse Fold		
Proposal:	Application for the erection of 5no dwellinghouses and the associated external works inclusive of hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatments - Part Retrospective	

SITE LOCATION



DELEGATION

- 1.1 The application falls to be determined by the Planning and Licensing Committee as the Head of Planning Services considers that it should be considered by the Committee in accordance with the Councils Scheme of Delegation.

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

- 2.1 Part retrospective application for the erection of 5no dwellinghouses and the associated external works inclusive of hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatments.

RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Planning and Licensing Committee resolves it is minded to **REFUSE planning permission**.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 The whole scheme has not been constructed in accordance with the plans that were approved under planning permission Ref: 16/00530/FUL. A similar application was determined in March 2019 (18/01252/FUL) and refused under delegated powers. The reasons for this related to the effect of the design of development (including the excessive amount of varying window proportions, window design, roof materials, and timber fencing) would have on the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the nearby Listed Building at Moorhouse Farmhouse. The rear dormers were also considered to cause significant harm, through overlooking and the loss of privacy to the rear habitable windows and rear garden areas of the residential properties at No's 35-39 Rochdale Road

In the spirit of positive and proactive working with the applicant, and despite planning officer concerns, the LPA has sought a compromise solution, whereby the most harmful elements, (which are the rear dormers, the timber fencing, and the roof materials) are replaced and altered. However, following these discussions, the applicant has confirmed that they are only willing to remove the rear dormers.

As such the LPA consider that the proposed development would still introduce a visually confusing mixture of materials, with bulky interlocking concrete roof tiles, and approximate 1.8 metre high timber fencing. These were not approved under planning permission Ref: 16/00530/FUL, and would thereby appear as a prominent and irregular form of development that would be uncharacteristic and conspicuous within its context. It would also visually compete with and distract from important views of the Grade II Listed Building known as Moorhouse Farmhouse and thereby conflict with Policies DM1, P2 and P3 the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

SITE & BACKGROUND

The application relates to a 0.1 hectare, V-shaped site occupying a corner location at the junction of Moorhouse Fold and Fox Street, Milnrow. It is situated in a residential area, which is predominantly characterised by terraced housing that is constructed in a mixture of stone and red brick, with pitched and hipped slate roofs.

A grade II listed two-storey stone cottage (Moorhouse Farmhouse) fronts onto a route connecting Moorhouse Fold and the cul-de-sac of Moorhouse Farm to the northwest corner of the site.

Planning permission for the demolition of light industrial buildings and the erection of 5 dwellings was granted on the 6 February 2017 (Ref: 16/00530/FUL). The development has been substantially constructed; however this has taken place prior to the discharge of any pre-commencement conditions. The development has also not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Following this planning permission was sought and refused for the 5 dwellings on the site (18/01252/FUL), including the insertion of rear dormers, by reason of the detrimental impact that the development has on the character and appearance of the area, the setting of a Listed Building and the living conditions of the residential properties at Nos 35-39 Rochdale Road.

PROPOSAL

The application once again seeks planning permission for the erection of the 5 dwellings. The form of the development is similar that which was approved under planning permission 16/00530/FUL. The properties are organised in two blocks which flank the east and western site boundaries. However, the unauthorised rear dormers which have been partly constructed are proposed to be removed under this proposal.

Therefore, in effect, the main considerations in this application relate to the amendments to the design and appearance of the proposed development and the associated boundary treatment, the majority of which has already been carried out and is in situ.

These include the introduction of a mixture of stone, red brick materials to the two residential blocks. The majority of the gable ends of blocks A and B, which front Moorhouse Fold, are faced in stone, with the remainder of these blocks being faced in red brick. Both blocks are now also proposed to have grey marley modern concrete interlocking tiles. They also have sandstone lintel heads above the upvc ground floor windows and doors within the front elevation of the blocks and above the ground and first floor windows in the stone faced gable elevations. A protruding decorative brick string course is also shown directly below the first floor front and rear windows within both blocks. All windows are proposed to be fitted flush with the face of the buildings.

