

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
25/00353/FUL	Claire Ringwood	26 th March 2026

Address: Cope Funeral Services Ltd, West Hill House, 158-170 Manchester Road

Proposal: Demolition of existing funeral home and detached garages and the erection of 28 self-contained apartments within three blocks over 3/4 floors with associated landscaping and on-site parking, cycle storage and bin storage, new vehicular entrance from Castle Avenue, closure of the vehicular entrance from Manchester Road and new pedestrian entrance from Manchester Road.

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site Notice expired?	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	Y

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to OnBase?	N/A
-----	--	-----

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

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE
----------------	--------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: MH

DATE: 27/03/2026

SITE

The application site is occupied by Cope Funeral Services which is a single storey building located on the corner of Manchester Road and Castle Avenue close to Rochdale Town Centre. There is a block of garages located to the southern end of the site. The building is set back from Manchester Road with a vehicle and pedestrian access from both Manchester Road and Castle Avenue. The frontage comprises grass and landscaping with an area of parking to the north-west corner. Ground levels vary at the site which sits higher than Manchester Road.

The site is surrounded by predominantly residential properties of varying ages and styles although there are some commercial buildings within close proximity.

The site falls within a Defined Urban Area (G/D/1) and a Physical Regeneration Area (G/R/1) as defined in Rochdale Borough Council's saved Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Proposals Map. Small areas of the site also fall within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone and an HSE consultation zone.

PROPOSAL

The proposal has been amended following concerns raised by officers on 9th October 2025 in regard to the massing, design, appearance, level of landscaping and impact on neighbouring properties along with various concerns / matters that were outstanding following consultee responses. The original scheme was for one three-storey block comprising 28 units (12 x 1 bedroom and 16 x 2 bedroom). The central atrium comprised a concierge entrance on the ground floor, staff facilities on the first floor and a gym on the second floor.

The amended scheme seeks permission for the erection of three blocks. Two blocks comprise a four-storey building and the third a three-storey building. The development comprises 28 residential apartments consisting of 2 x 1 bedroom and 6 x 2 bedroom flats in each 4 storey building and 12 x 1 bedroom flats in the 3 storey building. The application form states all the flats are to be provided as open market housing. A proposed rear elevation and a side elevation of the three storey block has not been submitted.

The buildings have a flat roof and the submitted plans state the development would comprise a mixture of brick, various types of cladding, louvered grills, aluminium copings and perforated metal screening.

The proposed buildings would be located close to the street frontage and vehicular access will be from Castle Avenue with 19 car parking spaces proposed to the north of the site, including 2 disabled parking spaces. Six of the car parking spaces are located at ground floor level in an undercroft area below the proposed three storey building. The cycle and bin stores are located on the ground floor of the three-storey building.

An area of landscaping is proposed to the south-west of the site with some additional perimeter landscaping to the site frontage and the north and south of the site.

The existing boundary wall is to be retained and the Manchester Road access blocked up with stone to match the existing wall.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS WITH APPLICANT/AGENT

The agent was advised on the basis of the initial submission that the proposed development could not be supported due to significant concerns with the massing, design

and appearance of the scheme along with concerns with the level of landscaping and impact on neighbouring properties. There were also outstanding issues raised by consultees. Given the extent of revisions considered necessary, officers recommended a pre-application process to work through the varied concerns.

Despite the above, revised plans were submitted making substantial amendments including a change in the number of buildings, the number of storeys proposed, and the quantum of apartments. Nevertheless, following a further review the agent was advised that there remained significant concerns with the proposals, including new issues arising due to the revised design. Several issues raised by consultees also remained outstanding.

The Council's Local List is explicit in highlighting that where applicants '*haven't engaged in pre-application discussions, we will not normally negotiate amendments to applications that are unacceptable, not policy compliant or which lack the required information for us to make a decision*'. Given the reviews undertaken on both the original and significantly altered proposals have raised serious concerns, officers did not consider it appropriate to invite further substantial changes through the same application.

PLANS AND DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED

The following plans and documents were submitted on 18th July 2025:

Drawing No: 24067-001 Rev A – Existing Floor Plans and Elevations

Drawing No: 24067-002 – Existing Floor Plans and Elevations (Garage)

Drawing No: 24067-200 Rev A – Site Location Plan

Drawing No: 24067-201 Rev A – Proposed Floor Plans

Drawing No: 24067-202 Rev A – Proposed Floor Plans

Drawing No: 24067-203 Rev B – Proposed Floor Plans

Drawing No: 24067-210 Rev B – Proposed Elevations

Drawing No: 24067-220 Rev A – Proposed Site Plan

Drawing No: 24067-230 Rev A – Topographical Survey

Drawing No: 24067-231 Rev A – Site Sections

Drawing No: 24067-240 Rev A – Proposed Landscaping

Design & Access Statement

Supporting Planning Statement by Summit Planning Associates, Ref:

1235.1.BCA(AC).AJO.Fn2, March 2025

Transport Statement by Mode Transport Planning, Project No: 328568, Version 1.3,

Date: 14 July 2025

Arboricultural Implications Assessment by Mulberry, Date: 27 February 2025, Ref:

TRE/WHHMR/Rev A

Arboricultural Method Statement by Mulberry, Date: 27 February 2025, Ref:

TRE/WHHMR/Rev A

Crime Impact Statement by Greater Manchester Police designforsecurity, Version A:

31/03/2025, Ref: 2025/0073/CIS/01

Energy & Climate Change Statement by BlueChip Architecture

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Rachel Hacking Ecology, Ref: RHE.4450.01, Date 07/04/2025

The following amended plans were submitted on 18th December 2026:

