

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00363/FUL

## DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.  
25/00363/FUL

CASE OFFICER  
Bob Melling

**DETERMINATION DATE** 29.07.2025 **EXT OF TIME** 12.12.2025

**Address:** 6 Church Street & 2 Todmorden Road, Littleborough, OL15 9AF.

**Proposal:** Change of use to commercial at ground floor level and self-contained flat at first floor level, together with alterations to fenestration and the erection of an external staircase and terrace.

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?	Y
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	Y

RECOMMENDATION	GRANT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS
----------------	-----------------------------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE:10/12/2025

---

## **SITE**

The application relates to 6 Church Street and 2 Todmorden Road, a pair of traditional terraced properties located on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Church Street, Halifax Road and Todmorden Road. The vacant properties are located on the edge of the defined Littleborough Town Centre boundary but are within the eastern extent of the Littleborough Town Centre Conservation Area. The River Roch runs along the eastern site boundary, with the site located in the River Flood Zone 3, and there are two Grade II listed buildings in the setting of the site: the Church of the Holy Trinity and the Railway Viaduct. 2 Todmorden Road is adjoined by 4 Todmorden Road and 9 Maden's Square to the north.

The application building had formerly been listed at Grade II, as it was erroneously believed to have been an early 19<sup>th</sup> century toll house. However, the actual toll house had been located 96m from the site and demolished c.1877 to 1878. The two properties formerly comprised a cottage constructed in 1878, and an office constructed in 1885. The office was constructed in the style of a toll house by a local architect which is believed to have contributed to the later mistake. Both the properties were last used as dwellinghouses. The delisting report notes that both properties have undergone significant alteration and remodelling. It concludes that the properties are modest and unexceptional and not of special architectural or historic interest in the national context.

The properties were originally constructed in local vernacular materials: gritstone and stone slate roofs. However, it is noted that the original roof coverings have been lost. 2 Todmorden Road has white uPVC fenestration while 6 Church Street has dark brown timber fenestration.

## **PROPOSAL**

Permission is sought for the change of use of the ground floor to a community 'Flood Defence Warning Hub' and the first floor to a self-contained, one-bedroom flat. The proposals also include the replacement of the existing roof tiles, fenestration and rainwater goods. Lastly, a raised terrace would be erected to the rear.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

### National Guidance

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

### Sub-Regional Policy

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P1 Sustainable Places  
JP-P2 Heritage  
JP-S1 Sustainable Development  
JP-S4 Flood Risk and the Water Environment

### Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

**SO1 Delivering a more prosperous economy**

- E1 Establishing thriving town, district and local centres
- E5 Encouraging the visitor economy

**SO3 Improving design, image and quality of place**

- P1 Improving image
- P2 Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
- P3 Improving design of new development

**SO4 Promoting a greener environment**

- G8 Managing water resources and flood risk

**SO5 Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport**

- T2 Improving accessibility

SD1 Delivering sustainable development

DM1 General development requirements

Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

BE/17 New Development Affecting Conservation Areas

EM/7 Development and Flood Risk

**RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

N/A

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

Conservation Officer

Comments submitted on 06.10.2025 following submission of amended plans. The comments have been summarised as follows:

- No objection to principle of development;
- No objections to revised decked area – large scale details / product specifications for the balustrade should be required by condition if approved;
- No objection to re-roofing in slate;
- No objections to aluminium rainwater goods; and
- The use of uPVC windows and composite doors would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA – product specifications for windows and doors should be required by condition if approved.

Environment Agency

(Summary) No objections in principle, however, the proposed development will only meet the NPPF requirements in relation to flood risk if the following planning condition is included:

**Condition**

*The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (ref 776 FRA-V1) and the following mitigation measures it details:*

- *Finished floor levels shall be set no lower than existing dwelling in metres above Ordnance Datum (AOD)*

*These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/ phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.*

*Reason*

*To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants*

#### Canals and Rivers Trust

No comments.