The submitted plans also show four velux windows within the front roof plane which would result in the creation of 2 additional bedrooms.

The original stone wall that enclosed the western side of the site has been removed and replaced with approximate 2 metre high vertical timber fencing. This, along with approximate 1.8m high timber fencing is also now proposed to be erected along the Moorhouse Fold frontage wrapping around the rear garden areas of plots 1 and 2 of Block A and the parking area to the south of the site. It is proposed to retain an existing concrete pillar and post with timber waney lap panel to the western side of the car park.

The site would be accessed via Moorhouse Fold which would lead to a private driveway running through the centre and terminating at the southeast corner of the site. One car parking space per plot, and two visitor spaces are also proposed to be provided.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

P2 Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage
P3 Improving Design of New Development
DM1 General Development Requirements
T2 Improving Accessibility

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (2016)

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

RELEVANT HISTORY

18/01252/FUL - Erection of 5 dwellings – retrospective – refused – 20/03/2019.

16/00530/FUL – Demolition of light industrial buildings and the erection of 5 dwellings – approved – 31/08/16.

17/00681/DOC – Submission of details to comply with conditions 3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15 and 16 of planning permission 16/00530/FUL –

Request completed – the development is unauthorised and the pre-development conditions applied for are unable to be discharged - 27/09/18.

18/00473/AM - Section 73 application for a minor material amendment to planning permission 16/00530/FUL to create two additional bedrooms within the roof space with two rear dormers and alterations to openings at ground and first floor level (Block A only) – Refused permission – 16/08/2019.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation and Design – Objects to the proposal. The development site is located within the setting of Moorhouse Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building, along with forming the setting for a number of non-designated heritage assets. Numbers 1 & 3 Moorhouse Fold are dwellings which are located within a converted barn which is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset, this building can be identified on the First Edition O.S. Map.

A number of residential properties surrounding the site are also deemed to be non-designated heritage assets due to their age, architectural form and historical values. These include: 1-7 Crossley Street (Odds only), 2 – 14 Crossley Street (Evens only), 29-41 Rochdale Road (Odds only), 43-53 Rochdale Road (Odds only) and 34-42 Rochdale Road (Evens only).

Whilst a planning permission was granted within the site, it is clear that the constructed buildings have not been built in accordance with the approved plans and the applicant and their agent failed to discharge any conditions of this permission.

A previous application to regularise the works, 18/01252/FUL, was recently refused. Since this point the applicant has now removed timber cladding and the dormer windows from the proposal. Whilst this has been completed the remaining comments from the previous consultation remain:

1. Masonry – the sandstone masonry which has been used to face the gables of the buildings is inappropriate. The pitch face finish is uncharacteristic of the local vernacular and it is apparent when viewing the buildings that 2 different types of sandstone have been used to complete these elements of the scheme giving a particularly poor finish. On the returning walls double courses of sandstone masonry follow the return around to provide a faux quoin which would have been better achieved using larger masonry blocks.
2. Bricks – The chosen brick, and the inclusion of a decorative string course is considered to be inappropriate within this location. A brick which is more in keeping with the local vernacular should be sought instead. Furthermore, some window lintels are standing soldier brick designs rather than art stone like the majority, again providing inconsistency in design.
3. Art stone lintels – the material and form, including a protruding key stone is a poorly designed modern interpretation of a classical feature. The architectural design of the buildings means the windows at first floor level sit in the wall

head and therefore this feature is missing at this level. This provides an awkward relationship between the ground and first floor windows, along with those which have brick lintels. It would have been more appropriate for water shot sandstone lintels and cills to be used throughout. Furthermore, the smoothly faced art stone against the pitch faced sandstone provides an uncomplimentary contrast.