Drawing No: 24067-201 Rev B – Proposed Floor Plans

Drawing No: 24067-202 Rev B – Proposed Floor Plans

Drawing No: 24067-203 Rev C – Proposed Floor Plans

Drawing No: 24067-204 – Proposed Floor Plans

Drawing No: 24067-205 – Proposed Floor Plans

Drawing No: 24067-210 Rev C – Proposed Elevations

Drawing No: 24067-211 Rev C – Proposed Elevations
Drawing No: 24067-220 Rev B – Proposed Site Plan
Drawing No: 24067-230 Rev B – Topographical Survey
Drawing No: 24067-231 Rev B – Site Sections
Drawing No: 24067-232 – Site Sections B

The following plan was submitted on 30th January 2026:
Drawing No: 24067-240 – Proposed Drainage Plan

The following information was submitted on 2nd March 2026:
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Rachel Hacking Ecology, Ref: RHE.4450.01, Date 27/02/2026
The Statutory Biodiversity Metric
The Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Technical Annex 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

JP-S1	Sustainable Development
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S3	Heat and Energy Networks
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-H1	Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
JP-H2	Affordability of New Housing
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design and New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-G6	Urban Green Space
JP-G7	Trees and Woodland
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P5	Education, Skills and Knowledge
JP-C1	An Integrated Network
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets for All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO2 Creating successful and healthy communities

C1 Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places
C2 Focusing on regeneration areas and economic growth corridors / areas
C3 Delivering the right type of housing
C4 Providing affordable homes

C6 Improving health and wellbeing
C7 Delivering education facilities

SO3 Improving design, image and quality of place

P1 Improving image
P3 Improving design of new development

SO4 Promoting a greener environment

G2 Energy and 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 stability

SO5 Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport

T2 Improving accessibility

DM1 General development requirements
DM2 Delivering planning contributions and infrastructure

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).
Affordable Housing SPD (March 2008)
Provision of Open Space in New Housing SPD (March 2008, updated January 2017)

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

78/D07432 - Outline Application For Sixty One Flats. Approved 11/12/1978.

15/00689/ADV - Two non-illuminated car park directional signs. Approved 25/08/2015.

15/01367/FUL - Installation of floodlighting to front elevation and chapel. Approved 22/01/2016.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Environment Agency

No comments at the time of writing.

Electricity North West

No comments at the time of writing.

Cadent Gas

Summary: No objection however, there are high-pressure pipelines in the area and it is a statutory requirement to input details into the HSE's Planning Advice Web App.

Health & Safety Executive

Summary: The HSE does not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.

United Utilities

Summary: The applicant is required to submit detailed drainage plans prior to determination or subject to a condition. Management and maintenance of SuDS is also required.

Urban Design

Summary: Given the ability to submit revised drawings, the applicant has not meaningfully addressed previously highlighted weaknesses. A robust pre-application process is now essential, as the current submission does not demonstrate the level of design consideration expected.

Highways

Summary: No objection subject to a dilapidation survey condition.

Transport for Greater Manchester

Summary: No objection subject to matters such as access, parking, cycle and bin storage being addressed.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary: Inaccurate and insufficient information has been provided.

Environmental Protection (Land)

Summary: A condition for a Preliminary Risk Assessment is required.

Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service

Summary: No archaeological matters in this instance.

Greater Manchester Police – Crime Prevention Team

Summary: A condition is required to ensure the scheme is design and constructed in accordance with the submitted Crime Impact Statement and/or achieves the Secured by Design (SBD) Award.

GM Fire Service

No comments at the time of writing.

Drainage Officer

Summary: The drainage proposals are not acceptable in principle, the drainage plans appear to be inaccurate and significantly lacking in detail.

Environmental Health (Noise)

Summary: No objection subject to conditions.

Environmental Management (Refuse)

Summary: 6 x 1100L bins are required.

RBC Public Open Space Officer

Summary: A financial contribution is required to be split between Sparth MUGA and Rochdale Leisure Centre.

RBC Education

No comments provided

Environmental Health (Air)

Summary: A Dust Management Plan to include each stage of development is required along with the inclusion of sustainable building methods, the installation of charge points and an air quality assessment.

Strategic Planning

No comments at the time of writing.

Street Lighting Officer

No comments at the time of writing.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to the occupiers of surrounding properties and the application has been publicised in the local press and with a site notice. 26 letters of objection (from 19 individuals) have been received. The representations are summarised below:

1. Inadequate consultation undertaken on the application.
2. The developer or LPA failed to adequately address concerns raised by residents during the consultation process, key issues were not adequately responded to, or were dismissed without proper and genuine consideration;
3. Section 20 Consultation (for Major Works) this is a specific legal process that landlords have to follow, when did this take place and where are the documents;
4. What Environmental Impact Assessment or audit was carried out on the possible health impacts of the 18 parking spaces;
5. What air pollution monitoring will be carried out during and after demolition;
6. What alternative provision, if any, has been made to the loss of the existing meeting room which residents use;
7. What consideration has been given, if any, for any future continued development or change of use for the site;
8. Incorrect address stated in the application submission;
9. Overdevelopment of the site;
10. Out of scale with the area;