#### LLFA

No comments received at time of writing.

#### Highways Authority

No objections.

#### Public Protection - Noise

No comments received at time of writing.

#### GMEU (20.11.2025)

Thank you for sending this report over. It has identified that further bat survey work is required to characterise the bat roost found on the site, and also to ensure that both buildings have had adequate survey work at an appropriate time of year. The one emergence survey that has been carried out was in September, outside the optimal survey timings.

I'm not sure why the surveys weren't undertaken this year within the appropriate survey season (May – August) to establish the use of the moderate building by bats (which require 2 surveys) and to characterise the roost in the low potential building.

Bats and their roosts are legally protected and as per Paragraph 98 and 99 of the ODPM Circular 06/2005, the presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. It is therefore essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted. Ecological surveys should only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances.

In line with this advice, we would advise that the additional survey work is provided prior to the determination of the application, unless there are exceptional circumstances to use a condition.

#### **REPRESENTATIONS**

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties, a site notice displayed in the vicinity and an advertisement was published in the local press. 1 objection and 1 neutral representation were received. The comments raised the following concerns:

- No parking for commercial premises;
- Noise disturbance for neighbouring properties; and
- The works will impede traffic flow.

## **ANALYSIS**

### **Principle of Development**

When read collectively, paragraph 90 of the NPPF, PfE policy JP-P2, and CS policy E1 aim to focus commercial, retail, cultural, and office development within town centres, in order maintain them as thriving and sustainable locations. Policy E1 requires such development to be concentrated within, or close to, allocated town centres under saved UDP policy G/S/1.

PfE also establishes the need for at least 616 net additional dwellings per year in Rochdale to meet the housing needs of the borough, and CS policy C1 looks to focus housing in town centres and sustainable locations.

Paragraph 92 of the NPPF states that when considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities (LPAs) should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale, so that opportunities to utilise suitable edge of centre sites are fully explored.

The site falls on the edge of the defined Littleborough Town Centre boundary but within the Littleborough Town Centre Conservation Area. The properties are in poor condition and have been vacant for several years. The proposals would provide a community use at ground floor level with a residential property above. The ground floor use as a community flood resilience hub is not considered to constitute a main town centre use, as defined under Annex 2 of the NPPF, and it is not considered that the use of part of the building for this purpose would be of detriment to town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and the wider retail catchment. Therefore, a sequential test was not required.

However, it is acknowledged that Use Class E covers a broad spectrum of uses, some of which contribute more than others to the vitality and viability of town centres. This includes retail and food and beverage establishments. It is considered that such uses, if permitted, would potentially give rise to harm to the vitality and viability of the town centre, and, therefore, a suitably worded condition is recommended to restrict the uses within Use Class E under which the ground floor unit can operate, namely subsections c) – g). The uses permitted under subsections c) – g) are those which are less prevalent within Littleborough Town Centre and less likely to harm the vitality and viability of the centre.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed uses would provide a viable, long-term use for the properties, preventing their further deterioration while increasing footfall in the eastern extent of the Conservation Area. There was historically a mix of uses (i.e. architect's office and house) at the site and it is considered that the mix of uses proposed under the current application would be compatible with the locality and in accordance with the Development Plan. Subject to the condition recommended above, the principle of development is accepted.

### **Impact on Heritage Assets**

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (as amended) requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

CS policies DM1 and P3 require development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. CS policy P2 requires development to protect and enhance character, landscape and heritage. In addition, PfE policy JP-P2 explains that development proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets will be considered having regard to the NPPF.

Paragraph 213 of the NPPF states: *'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.'*

The application site is located within the Littleborough Town Centre Conservation Area and is within the setting of two listed buildings. On this basis, consultation has been carried out with the Council's Conservation Officer. The Officer supports the principle of development on the grounds that the proposals would bring vacant properties in poor condition into a viable use, thus increasing activity in the eastern part of the Conservation Area. Moreover, the proposed subdivision would be consistent with the historic mix of uses at the site.