4. Roof – The roof line is uncharacteristically steep and the buildings dominant the streetscape because of this. The inclusion of concrete roof tiles does not complement the local vernacular which is natural slate and stone slate. It would be appropriate for the buildings to be re-roofed with a complementary product.
5. Windows – The windows should have been located within a recessed position within the openings which would have given better dimension and animation to the elevations. The mix of shapes and sizes makes it difficult to understand the influences driving the building design and the omission of the mullion feature lack reference to the surrounding historic environment. Roof lights – Whilst the roof lights are relatively flush fitting their inclusion draws attention to the unusually large roofs. It is noted that the previous permission granted
6. Doors – The proposed main entrance doors to the properties are composite finished in a recessive colour to match the windows.
7. Fascia and verge – The fascia is overly dominant due to its excessive depth which creates a clunky looking feature. This detail sweeps round on to the gables providing an excessively deep overhang depth between the roof and the wall, this is particularly noticeable on Block B, Plot 3.
8. Boundary wall – The sweeping curved wall constructed of coursed pitch faced sandstone is uncharacteristic of the local area. This feature should be removed.
9. Boundary fences – Close boarded timber fencing is uncharacteristic of the area and as such should be replaced by a stone wall in a form matching the original one which has been removed, contrary to the previous permission.
10. Hard surfacing and landscaping – the use of gravel on an eco-grid could be appropriate depending upon the chosen product specifications.

In light of the above, the application is recommended for refusal.

Highways and Engineering – Awaiting consultation response. This will be reported via the update report prior to the planning committee meeting.

Public Protection (Air Quality) – No objections subject to the installation of charge points in every parking space. These charge points must have a minimum power rating output of 7Kw and fitted with a universal socket that can charge all types of electric vehicles currently on the market and meet safety and accessibility requirements. These charge points must be at least mode 3 or equivalent.

Public Protection (Contamination) – No objections to the proposal.

Public Protection (Noise) – No objections to the proposal.

Drainage – No objections subject to a condition for a surface water management scheme to be submitted and approved within a reasonable timescale.

United Utilities – No objections subject to the imposition of planning conditions for a surface water drainage scheme, the drainage of foul and surface water on separate systems, and a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – No objections to the application on ecology grounds. The buildings that were demolished had only low potential to support bats.

Transport for Greater Manchester - No objections to the proposal. It falls below the quantum of development required for a highways impact assessment. However each dwelling should have the provision for cycle parking and tactile paving and dropped kerbs should be installed across either side of the site access.

Rights of Way Officer – Whilst the proposal does not affect the right of way of way MilFp2299a that runs over land adjacent to the planning area, the applicant should be advised that this route should be available prior, during and following the development and should not be obstructed with fencing, materials or plant machinery.

TOWNSHIP PLANNING PANEL

There was no Pennines Township Planning Panel Meetings scheduled for November 2019 and the December Panel Meeting has been re-arranged due to the date conflicting with the General Election.

MEMBER REPRESENTATIONS

No member representations have been received.

PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS

Objection Reps	4	Support Reps	1	Neutral Reps	0
-----------------------	---	---------------------	---	---------------------	---

The application has been publicised in the local press. Site notices have been erected in the vicinity of the site and notification letters have also been sent to local residents informing them of this planning application. As a result of this 5 letters of objection, from 4 local residents, and 1 letter of support have been received. The contents of these can be summarised as follows:

Letter of support

- Future buyer from Milnrow wants to upgrade has stated that we need houses and this site is better than the horrible car dismantling repair sheds that were

there previous - blocking the road with unsightly damaged vehicles and commercial trucks.

- Milnrow already comprises a mixture of materials, styles and designs so is not sure what the difference is with this development as it is tucked away and not in a conservation area.
- The dormers need to be taken off, the surrounding old wall that was demolished should be replaced and formed right round to the development entrance and the existing cottage to be rendered appropriately. Aside from this once the site and its borders are finished and the houses rain stained in a few years they will be great and nothing unusual to other dwellings in Milnrow.