11. Would erode the identity, aesthetic and historic integrity of the neighbourhood;
12. The scale of the development may lead to anti-social behaviour;
13. Cumulative impacts with other developments ongoing in the area;
14. Overbearing impact;
15. Loss of light and overshadowing;
16. Loss of privacy;
17. Loss of views;
18. Increase in air pollution;
19. Noise, disturbance and littering from future occupiers and during construction;
20. Impact on quality of life;
21. Loss of existing green space and biodiversity;
22. Open space for future residents has been extremely limited;
23. Does the parking provision meet adopted standards;
24. Parking is inadequate;
25. Loss of car parking on a site between Castle Inn and St Albans Hotel will increase on-street parking;
26. Impact on existing roads and access for emergency services;
27. Impact on local businesses due to difficulty parking;
28. Highway safety especially for children and vulnerable people;
29. Under provision of refuse facilities;
30. Proximity of bins to existing residential properties and impact of this;
31. There are already too many unoccupied flats within Rochdale already;
32. If this application is approved consideration should be given to existing residents parking permits;
33. Pressure on local services;
34. Lack of affordable housing

Officer Notes: The application was initially submitted, validated and neighbour letters sent out with an incorrect site address. Once this matter was brought to the attention of officers, the application was invalidated and the documents removed from the Council's website. Amended documents referring to the correct site address were subsequently submitted, and the application was validated and neighbouring properties re-notified. A press notice was advertised in the local newspaper and a site notice was also displayed at the site. Neighbour notification letters were sent to properties adjoining the site and those facing it. The statutory 21-day consultation period was given in the neighbour notification letters and the site notice and at no time was a request to extend this date received. Officers are therefore satisfied that their statutory duty to notify neighbouring properties was undertaken correctly.

It should be noted that the LPA have not been involved in any discussions with the applicant prior to the application being submitted. Although the LPA would recommend that applicants consult with local communities/councillors/stakeholders in advance of a major planning application being submitted, this is at the discretion of the applicant.

The application is not of a size that requires an Environmental Impact Assessment.

Following amendments to the scheme, letters were sent on 13th January 2026 to all those previously consulted, or who made representations. No further comments have been received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The application site is allocated as a Defined Urban Area under the Proposals Map of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). Policy G/D/1 of the UDP aims to locate new development in the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside.

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.

The latest published information suggests that the Council can demonstrate over 5 years' worth of deliverable housing sites, as required by national policy however, this does not preclude the promotion of sustainable development where this can assist in delivering additional housing to meet local needs. The recent adoption of PfE has also increased the housing requirement to 616 averaged across the plan period.

The application seeks permission for the erection of three blocks of flats on a previously developed site in close proximity to Rochdale Town Centre. The site is within a predominantly residential area and is in a sustainable location, close to a local supermarket and a number of sustainable transport options are available. The building will provide residential accommodation across 28 units with a mix of 1 and 2 bedrooms.

As such, the principle of development in the urban area for residential purposes is considered acceptable and in accordance with Policy C1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy G/D/1 of the saved UDP, Policy JP-H1 of PfE as well as the NPPF however, this factor must be balanced against all other material considerations, as outlined below.

Housing Mix

Read individually or collectively, the Core Strategy, PfE and the NPPF seek to ensure that planning decisions should result in places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policy JP-H3 of PfE states *'residential development should provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes reflecting local plan policies, and having regard to masterplans, guidance and relevant local evidence'*.

Paragraph 61 of the NPPF sets out that *"to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet as much of an area's identified housing need as possible, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community"*.

Policy C3 of the Core Strategy seeks to deliver the right type of homes, well designed and built to appropriate densities, to meet the overall needs and aspirations of the borough and to do this, in this instance Policy C3 seeks to *"Ensure new development provides housing types that take account of local needs and aspirations"*.

The proposed development comprises 28 units (16 x 1 bedroom and 12 x 2 bedroom) consisting of 2 x 1 bedroom and 6 x 2 bedroom flats in the 4 storey buildings and 12 x 1 bedroom flats in the 3 storey building. Based on the site's location in a sustainable location with good access to the town centre, this mix is considered appropriate in terms of size of units.

Affordable Housing

The provisions of Policy C4 of the Core Strategy and the Council's Affordable Housing SPD, set out a requirement of approximately 15% of homes to be affordable, equating to 7.5% of Gross Development Value. The Core Strategy sets a clear expectation that affordable housing will be provided onsite and that off-site contributions may be used in exceptional circumstances.

The proposed development will lead to the creation of 28 residential apartments, all of which are identified for market sale. The submitted Planning Statement states the appropriate contribution will be secured by way of S106 but provides no justification as to why onsite provision has not been included. For affordable housing however, no further details have been provided. The application is not supported by any draft heads of terms so it is also unclear what contribution is expected. Overall, the application has not provided sufficient information to address the local and national policy requirements for provision of affordable housing. Had the application been considered acceptable in all other regards, further information would have been sought to address these issues.

Design and Appearance

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that *"the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve"*. Paragraph 135 goes on to state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

Additionally, paragraph 139 sets out that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

The National Design Guide (NDG) states that *"The long-standing, fundamental principles for good design are that is it: fit for purpose; durable; and brings delight"*. The NDG advises that scale, appearance materiality and detailing of buildings are key components for well-designed places. The Building for a Healthy Life guidance document states that building forms and materials should be used to reflect local character.

The above considerations are largely reflected within Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's Core Strategy which ultimately require development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. Policy JP-H3 of PfE states that *'innovation in housing development will be supported where it is consistent with the principles of good design'*.

Core Strategy Policy P1 sets out that high quality design will be required in all new developments, requiring that under-used land and buildings are re-used and creating people-friendly and safe environments. Core Strategy Policy C3 requires new development to adhere to high standards of design, respecting context (scale, density, massing, height, layout) and contributing positively to the townscape. Core Strategy Policy DM1 states that all development proposals should be of a high-quality design and takes the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.

The existing building occupies a large area of the application site and although it has little in the way of architectural merit, its scale means that it is not imposing within the street scene and sits comfortably within the predominantly residential area. The existing

building has a predominantly flat roof and is single storey in nature and set within landscaped grounds. The change in levels on the site, mean the existing building is at a higher level than the road.