The existing properties have a mixture of uPVC and timber fenestration with unsightly concrete roof tiles. The proposals would see both properties re-roofed using blue slate and this is considered to be an improvement on the existing situation. Furthermore, the use of aluminium rainwater goods is considered appropriate and the proposed terrace to the rear, including the 1.1m high balustrade, is considered to have a neutral impact on the significance of the Conservation Area subject to the submission of large-scale details for the balustrade, which are recommended by condition.

The existing uPVC windows would be replaced with slim profile uPVC heritage style windows finished in sage green and the existing timber windows would be replaced with slim profile aluminium with a sage green finish. The existing external doors would be replaced with composite flood doors. While it is considered that the use of uPVC windows and composite doors would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area, paragraph 215 of the NPPF notes:

*'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'*

The proposals are considered to provide significant public benefits by bringing vacant properties in deteriorating condition back into use. The proposals would provide a community facility designed to showcase how local residents and businesses can mitigate the risks of flooding through amendments to their properties. Moreover, the proposals would provide a one-bedroom flat at first floor level in a sustainable location on the edge of the town centre. Therefore, the proposals are considered to secure the optimum viable use of the properties and, on this basis, the less than substantial harm is clearly outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme.

Notwithstanding, conditions are recommended to require the submission of product specifications for the windows and external doors prior to above ground works taking place.

In light of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposals would accord with the heritage and design requirements contained within CS policies P2, P3 and DM1, PfE policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 and the NPPF.

### Residential Amenity (Neighbour and Occupier)

Policies in the CS, PfE and the NPPF seek to ensure that planning decisions result in places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Although it is expected that most new developments will have some impact on neighbours, it is important to ensure that the impact is not so significant that it results in unacceptable harm. All new developments should avoid causing a significant loss of privacy and/or light for occupiers of new neighbouring dwellings and existing dwellings.

No new window openings or extensions are proposed to the properties and therefore it is not necessary to assess the impact of the development on neighbouring properties regarding privacy, natural light or outlook.

### *Noise and Disturbance*

Paragraph 198(a) of the NPPF advises that planning decisions should mitigate and reduce to a minimum, potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life. Similarly, CS policy G9 explains that new development should not lead to an unacceptable increase in noise pollution.

With regards to the character of the surrounding area, while this particular terraced block consists of solely residential properties, it is important to recognise that the properties front a heavily trafficked highway network on the edge of the town centre. Although the proposed community use would result in an intensification of the existing use with more frequent comings and goings likely, it is not considered that the differing patterns of behaviour would be out of character with the location. No parking is allocated for the community use and there are double yellow lines around the site on Todmorden Road, Church Street and Halifax Road. This would restrict the comings and goings by private vehicles, thus mitigating the impact on the neighbouring properties.

While no operating hours have been proposed under this application, it is considered likely that the community hub would operate between typical working hours and not during unsociable hours.

A Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) has been submitted which sets out several mitigation measures to ensure that conditions in habitable rooms within the application property are acceptable and within the design criteria outlined in BS8233:2014 - Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings. Subject to the development being carried out in accordance with the NIA, it is considered that the proposed community hub would have an acceptable relationship with the proposed first floor flat and the adjoining residential properties, in accordance with CS policy G9, PfE policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

### *Internal Space Standards*

PfE policy JP-H3 requires all new dwellings to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). The NDSS is a technical standards document produced by the Government to ensure internal space within new dwellings is suitable.

The proposed first floor flat would have a gross internal floor area of approximately of 54.6m<sup>2</sup>, which is in accordance with the minimum gross internal floor area for a 1-bedroom, 1-storey dwelling for 2 persons (50m<sup>2</sup>). Moreover, the bedroom would measure approximately 15.9m<sup>2</sup>, which is in accordance with the minimum floor area requirements for a double bedroom. Lastly, it is considered that the proposed flat

would have sufficient storage space and that each habitable room would receive sufficient natural light and outlook.