Letters of objection

- The development is at an advanced stage of work with all five properties almost complete however the developer seems hell bent on defying the planning officer by refusing to carry out essential works to comply with the original planning consents dating back to 2015/2016.
- No details are included as to the boundary detail fronting Moorhouse Fold.
- Although the application is made with regard to five premises there are; within the boundary of the site; six properties which include the cottage at number 1 Moorhouse Fold.
- The application refers to two vehicles per premises this would make a total of 12 vehicles to be accommodated within the site. Where are these to be accommodated and how?
- The documentation presented in respect of traffic is out of date and does not represent the present number of private vehicles to neighbouring properties and significant traffic to and from the school.
- 8 car parking spaces for 5 houses is limited.
- School traffic/vehicles often park in front of our garages and block access.
- There is little or no facility within the development for gardens or defensible spaces or places for children to play. In fact the access to the on-site parking spaces would necessitate crossing very close to the doorway of number one.
- In the submitted plans the only difference with the previously rejected plans is that the dormer windows have been removed.

- The roof profile has not been reduced as was required and there is still within the roof space scope to provide accommodation again previously rejected.
- The builders can't even build a temporary fence without it falling down each week. How many times do I have to move it from blocking the road?
- Concerns that temporary fence will be altered to allow a gate and access to rear garden area for bin storage.
- An old oil slump has been emptied into the ground during construction.
- If application is refused urges immediate demolition. If it is approved urge that any conditions are rigidly applied.

Officer response: The local resident's concerns, where they form material planning considerations, are covered in the main body of this report.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

1. The principle of residential development on this site, and the shape, form and layout of the development has already been established through the previous extant planning permission (16/00530/FUL) for five dwellings and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Design

2. Following the refusal of planning permission of the previous application (18/01252/FUL) discussions took place with the applicant's agent in respect of potential alterations that would overcome the previous reasons for refusal. A number of potential revisions have been discussed. However, the applicant only proposes to remove the unauthorised rear dormers under this application.
3. The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by rows of terraced housing that are constructed in either natural stone or red brick, with pitched or hipped slate roofs. Many of these share other distinctive features such as recessed vertically aligned ground and first floor windows, which provide balanced and symmetrical facades. Moreover, the semi-detached cottage, at 1 Moorhouse Fold, which sits within the heart of the site and remains largely untouched, and like a number of other properties in the area contains traditional timber mullion windows.
4. It is recognised that the previously approved scheme was of an unusual stepped profile design with differing window sizes. However this did incorporate some traditional features and characteristics that are prevalent in the surrounding area.

These included stone slate roofs and first floor windows divided by mullions. Planning conditions were also attached to the permission in an attempt to ensure that materials, including the use of natural stone in the elevational treatment and the site boundary treatment were provided. Details of the windows and doors, including their materials, recesses and opening profiles were also required to be submitted to and approved by the LPA.

5. However, the proposed development does not incorporate any of these details and the planning conditions attached to the original permission were not discharged. Instead, the scheme, which has been substantially constructed, comprises a visually confusing mixture of materials, bulky interlocking concrete roof tiles, and randomly positioned decorative features.
6. As previously noted, discussions have taken place between the LPA and the applicant in an attempt to overcome planning officer concerns. The LPA is mindful that the size, shape and profile of the building is largely consistent with what was previously granted planning permission (Ref: 18/01252/FUL). As such they are reluctantly of the view that it would be difficult to resist granting planning permission for a scheme which showed the bulky interlocking marley modern roof materials to be replaced by natural slate, and the introduction of a robust attractively designed 1.8m high natural stone wall to replace the existing means of enclosure. The applicant was given the opportunity to revise the scheme to take account of this advice but has chosen not to do so. The LPA therefore has no other alternative than to maintain its view that the proposed development appears as a prominent, unsympathetic and irregular form of development that would be uncharacteristic and conspicuous within its context.
7. Therefore, for the reasons provided above, the proposal would fall significantly short of the expectations of CS Policies DM1 and P3. Amongst other things, these require all development proposals to be of high quality design, taking the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, and landscape in general.
8. Paragraph 124 of the Framework also advises that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and help make development acceptable to communities. For the reasons provided above it is also that the proposal would amount to poor design under paragraphs 124 and 130 of the Framework.