The proposed development (as amended) introduces two, 4 storey blocks and a 3 storey block in a modern design with a flat roof. The top floor of the four storey blocks are slightly set in from the floors below and there comprise numerous types of materials to the elevations. The submitted Site Sections indicate that the existing levels will be significantly lowered to road level and would be significantly lower than the neighbouring property at 172 Manchester Road (requiring substantial excavation) however, officers are not convinced this is an accurate reflection of the levels at the site and with the neighbouring properties, acknowledging that the site sections indicate the areas not surveyed.

It is clear that consideration has been given to the relationship with the neighbouring properties to the front and rear of the scheme as the submitted Proposed Site Plan references the distances to boundaries and elevations however, none are shown for neighbouring properties to the sides. The three storey building is approximately in line with 156 Manchester Road however, the four storey block adjacent to 172 Manchester Road is set forward of this neighbouring property by approximately 3m.

The Council is not averse to modern designs, and providing interest to the street scene is encouraged however, the Council has always maintained its concern with the scale, massing, design and appearance of the proposed development. The Council's Urban Design Officer raised strong concerns in their initial comments stating that a three-storey building might be acceptable in principle but the proposal fell short of the design quality needed to support that scale and referred to the combination of materials as haphazard and with poor detailing. The submitted Design & Access Statement failed to assess the site and its context or explain the rationale behind the design decisions.

The amended scheme divided the building into 3 blocks and increased the height of two of these blocks to four storey. The buildings were moved back from the footpath slightly, the balconies were removed and there were amendments to the proposed materials and bin storage. However, the overall footprint of the proposed development has generally remained the same with the same number of units proposed. Officers feel little has been addressed in terms of scale, massing, design and appearance and the increase in the height of two of the blocks is a clear indication that the concerns initially raised and those of the Council's Urban Design Officer have not been taken into consideration.

The existing, attractive boundary stone wall is to be retained and the inclusion of parking, bin stores and plant areas to the rear of the development are welcome however, an updated Design & Access Statement was not submitted to justify the significant differences in height of the proposed development with the neighbouring properties and existing building lines.

The amended proposal is considered to have an unsympathetic appearance and is an incongruous addition within the street scene. The proposed development remains excessive in scale, height and massing and is overly dominant in the street scene of this part of Manchester Road and it would be particularly out of scale with, and overbearing to, the neighbouring two-storey detached property at 172 Manchester Road.

The Council's Urban Design Officer remains of the opinion that the proposed building would have benefitted from responding to the streets terraced housing typology which is characterised by consistent frontages, generous internal floor to ceiling heights, well-proportioned elevations and pitched roofs. In contrast, the amended scheme provides

compressed floor to ceiling heights, resulting in an incoherent streetscene which does not reflect local characteristics as encouraged by Building for a Healthy Life design toolkit (BHL): *“Positive characteristics such as street types, urban grain, plot shapes, building forms and materials should inform new development”*. This lack of cohesion with the surrounding streetscene is exacerbated by the material palette which does not demonstrate any relationship with local precedents.

Additionally, the finished floor level relies on significant excavation works so officers have serious reservations as to the ability to achieve this finished floor level, whilst retaining the boundary wall and including the indicated frontage landscaping within such a confined space. Give this constraint and considering the context of the street which benefits from street trees and green boundaries as common features the design fails to provide a sufficient landscaped setting for the scale of the buildings.

The Urban Design Officer stated the proposed development introduces a fragmented perimeter block structure, blank or largely blank street corners which reduce street activity, passive surveillance and limits visual interest. The blocks arrangement also creates areas of left over, purposeless space, including a newly introduced narrow alleyway which will create safety concerns without serving any functional purpose. The ground floor apartments to the rear also lack privacy if residents were to use the garden or access the car park.

For the above reasons, the proposal is considered to be excessive in scale, height and massing, overly dominant and unsympathetic in appearance. It represents poor design which fails to respect the character of the surrounding area and is an incongruous addition to the street scene of Manchester Road contrary to Rochdale Core Strategy Policies P1, P3, C3 and DM1 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Further to the above are the considerations of the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) ‘Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development’ which states that new developments *“should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.”*

Policy DM1 of the adopted Core Strategy requires that all development proposals are compatible with surrounding land uses, both in terms of its impact upon those uses and the impact of the surrounding land uses upon the amenities of future residents. Policy G9 also requires that sensitive new development such as housing, are not adversely affected by existing sources of pollution such as roads and certain types of industry.

Space Standards & Privacy

The SPD – Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development sets out minimum space standards that should be applied to all new residential development and development which affect existing residential properties.

4.2 of the SPD states *‘where buildings of three or more storeys are proposed, or there is a marked difference in levels, it may be necessary for the minimum distances set out in (ii) and (iii) above to be increased’*.

The existing buildings adjacent to the site, including those on Castle Avenue to the north, Manchester Road to the east and south and West Hill to the west are in residential use.

There is a two-storey commercial building on the opposite side of Manchester Road to the south east of the site but this backs onto the A58.

The Proposed Site Plan shows distances of 10.9m from the rear elevation of the 4-storey block to the rear boundary of properties on West Hill and 172 Manchester Road and a distance of 16.7m back-to-side with properties on West Hill. The property at 38 West Hill has two side facing windows, one at ground floor and one at first floor. The properties at 39, 40 and 41 West Hill have back-to-back distances shown varying from 21.8m to 22.5m. There are distances shown on the Proposed Site Plan varying from 19.6m to 23m between the front elevations of the proposed buildings and the neighbouring properties facing the application on Manchester Road.

