

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)**Full Planning Application**

APPLICATION REFERENCE: 25/00312/FUL

Applicant McDonald's Restaurants Ltd C/O Agent	Agent Mr Henry Mackenzie(Lichfields) Sixth Floor, Ship Canal House 98 King Street Manchester M2 4WU
---	---

Part I - Particulars of Application

Proposal: Development of a drive-thru restaurant (Use Class E / Sui Generis) with associated access, servicing, car parking, hard and soft landscaping, substation, engineering works and other associated works

Location: Land At Junction of Water Street and Molesworth Street, Rochdale

Valid On: 9 April 2025

DECISION: REFUSE PERMISSION**Refusal(s) (3)**

- 1 The development proposals would site a fast-food outlet within walking distance of Rochdale Interchange, Rochdale Riverside, Rochdale Sixth Form College and Hopwood Hall College and thus are in clear conflict with the requirements of paragraph 97a) of the National Planning Policy Framework. Furthermore, the application is not supported by sufficient evidence that clearly discounts an adverse impact upon the health outcomes in both children and adults both locally and across the borough given that it would place an additional hot food takeaway use within an area identified as having one of the highest concentrations of such uses nationally, and where dire and declining health outcomes in children and adults that include preventable illnesses which can in part be attributed to poor dietary choices have been identified. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy C6 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P6 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed development, in light of the proposed site layout, building position, boundary treatments, engineering works and landscaping, the

absence of active frontages to the surrounding highway network, the dominative presence of large expanses of car parking, clear lack of priority for pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable users, and the scale, form and elevational treatment of the store building would fall well-short of the expectation for new development to be well-designed. The development proposals ultimately comprise a form of development which is a wholly car-dominated, unsustainable form of development that places pedestrians and active travel users at the lowest priority, which sits at a disharmony with the positive qualities and characteristics of the surrounding built and natural environment and seeks to deliver visually unresolved and incongruous forms of development at a secondary gateway to, and at the edge of, Rochdale Town Centre. The proposals therefore fail to comply with contents of Policies P1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 By reason of the site access and the internal site layout, the proposals would not ensure a safe environment for pedestrians, cyclists, and in particular, the most vulnerable groups of society as they would fail to be afforded priority by design. The proposals therefore fail to comply with the requirements of Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policies JP-C6 and JP-C8 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Date of Decision: 03/03/2026

Melanie Hale
Head of Planning

IMPORTANT

PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE READ AND FULLY UNDERSTOOD THE CONTENTS OF THIS DECISION NOTICE. YOUR ATTENTION IS DRAWN TO THE ATTACHED NOTES.

INFORMATIVE:

The Local Planning Authority's reasons for its decision are set out in the accompanying officer's report.

Your attention is drawn to the following (2)	
1	The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could

	have made the development acceptable, and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.
2	For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following list of plans: • 3484_AEW_2285_1001 – Location Plan • 13484_AEW_2285_1002 Rev. C – Block Plan • 4230334-SK03 Rev. I2 – Existing Site Plan • 13484_AEW_2285_1004 Rev. E – Proposed Site Plan • 13484_AEW_2285_1005 Rev. D – Proposed Building Elevations • 13484_AEW_2285_1006 Rev. B – Proposed Building Floor and Roof Plan • 13484_AEW_2285_1012 – Proposed Site Sections and Contextual Elevations • 13484_AEW_2285_1015 Rev. B – Proposed Site Landscape Plan • A6748-01 Rev. C – Landscaping Scheme • 4230334-1101 Rev. P1 – Retaining Wall Details • 4230334-SK01 Rev. I4 – Proposed Levels and Overland Flow Routes • AMA-53024-SK-004-3.3 Rev. P01 - PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS

INFORMATIVE:

The Local Planning Authority's reasons for its decision are set out in the accompanying officer's report.

INFORMATIVE:

If you are unhappy with the decision to refuse permission you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Details of how to appeal can be obtained from the Planning Inspectorate, Customer Support Unit, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN or

via their website at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-appeals-procedural-guide>.