Heritage

9. The application site is located in proximity to a Grade II listed building known as Moorhouse Farmhouse (the listed building). In accordance with the statutory

duty set out in Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (S66), special regard must be paid to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they may possess.

10. The listed building comprises a two-storey dwelling house finished in natural stone (with larger quoins to the corners) and a stone slab roof. The building's elevations include a series of triple-pane 'Pennine' timber windows divided by flat stone mullions. The building's principal frontage faces south onto Moorhouse Fold, with areas of its curtilage to the east side and rear (north) comprising a combination of hard and soft landscaping. A random stone boundary wall reaching some 1.25 metres in height follows the curvature of the building's eastern and northern boundaries and is backed by taller conifers reaching approximately 4 metres in height.

11. The listing description is as follows:

12. Farmhouse. Late C18. Hammer-dressed watershot stone with graduated stone slate roof. Double-depth plan with 2 bays and 2 storeys. Quoins. Central square-cut door surround flanked by 3-light flat-faced stone mullion windows each with one mullion removed. 10-light workshop window on first floor with 1 mullion removed, 4 blocked lights and a continuous sill band. Gable chimney stacks. Rear partly obscured by a later addition, has 3-light windows on the upper floor (each with a mullion removed). The adjoining farm buildings are not included in this entry.

13. The significance of this heritage asset is therefore considered to derive from its special architectural detailing and interest.

14. The setting of a heritage asset is defined in the Glossary to the Framework:

15. "The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral."

16. It is acknowledged that the setting of this listed building already includes terrace housing at close quarters and that the previously approved application (16/00530/FUL) was considered to respect the character and setting, and not harm the significance of the listed building. However, this view was taken on the basis of the negative contribution that the now demolished garage buildings had on its setting at the time of the application. This is no longer the case as they have been removed.

17. The development is situated only approximately 19 metres away from the listed building and whilst it does not conceal any of its architectural features, its close proximity to the site results in it clearly forming a part of the surroundings in which the heritage asset is experienced. The Conservation Officer has been consulted and has raised a number of concerns about the uncharacteristic materials and features that have been used in the development. These include the roof, fascia and verges, windows, and boundary treatment and are thereby consistent with those set out in the design section of this report.
18. As previously mentioned, the LPA are of the opinion that the previous approval of the site under Ref: 16/00530/FUL would make it difficult to argue against some of the features i.e the windows, fascia and verges at any subsequent appeal. However the roof materials and design and appearance of the timber fencing is such that they would visually compete with and distract from important views of this designated heritage asset. As a result it negatively contributes to and causes material harm to the experience of the asset within its setting. It therefore does not preserve the setting of the listed building, which in accordance with S66 the LPA is required to have special regard.
19. This harm is considered to be less than substantial, but nevertheless of considerable overall importance and weight. Where any harm to the significance of designated heritage assets would be less than substantial, paragraph 196 of the Framework states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. No public benefits have been advanced in the applicant's heritage statement, and therefore would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the significance and setting of the listed building as a designated heritage asset.
20. For the reasons provided above the proposal would therefore conflict with the CS Policies DM1, P2 and P3. Amongst other things, these require developments to respect context where it is positive and have regard to density, layout, landscape and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general as well as protecting, conserving and enhancing the Borough's key heritage assets.

Living conditions

21. The unauthorised rear dormers that have been constructed on Block A are now proposed to be removed and replaced with 4 velux windows.
22. The submitted plans show there to be one additional second floor bedroom within the roof space of each of the two properties in Block A. Whilst these would only be served by rooflights there would be 2 roof lights positioned within the front roof plane, and 2 in rear roof place of each of these properties. Given the size of the

bedrooms, the LPA is satisfied that these would ensure that they would not appear overly dark or gloomy as there would be sufficient natural light.