Officers have measured a distance of approximately 14m between the side elevation of the proposed three storey building and 156 Manchester Road and a minimum of approximately 4.5m and a maximum of 5.4m between the side elevation of the four-storey block and the side elevation of 172 Manchester Road.

Whilst most of these measurements narrowly meet the minimum space standards set out above if the proposed building was of an equal scale to the existing properties, taking into consideration the four/three storey nature of the blocks, the levels onsite and the large floor to ceiling windows proposed, Officers consider that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the living environment of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy and overlooking.

The distances between the proposed development and the neighbouring properties are not adequate and as the Council's SPD specifically refers to increased distances being necessary where buildings of three or more are proposed, the scheme would also be visually dominant and overbearing and introduce a level of overlooking which would impact on neighbouring properties privacy.

Noise and Disturbance

In terms of noise and disturbance from future occupiers of the proposed development, the site is within a predominantly residential area and introducing another residential use into the area is not considered detrimental to the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

Whilst there would inevitably be some noise and disturbance during demolition and construction works, had the application been acceptable, conditions would have been able to sufficiently mitigate these impacts.

Taking all of the above into consideration the proposed development is contrary to Policies DM1 and G9 of the Core Strategy, the Council's SPD and the NPPF.

Living conditions of future occupiers

The application site is close to the A58 which is a busy main route into and out of Rochdale Town Centre. A Noise Impact Assessment has not been submitted with the application and officers cannot therefore determine whether the proposed development would be adversely affected by existing sources of pollution such as the A58 road. Notwithstanding this, the area features many residential properties and had the application been acceptable in all other regards, a Noise Impact Assessment would have been required by way of condition.

In terms of occupier amenity, the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) is a technical standards document produced by the Government to ensure internal space within new dwellings is sufficient for future occupiers. Additionally, in accordance with PfE Policy JP-H3 (Type, Size and Design of New Housing), it is a requirement for all new dwellings to comply with the nationally described space standards and be built to the accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable.

On assessment of the proposed floor plans, two of the proposed flats are marginally below the minimum requirement of 50sqm for a 1B2P dwelling, measuring 49sqm, the remainder of the proposed flats meet the NDSS minimum requirements. Although these two flats have an acceptable internal layout and are only marginally under the required NDSS, it would be expected that new developments comply with the space standards, particularly in a development of this size.

Notwithstanding this, the NDSS also requires a double bedroom to have a floor area of at least 11.5m² and be at least 2.75m wide. A single bedroom would be required to have a floor area of at least 7.5m² and be at least 2.15m wide. Bedroom measurements have not been provided however, from the officer's assessment, all bedrooms appear to be below the required space standards with the single rooms measuring approximately 6.9m² and the double rooms approximately 9.5m² to 10.8m².

Alongside the requirement for all new dwellings to comply with the NDSS they also need to be built to the accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable. Other than referenced in the policy section of the submitted Supporting Planning Statement, it is not clear whether the scheme is in compliance with Part M4(2) and taking into consideration the ground levels on the site the proposals do not seem to have shown consideration of this requirement at this stage.

The development proposes a communal garden area to the rear of the 4 storey blocks which measures approximately 272m². This would be suitable for sitting-out and for use as a communal open space however, as highlighted previously, access to this space requires residents walking directly past living room windows to the ground floor flats, presenting a conflict with the privacy of these residents.

Whilst more minor, these issues of amenity further demonstrate the unacceptable design of the proposals. The failure to demonstrate acceptable amenity standards is contrary to Policies DM1 and G9 of the Core Strategy, the Council's SPD and the NPPF.

Crime and safety

Policy P3 of the Core Strategy requires all new developments to incorporate design measures that design out crime and ensure developments and spaces are safe to use and access. Similarly, Policy DM1 requires all development proposals to minimise opportunities for crime against people or property.

The application is supported by a Crime Impact Statement (CIS) which sets out numerous points and considerations for the applicant to consider in order for the development to achieve Secured by Design accreditation.

The scheme has been amended since the submission of the Crime Impact Assessment and the Greater Manchester Police ('GMP'), Design for Security Consultant has advised that each of the blocks should be served by a single-leaf main communal entrance fronting onto Manchester Road, where surveillance opportunities over them and any

visitors coming to/from them would be maximised. They have also requested that all other external entrances to the sides and rears of the blocks should be enclosed within private space and for the use of residents only. They highlight that failure to enclose these spaces could leave resident's vehicles and the hidden windows/doors of the building itself vulnerable to attack/unauthorised access unseen, as well as the hidden/sheltered undercroft areas vulnerable to fostering loitering/gathering/nuisance issues. These potential issues reflect planning and urban design officers' previous comments on the revised design of the proposals. Fully addressing the comments from GMP would necessitate revisions to the design and would as an example still result in the dark and secluded narrow alleyway with no function, but which would require secure fencing/gating creating a further element of poorly considered design on the street frontage.

Overall, officers consider that due to the design, that clear amendments are needed to ensure the development is safe, secure and free from crime. As such, the proposed development does not comply with Policy DM1 and P3 of the Core Strategy.

Highways

Policy T2 of the Core Strategy requires development to comply with the Council's car parking standards and Policy DM1 requires that development provides satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring and servicing arrangements, taking into account the proposed use and location.

Policy JP-C8 of PfE requires new development to be located and designed to enable and encourage walking, cycling and public transport use to reduce the negative effects of car dependency and help deliver high quality, attractive, liveable and sustainable environments.

