

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00207/FUL

## DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.  
25/00207/FUL

CASE OFFICER  
Aimee Bovaird

**DETERMINATION DATE** 16.10.2025 **EXT OF TIME**

**Address:** Land To Rear Of 102 Wood Street Middleton Manchester M24 5TP

**Proposal:** Proposed change of use to Class B8 (storage or distribution) including erection of storage unit with associated car parking, boundary treatments and cycle storage

|           |                            |   |                       |   |
|-----------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| PUBLICITY | Weekly list expired?       | Y | Site notice expired?  | Y |
|           | Neighbour letters expired? | Y | Press Notice expired? | Y |

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

|          |                                   |   |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---|
| COMMENTS | Planning Panel comments received? | N |
|          | Neighbour comments received?      | Y |

|     |                                                  |   |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|---|
| EIA | Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase? | N |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|---|

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

|                |        |
|----------------|--------|
| RECOMMENDATION | REFUSE |
|----------------|--------|

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE:23/10/2025

---

## **SITE**

The site is located at the rear of 102 Wood Street, it is an area of hardstanding that is used for the storage of cars. The site meets the rear boundary of 17-19 Rectory Street and an area of grassed land at the rear boundary of dwellings 5 – 15 Rectory Street. The west boundary meets the boundary of Triumphant Kids Nursery. The building 102 Wood Street has residential dwellings on the first floor and is a white rendered building.

The site can be accessed from Wood Street and is located within the Defined Urban Area

## **PROPOSAL**

The application seeks permission for the erection of a storage unit along with waste, cycle storage and associated car parking.

The proposed storage unit will have a pitched roof and be 6m in height, 12m deep and 16.6m wide. The application proposed 10 car parking spaces, cycle storage and waste storage.

No information has been provided to clarify hours of opening, what type of storage and distribution will take place or an exact number of staff.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

### **National**

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

### **Sub-Regional Policy**

Places For Everyone (PfE)  
JP-S1 Sustainable Development

### **Local**

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:  
**G/D/1** Defined Urban Area

### **Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:**

|                   |                                     |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>P3</b>         | Improving Design of New Development |
| <b>DM1</b>        | General Development Requirements    |
| <b>T2</b>         | Improving Accessibility             |
| <b>Appendix 5</b> | Schedule of Parking Standards       |

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

## **RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

20/01007/FUL - Change of use from public house with ancillary residential use to mixed use comprising of retail and residential with installation of new shopfronts including erection of raised terrace (part-retrospective). Refused

## **CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

### Highways And Engineering

Required further information

### Env Health - Noise/Odours

No objection

### GMP - Design For Security

No objection subject to a condition if the application is approved.

### Environmental Control (Landfill Gas)

No comments received to date

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

Letters of notification have been sent out to surrounding occupiers and a site notice has been displayed in the vicinity. Objections have been received and raised the following concerns.

- Question land ownership
- Will result in noise
- Harm wildlife by removing trees
- Will make the area industrial
- Have a negative impact on privacy and residential amenity
- Close proximity to childcare facilities and this has safety implications
- Not in keeping with local character

## **ANALYSIS**

### Principle of Development

The site lies within the Defined Urban Area under saved policy G/D/1 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP). New development, wherever possible and appropriate, should be concentrated within the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside.

Policy E2 1.h) sets out new employment development that is located outside designated employment areas should be supported where it is not detrimental to amenity.

The application states the use will fall under B8 Class, used for storage and distributions. This is proposed for the storage of cars however no further details have been provided.

Given the general support offered by policies for such uses, subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposals upon the amenity of the area, the principle of development is considered acceptable.

### Design and Appearance

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to adhere to high quality design and enhance the borough's identity and

sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general.

In addition, paragraphs 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places 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. Finally, paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that 'development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

The site and surrounding area is of a predominantly domestic, urban character. The site has residential dwellings located to the rear, a nursery west of the site and is close to Middleton Town Centre.

No. 102 Wood Street is located at the front of the site, this is a white rendered converted public house of a traditional design with residential flats at first floor level. Dwellings to the rear form part of the historic townscape, dating from late nineteenth century, with those opposite dating from the post-war period and are set back from the highway and constructed from red brick.