23. The cill heights of the rear roof lights also measure around 1.7 metres, which would result in much of the outlook from these being of the sky. Whilst outward views from these windows when standing would be possible for some people the level of outlook and privacy levels of the residents of No's 35-39 Rochdale Road are not considered to be limited to such a degree as to warrant the refusal of the application on this basis. The LPA are therefore satisfied that sufficient separation distances and relationships between proposed and existing properties would also ensure that the living conditions of neighbouring residents and future occupiers would not be unduly effected.
24. The Council's Public Protection Section have also been consulted and not raised any objections in regards to potential noise and disturbance.
25. As such it is considered that in this respect, the proposal would comply with CS Policy DM1, which amongst other things, requires all development proposals to not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, and loss of privacy.

Access, Highways and Parking

26. The Council's Highway Section has been consulted in respect of the car parking provision, manoeuvrability within the site and highway safety.
27. The development site falls below accepted standards for the adoption of roads by the Council. However, they state that design standards do allow small sections of localised narrowing and the impact of the traffic movements is also considered to be low for this site.
28. Although they originally objected to the scheme, having reviewed the planning history of the site and the previous consultation responses from the highways section they do not consider that they could sustain an objection on highway grounds.
29. Whilst they have not suggested any conditions, it is considered that those attached to the previous consent would also be reasonable and necessary in this instance (if the application was recommended for approval). These included the requirement for the submission of schemes to be approved for the design, construction and drainage details of the new estate road and car parking areas, for the details of the locations of bollards, and to widen the carriageway of Moorhouse Fold and the realignment of the footway along the site's frontage. Subject to these conditions, the proposal would comply with the requirements of CS policies T2 and DM1.

Contamination, drainage and ecology

30. The Council's contaminated land officer and drainage officer have been consulted and have both raised no objections in regards to contaminated land and drainage matters. However the drainage officer's response requires the submission and approval of a detailed drainage scheme. United Utilities have also not raised any objections subject to conditions for a surface water drainage scheme, the drainage of foul and surface water to be on separate systems, and a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan.
31. The GMEU has not raised any objections on ecology grounds as the buildings that were demolished had only low potential to support bats.
32. In these respects the proposal would comply with CS Policies G7, G8, G9 and Saved UPD Policies EM/7 and EM/8. In combination these seek, amongst other things, to recognise and protect sites and features of biodiversity importance, manage water resources and flood risk, and reduce the impact on pollution and contamination.

Conclusion

33. In conclusion, the LPA has entered into discussions with the applicant to achieve a compromise solution. However, the applicant has confirmed that they are only willing to remove the rear dormers. The LPA therefore has no other alternative than to maintain its view that the proposed development appears as a prominent, unsympathetic and irregular form of development that would be uncharacteristic and conspicuous within its context. It would also visually compete with and distract from important views of the Grade II Listed Building known as Moorhouse Farmhouse and thereby conflict with Policies DM1, P2 and P3 the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Planning and Licensing Committee resolves it is minded to **REFUSE planning permission for the following reasons:**

1. The proposed development would introduce a visually confusing mixture of materials and would appear as a prominent and irregular form of development that would be uncharacteristic and conspicuous within its context. It would therefore not constitute high quality design and have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would also visually compete with and distract from important views of the Grade II Listed Building known as Moorhouse Farmhouse. No public benefits are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm that this would cause to the significance and setting of this designated heritage asset. As such it would thereby not preserve the setting

of the Listed Building and thereby conflict with Policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By reason of its siting, materials and design the approximate 1.8 metre high timber fencing would present an unsympathetic and strident hard edge that would be out of keeping with and significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would also visually compete with and distract from important views of the Grade II Listed Building known as Moorhouse Farmhouse. No public benefits are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm that this would cause to the significance and setting of this designated heritage asset. As such it would thereby not preserve the setting of the Listed Building and thereby conflict with Policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.