The application site is located in close proximity to Rochdale Town Centre, with plentiful amenities and facilities accessible by sustainable means of transport. The proposed development shows a provision of 19 car parking spaces including 2 disabled spaces. Cycle storage is provided next to the bin store on the ground floor of the three-storey block. The submitted plans state 28 x two tier stands although no details of these have been provided. The submitted plans are unclear as to whether the bike store is enclosed or simply a covered open store. To ensure stored bicycles are secure, the store would be required to be lockable. Had the application been acceptable in all other regards a condition would have been imposed for details of the stands to be provided and showing a lockable store.

A Transport Statement has been submitted which determines that the proposed development is anticipated to generate 6 two-way parking trips during the AM peak hour and 7 two-way trips during the PM peak hour (based on TRIPS trip rates). The proposed access will provide a 6m wide carriageway to support two-way car movements in and out of the car park. The Council's Highways Officer advised that given the sustainable location of the site, the level of parking is appropriate. The Highways Officer does not expect any problematic volume of traffic at this location and the access to the site has adequate visibility and is suitable for the type of traffic expected at this location.

The existing access from Manchester Road will be permanently closed off and had the application been acceptable in all other regards, a condition would have been imposed to ensure the footway is re-instated to adoptable standards.

Bin storage is located on the ground floor of the three-storey block adjacent to the cycle store which shows the provision of 6 x 1100L bins. Following consultation with the Council's Recycling Co-ordinator this is acceptable.

Overall, the proposed development would be sustainably located and make satisfactory arrangements for vehicle access, manoeuvring and parking, and would facilitate safe and convenient pedestrian circulation to and from the site. The Council's Highways Officer has raised no objections and subject to relevant conditions, the proposal complies with the requirements of Core Strategy Policies T1 and T2, Policy JP-C8 of PfE and the NPPF.

Landscaping and Biodiversity Net Gain

Policy G6 establishes that development should protect and improve green spaces and where trees are to be removed they should be replaced at a ratio of 2:1. This is reinforced in Policy JP-G7 of PfE which states 'where development would result in the loss of existing trees, requiring replacement on the basis of two new trees for each tree lost, or other measures that would also result in a net enhancement in the character and quality of the treescape and biodiversity value in the local area, with a preference for on-site provision'.

Policy G7 requires that sites and features of biodiversity and geodiversity importance are given full and appropriate recognition and protection and that opportunities for enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity will be supported. It is expected that development proposals will protect, enhance, and create biodiversity opportunities through new habitats, landscaping, and building and construction features wherever possible. Core Strategy Policy G7 requires that no development should result in a net loss of biodiversity and geodiversity.

PfE Policy JP-G9 seeks to deliver a net enhancement of biodiversity resources through a collective of measures which are broadly aligned with the approach to BNG outlined within the Environment Act (2021), the NPPF and supporting guidance documents. The provisions of the Environment Act in respect of BNG are now a statutory requirement for planning applications and so the proposed development should achieve net gains for biodiversity via species enhancement as guided by the NPPF (paragraphs 187d and 192b) to achieve demonstrable net gain for biodiversity.

When determining planning applications paragraph 193 of the NPPF sets out that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. Opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should also be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate (had the application been acceptable in all other regards, biodiversity enhancements would have been secured by way of condition).

The Greater Manchester Ecology Unit ('GMEU') was consulted on the application and initially advised that insufficient information had been provided regarding the BNG assessment and the bat and tree assessment. An updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and BNG metric were submitted on 2nd March 2026.

GMEU reviewed the updated PEA and BNG metric and advised on the following matters:

Bats

There appears to be very limited information regarding the trees onsite with no information provided in the results and the 'Impacts on Species' section simply stating that the trees offered negligible potential for roosting bats. More details are required

regarding the trees and if any Potential Roosting Features (PRFs) were found, particularly given that all trees are proposed to be removed.

Biodiversity Net Gain

No species lists have been provided for the baseline habitats present and the Council's Ecologist would expect this to be provided in the PEA report. A small area of ruderal/ephemeral habitat is shown in the baseline tab of the metric and within the baseline map in the report, however this is not stated within the report but should be, along with species present.

The report states that '*Multiple individual trees exist on site, ranging in size and condition.*' – this does not provide sufficient information to review the BNG and GMEU would expect the report to state how many trees are currently present and the size and condition of each. The Habitat Condition Assessments (HCAs) refers to T1 to T7 which should also be shown in the baseline plan. The report also states that the baseline trees deliver 0.1253 habitat units however, this is the size of the trees combined in hectares, not the habitat units.

Landscape Plan

There does not appear to be an updated Landscaping Plan provided even though the proposed plans have changed, therefore most of Council's Ecologists original comments still apply. The 'Proposed Landscaping' figure shown in the PEA report (Appendix 5), shows that there are proposed hedgerows and 7 small sized trees which do not appear to have been captured in the BNG metric or report. The Council's Ecologist is struggling to work out where the native mixed scrub is proposed.

The 7 trees proposed are non-native species. The Council's Ecologist recommends that native species are used, or justification should be provided as to why this is not feasible and the proposed seed mixes/ species for the modified and wildflower grassland does not appear to be provided within the report or the landscape plan but this would be expected.

Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS)

Wall cotoneaster is present onsite, and it is an offence under the terms of Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to allow the plant to grow in the wild. The Council's Ecologist recommended that a condition be imposed had the application been acceptable that prior to the commencement of any works on site (including vegetation clearance) a methodology for the control of invasive species be submitted to and agreed by the council. Once agreed the method statement must be implemented in full.

Nesting Birds

A condition was recommended for no removal of, or any works to, any trees, vegetation or buildings during the main bird breeding season as all wild birds, their nest and eggs are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Although minor changes have been made to the BNG submission following the updated site plan, GMEU do not believe the assessment is accurate (proposed trees and hedgerows are missing). Additionally, insufficient information has been provided regarding the habitats present, with no species lists provided. There is also a lack of

information regarding the trees on-site for both the BNG baseline and details on whether they provide any bat roosting potential.