The development proposes a storage unit along with waste, cycle storage and associated car parking. The storage unit will be finished in red brickwork and dark grey cladding which would be typical for a storage unit.

The proposed development would be set back from the highway and screened from most vantage points along the nearby highways by buildings and vegetation, however due to its large scale would undoubtedly be visible to passers-by and in particular, the occupants of the residential dwellings on Rectory Street.

Due to its scale and utilitarian appearance, the proposed unit would clearly sit at odds with the established character of the area. Despite some screening by buildings and vegetation, it would inevitably still comprise a prominent and conspicuous feature which would be harmful to the character of the site and surrounding area. The large storage unit is not in keeping with residential dwellings and uses within the urban area, the appearance is uninviting and will detract from the street scene. It will introduce a structure that is industrial in appearance, it will be finished in cladding as previously mentioned.

As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Impact on Surrounding Occupiers

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Council's 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."*

The proposed development includes car parking spaces on the site and it can be assumed there will be comings and goings from cars and larger vehicles throughout the day and into the evening, in terms of noise and disturbance this would not be dissimilar to the previous lawful use of the land as a public house. There would have also been frequent comings and goings throughout the day which may not be dissimilar to a storage unit. For this proposal hours of opening could be restricted if approved to mitigate the impact of cars. However surrounding residents will still be impacted to a point through car lights and general noise.

Garden areas at the rears of dwellings on the western side of Rectory Street have been extended piecemeal and have made use of the land between their original rear boundaries and the site boundary for larger garden areas. The proposed storage unit will be located a distance of 0.4m from the boundary of no 19 Rectory Street and 1.5m from 17 Rectory Street in addition to being within 1m of the boundary of the garden area at the rear of nos. 9-15 Rectory street.

Owing to its proximity and scale, the proposed storage unit will have a considerable overbearing impact on the garden areas of properties on Rectory Street.

Furthermore, as the majority of the storage unit would sit above and not be shielded by the existing boundary treatments, it would be highly prominent from the rear facing habitable rooms (in particular the upper floor windows) and would comprise a wholly dominant addition that would be unduly harmful to the occupant's outlook..

As such, it is considered that the proposals would not comprise a good standard of amenity for future occupiers and surrounding occupiers and not accord with the requirements of Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### Highways

Policy DM1 states that all development proposals should provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location. Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

As part of the application process the Council's Highways Officer has been consulted. They have stated that no Transport Statement has been submitted as part of the application and there is no indication of traffic generation. The application is also not clear in what type of vehicles are to be expected at this location.

Given the height of the roller shutter, it is considered that larger vehicles such as HGVs could be used in the operation of the site, which the LPA could not restrict by condition. Given the surrounding land uses, pedestrian activity is of course common, and given that Wood Street accommodates a reasonable level of traffic, if the proposals could not accommodate safe access and egress from the site in a forwards gear then it would undoubtedly give rise to unacceptable risks to pedestrian safety.

In the absence of such information, the proposals cannot demonstrate that they are able to operate safely and therefore fail to comply with the requirements of CS Policy T2, PfE Policy JP-C8 and the NPPF.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. By reason of its siting, scale, design and materiality, the proposed storage unit would fail to sit sympathetically with the character of the surrounding area. The proposals would therefore be harmful to the established character of the area and are therefore contrary to Policies E2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By reason of its siting, scale and design, the proposed storage unit would constitute an unduly dominant and discordant feature that would be incongruous in views from, and overbearing to, the rear garden areas and rear facing habitable room windows of nos. nos 9 – 19 Rectory Street The proposal would therefore be contrary to the residential amenity aims of Policies E2 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The application is not supported by sufficient information to determine whether the development proposals could operate safely and not lead to unacceptable risks to highways and pedestrian safety. In the absence of such information the proposals therefore fail to comply with the requirements of Policies E2 and T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-C8 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **Procedure Statement**

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

## **Informative**

For the avoidance of doubt the decision relates to the following plans and documents:

- Location Plan
- Proposed Site Plan Sheet 3
- Proposed Elevations Sheet 5
- Proposed Plans Sheet 4
- Proposed Site Elevation Sheet 6
- Planning Statement dated March 2025