### *Summary*

Subject to the addition of the recommended conditions, it is considered that the proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties or the future occupants of the proposed dwelling and therefore is in accordance with CS policies DM1 and G9, PfE policies JP-H3 and JP-P1 and the NPPF

### Flood Risk

The site is located in the River Flood Zone 3 and the application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The vulnerability classification of the site would reduce from 'more vulnerable' to 'less vulnerable' as a result of the conversion of the ground floor to a commercial use and the first floor to a residential use.

The type of development proposed under the current application is exempt from applying the sequential test, as per paragraph 176 of the NPPF.

The FRA concludes that, subject to the proposed mitigation measures, the proposed development would be safe in terms of flood risk and would not increase flood risk elsewhere.

The Environment Agency (EA) was consulted on the proposals and raised no objections subject to the inclusion of a condition regarding the proposed mitigation measures.

Subject to the recommended condition, the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of flood risk and would accord with both the Development Plan and the NPPF.

### Access and Highway Safety

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF sets out that: *'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.'*

The Highways Authority have raised no objections to the proposal and confirm that the proposals are unlikely to have any material impact upon the highway. The site is in a highly sustainable and accessible edge of town centre location. No conflict has been identified with either the Development Plan or paragraph 116 of the NPPF.

### Ecology

#### *Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)*

In England, BNG is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Under the statutory framework for BNG, subject to some exemptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the BNG objective is met. This objective is for development to deliver at least 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved through onsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits.

However, there are exemptions to this requirement, including development falling below the threshold. This includes the current application, which comprises a change of use with no loss of existing habitat on site.

### *Bats*

The submitted Bat Survey has identified that further bat survey work is required to characterise the bat roost found on the site, and also to ensure that both buildings have had adequate survey work at an appropriate time of year (May-August 2026). The roost location is underneath the gutter from a gap in the eaves, above the first-floor window on the southeast elevation. GMEU was consulted on the application and stated the following:

*'Bats and their roosts are legally protected and as per Paragraph 98 and 99 of the ODPM Circular 06/2005, the presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. It is therefore essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted. Ecological surveys should only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances.'*

The additional survey work is required to inform the Natural England (NE) European Protected Species (EPS) licence.

In this instance, the applicant has set out exceptional circumstances as to why the permission should be granted with a condition requiring the submission of the additional surveys prior to the commencement of certain works, namely works to the area of the property where the roost was identified.

The applicant has advised that the development is dependent on grant funding which must be spent by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2026. If planning permission cannot be granted until after the additional survey work in May 2026, then the applicant will lose the grant.

In terms of the physical condition of the buildings, the applicant has explained that all the floor joists and floor timbers are severely affected by wet rot. Temporary propping has been installed to prevent the collapse of the buildings. Furthermore, the buildings are unsafe to enter which is why only external emergence bat surveys could take place. In addition, the external walls are leaning and need stitching and bracing.

In considering the acceptability of the development within the planning regime, in respect of protected species, specific regard must be given to The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 that requires that *'Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.'* Damage or destruction of a breeding site would be an offence under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the 'Regulations') unless an EPS licence is issued prior to commencement of works or confirmation is received from NE that the development would not require such a licence.

When determining whether or not to grant a licence, NE must be satisfied that the following three tests have been met:

- (a) There is a purpose for the activity – for example, you need to preserve public health and safety, or there's an overriding public interest (such as providing housing in an area where shortfalls have been identified).
- (b) There is not a satisfactory alternative.

- (c) The protected species will not be harmed as a result of the proposed activities.

In the absence of an application for an EPS licence, the LPA are required by Regulation 9(3) of the Regulations to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive in the determination of the application. The LPA are therefore required to consider whether there would be a reasonable prospect of a licence being granted by applying the three tests.