For the reasons given above, the application has failed to provide sufficient or accurate information in respect of BNG, protected species, and tree planting and is therefore contrary to Policies G6 and G7 of the Core Strategy, Policies JP-G6, JP-G7 and JP-G8 of PfE and the NPPF.

Land Contamination

Policy G9 requires that any risks associated with contaminated land are identified and addressed prior to development. It is therefore important that ground conditions are fully considered by developers as part of new development proposals and, where necessary, appropriate remedial measures must be set out and implemented to address any issues of unstable land and ensure safety and stability of new development.

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the local environment by preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability, and remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

The site is within an RMBC and EA Landfill Records area and the Council's Environmental Protection (Land) officer has recommended that a Phase I Report (Preliminary Risk Assessment) should be undertaken. Whilst this information should have been provided with the initial application, had the application been acceptable, this matter could have been dealt with by way of condition.

The application site is also in the vicinity of a High-Pressure Pipeline and Cadent Gas were notified of the application. Cadent Gas advised that they had no objection to the proposal but recommended that the HSE were contacted for their comments. Cadent Gas recommended an informative be added to the decision advising the applicant to submit details of the planned works to them. Officers consulted the HSE through their planning advice web app and the HSE's advice was 'do not advise against, consequently, HSE does not advise, on safety grounds against the granting of planning permission in this case.

Accordingly, subject to the suggested condition and informative the proposal would comply with the requirements of Core Strategy Policy G9 and the NPPF.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy G8 requires that new development does not lead to any increased form of flooding locally or further downstream, does not impede natural water and flood risk management, is not detrimental to existing or potential flood storage areas, contributes where possible to alleviating existing flood risk and is itself well protected from flood risk and ensures prudent use of water resources.

Policy JP-S4 (Flood Risk and the Water Environment) of PfE expects developments to manage surface water runoff through sustainable drainage systems and development should achieve greenfield run-off rates unless it is demonstrated to be impracticable.

Despite being a major application, no detailed drainage proposals for the site were initially submitted. The Council's Drainage Officer as the Lead Local Flood Authority stated that

where drainage details have not been provided, a condition on the application is not appropriate where the principle is not acceptable.

A Proposed Drainage Plan was submitted on 30th January 2026 and reviewed by the Council's Drainage & Flooding Officer who advised the proposed development area has a footprint of 0.198 ha which lies in Flood Zone 1 and which is not immediately threatened by surface water or reservoir flooding. However, as this is a significant development a comprehensive drainage strategy and a SuDS Assessment should be provided. The aim should be to discharge surface run off in line with the drainage hierarchy.

The drainage plan submitted proposes a separated, fully piped foul and surface water system which discharges into separate sewers under Manchester Road and Castle Avenue. However, the drainage plan is considered to be inadequate. It shows main sewers in Manchester Road and Castle Avenue which are not consistent with UU sewer records which only show combined sewers within the immediate vicinity, and with different diameters. There appears to be an attenuation tank but there are no details or hydraulic calculations, volumes, flow rates etc. The MH schedule does not match the submitted plan whilst cover levels on the schedule are approximately 40m higher than on the topographical drawing. In addition, the drawing notes refer to "Thames Water" approval, and the key does not match the drawing.

The surface water system includes a buried attenuation tank solution which is not preferred. Infiltration based drainage solutions and hybrid / partial systems have not been investigated and could only be discounted once BRE365 testing has been undertaken and confirms unsuitable ground conditions.

If infiltration is found not to be viable, then discharge to a surface water outfall should be investigated. There are no records of watercourse or SW sewers in the immediate vicinity. However, there is a public SW sewer in Sparth Bottoms Road

Calculations should have been provided showing the proposal's drainage system to be feasible for a 1-in-100-year storm event + 45% climate change allowance, appropriate for the 'Irwell Management' Catchment area.

The landscaped area proposed could present a viable opportunity for source controls and surface-based SuDS to be incorporated e.g. ponds, detention basins, rain gardens, tree pits etc.

As the application is lacking in the above details, the proposed development is not in accordance with Policy G8 of the Core Strategy, Policy JP-S4 of PfE and the NPPF.

Sustainability

The NPPF sets out a number of considerations in planning for climate change and requires new development to be planned for in ways that can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Policy G2 of the adopted Core Strategy similarly expects all new development to adhere to the energy hierarchy of demand reduction, energy efficiency, and allowable solutions. Core Strategy Policy C3 states *'it is also important that new homes are sustainable by making the best use of design and modern construction techniques to increase energy efficiency and help to tackle climate change'*.

Places for Everyone has built on the above through more detailed policies JP-S1, JP-S2, and JP-S3 with accompanying guidance on achieving the policy requirements.

An Energy & Climate Change Statement has been submitted with the application which makes reference to the development complying with or exceeding the requirements of Building Regulations Part L (2021) and provides details of the building fabric U-values, Air Tightness, emission rates and potential renewable energy measures. The Statement does not refer to Places for Everyone, nor has it provided an assessment against the targets set out in the pro-forma and guidance documents to achieve the policy requirements. Assessing the information that has been submitted against the GMCA Energy and Carbon Proforma, the proposals fall short of the target U-Values for all surfaces, and for air-tightness, whilst the dwelling emission rates for carbon emissions would exceed the carbon content of heat target. Whilst reference is made to heat-pump and PV technologies, no details of these are shown on any plan so it is not possible to assess whether the provision would comply with the PfE policies. The lack of information on these technologies also raises concern that further height could be added to the buildings from associated infrastructure and plant. No justification has been provided for the proposals' divergence from these targets.

At this stage, insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate accordance with Core Strategy Policies C3 and G2, Policies JP-S1, JP-S2 and JP-S3 and the NPPF.

Planning Contributions and Viability

Core Strategy Policy DM2 requires developers to provide, or contribute towards the cost of physical, environmental and social infrastructure that is needed because of proposed development; and or to mitigate the impact of development, through planning obligations and agreements, if the development would otherwise have a negative impact on the delivery of a strategic objective. However, this policy also requires consideration to be given to the need to ensure that schemes remain viable whilst taking into account the need for contributions or infrastructure required to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. In the case of residential development such as this, the Core Strategy specifically requires contributions towards affordable housing (Policy C4 of the Core Strategy), open space provision and maintenance (Policy G6) and education facilities (Policy C7).

Paragraph 59 of the NPPF also states that where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that comply with them should be assumed to be viable. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at application stage.

In this instance, the following contributions would have been requested had the application been acceptable in all other regards.

Affordable Housing Provision

As set out previously within this report the development is expected to provide affordable homes in line with Policy C4 of the Core Strategy and the Council's Affordable Housing SPD. The application provides no justification for lack of onsite provision but states that a contribution would be made towards affordable housing. No draft Heads of Terms have been provided, nor have details of GDV been provided to calculate any offsite contribution. Had the application been acceptable the above information would have been requested prior to determination of the application

Local Open Space and Outdoor Sports Provision

Policy G6 of the Core Strategy requires that residential development should provide or contribute financially towards recreational open space and formal sports provision in accordance with the standards set out in the 'Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing' SPD.

The SPD sets out that developments of more than ten dwellings with less than 100 bedrooms in total will not need to make provision for recreational open space on site but will be expected instead to make a financial contribution towards the provision / improvement of an area or areas of recreational open space in the locality.

The Council's Environmental Management Team have advised that a financial contribution split between Sparth MUGA and Rochdale Leisure Centre would be required. The submitted Planning Statement stated the appropriate contribution will be secured by way of S106.

Education

The Council's education department had no comment to make on any expected contribution. Given the scale and form of development it is accepted in this instance that the proposals would not be likely to generate a significant requirement for school places.

Had the application been acceptable in all other regards, the financial contributions and a S106 Legal Agreement could have been progressed. The applicant's submission does not raise any viability case, although it is noted that other policy requirements such as those relating to energy and carbon above have not been met, with no justification provided.

Conclusion

Whilst the principle of residential redevelopment of the site is supported, the proposal fails to comply with a significant number of local and national policies. Substantial revisions and additional technical information would be required to achieve an acceptable scheme. As such the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. By reason of its excessive scale, height and massing, the proposed development would be overly-dominant in the streetscene and unsympathetic in appearance. In addition, the architectural detailing and fenestration, combined with the proposed materials compound the poor design which fails to respect the character of the surrounding area. As such the proposed development would conflict with Rochdale Core Strategy Policies P1, P3, C3 and DM1 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By reason of its excessive scale, height, massing and insufficient separation distances, the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the living environment of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, overlooking, visual dominance and overbearing effects. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and G9 of the Core Strategy, the Council's SPD and the NPPF.
3. The proposed development fails to provide an acceptable standard of living for future residents due to non-compliance with the Nationally Described Space

Standards, lack of privacy to ground floor flats without defensible space and the creation of unsecure secluded areas. Furthermore, the application fails to achieve the energy and carbon targets set out in PfE policy, nor has sufficient information been provided as to compliance with Part M4(2) accessibility standards. Combined, these factors are to the detriment of the living standards of future residents and is contrary to Policies DM1 and G9 of the Core Strategy, PfE Policies JPS-2 and JP-H3, and the NPPF.

4. The application has failed to provide sufficient information regarding ecology and trees, including the habitats present onsite, species lists within habitats, priority species, and suitable 2:1 tree replacement. The submitted information pertaining to BNG is inaccurate and insufficient. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies G6 and G7 of the Core Strategy, Policies JP-G6, JP-G7 and JP-G8 of PfE and the NPPF.
5. The application has failed to provide sufficient information in respect of a comprehensive drainage strategy and a SuDS Assessment. The drainage plan as submitted is inaccurate and significantly lacking in detail. No details have been provided to demonstrate consideration of SuDS. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy G8 of the Core Strategy, Policies JP-S4 of PfE and the NPPF.

Procedure Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

Notes for Applicant:

1. The assessment of this application is based on the following drawings:

Drawing No: 24067-001 Rev A – Existing Floor Plans and Elevations
Drawing No: 24067-002 – Existing Floor Plans and Elevations (Garage)
Drawing No: 24067-200 Rev A – Site Location Plan
Received on 18th July 2025

Drawing No: 24067-201 Rev B – Proposed Floor Plans
Drawing No: 24067-202 Rev B – Proposed Floor Plans
Drawing No: 24067-203 Rev C – Proposed Floor Plans
Drawing No: 24067-204 – Proposed Floor Plans
Drawing No: 24067-205 – Proposed Floor Plans
Drawing No: 24067-210 Rev C – Proposed Elevations
Drawing No: 24067-211 Rev C – Proposed Elevations
Drawing No: 24067-220 Rev B – Proposed Site Plan
Drawing No: 24067-230 Rev B – Topographical Survey
Drawing No: 24067-231 Rev B – Site Sections
Drawing No: 24067-232 – Site Sections B
Received on 18th December 2026

Drawing No: 24067-240 – Proposed Drainage Plan
Received on 30th January 2026

2. The applicant is advised that there are TPO trees at the rear of the site within West Hill.