Given the condition of the buildings and the need to preserve public health and safety, it is considered that there would be a reasonable prospect of a licence being granted providing suitable mitigation measures are proposed, such as bat boxes. to increase bat roosting provision, details of which can be secured by planning conditions. As such, subject to conditions, the application may satisfy the third test in terms of maintaining the population of bats at the site.

Overall, it is considered that the LPA can be satisfied that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated which justify the commencement of certain works prior to the submission of the required bat surveys during the next bat roosting season (May-August 2026). Moreover, given the condition of the buildings, the LPA can be satisfied at this time that there is a reasonable prospect of European Protected Species Mitigation licence being granted by Natural England.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **GRANT subject to the following conditions:**

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

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

2. This permission relates to the following plans:-

- Location Plan and Floor Plans as Existing. Dwg no. SS-01
- Elevations as Existing. Dwg no. SS-02
- Strip Out as Proposed. Dwg no. D-01
- Elevations as Existing Strip Out and Cracking Repairs. Dwg no. D-02
- General Arrangement Plans as Proposed. Dwg no. GA-01. Rev A
- Elevations as Proposed. Dwg no. GA-07. Rev A
- Door and Window Schedule. Dwg no. GA-08. Rev A
- 'Toll House, Littleborough: Noise Impact Assessment' prepared by dBx Acoustics Ltd, reference 25004-R01-SF, dated 28/01/2025
- 'Flood Risk Assessment' prepared by RIDA Reports Ltd, reference 776 FRA-v1, dated March 2025
- 'Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Surveys (BERS)' prepared by Arbtech Consulting Ltd, dated 30/09/2025

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

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

3. No development or works to the roof (including joists, rafters, eaves, soffits, fascia boards, the ceilings of any first floor rooms and the roof covering of any building) and to the window on the first floor to the rear elevation facing south-east shall take place until:
  - (a) Two additional bat surveys on each property (comprising dusk emergence and/or dawn re-entry surveys) have been undertaken during the bat active season of May to August 2026, by a suitably qualified and licensed ecologist, to update and confirm the status of the roost; and
  - (b) A Bat Survey Report and Impact Assessment, including the survey results, evaluation, and detailed mitigation/compensation strategy, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved mitigation and the terms of the EPS licence.

Reason: To ensure adequate assessment and protection of bats, a European Protected Species, prior to commencement of works that could affect a known roost, in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement: A detailed mitigation/compensation strategy will need to be implemented prior to the commencement of certain above ground works and a scheme therefore needs to be agreed in advance of the same.

4. No above ground works shall take place until samples and/or full specifications for the windows, external doors, roof lights, roof coverings and detailed designs of the balustrade, at a scale of not less than 1:50, to be used on the development hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The windows, doors, roof lights, roof coverings and the balustrade shall be installed in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in the interest of preserving the significance of the Conversation Area, in accordance with policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) or any equivalent Order following the revocation and re-enactment thereof, the ground floor unit hereby approved shall only be used for the purpose of uses described within Class E (C)-(G, iii) inclusive, and no other purposes including other uses within Use Class E.

Reason: In the interests of protecting town centre vitality and ensuring compatibility with surrounding land uses in order to comply with the requirements of policies DM1 and E1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the noise mitigation measures set out within the submitted noise impact assessment (reference 25004-R01-SF). The ground floor use hereby approved shall not be used until a verification report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which confirms that the approved ventilation and acoustic measures have been implemented to achieve the required maximum noise levels. The noise attenuation measures shall be retained as installed thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of residents in order to comply with the requirements of policies G9 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (reference 776 FRA-V1) and the following mitigation measures it details:
  - Finished floor levels shall be set no lower than existing dwelling in metres above Ordnance Datum (AOD).

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing / phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants in order to comply with the requirements of policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-S4 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Procedure Statement**

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

Report Author Bob Melling