

APPLICATION NUMBER: 25/00558/TELE

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

25/00558/TELE

CASE OFFICER

Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 25.07.2025 EXT OF TIME

Address: Mbnl Telecommunications Cell Site Grass Verge Phoenix Close Rochdale OL10 2JG

Proposal: Prior notification for a proposed 20m high telecommunications mast and associated works

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	N/A

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

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

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

PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED AND GRANTED

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: LA

DATE:24/07/25

SITE

The site is located on the grass verge near Phoenix Close, Rochdale. The surrounding area is industrial, with a number of warehouses containing business such as an electrical engineer, movie studios, fireplace shop and a women's clothes shop.

The site is within a Primary Employment Zone and lies just outside Heywood Station Conservation Area. The Conservation Area includes Phoenix Brewery, this has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks prior approval for the installation of a 20m high telecommunications mast and associated works.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (As Amended).

National Guidance

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

Places for Everyone

JP-S1 Sustainable Development
JP-C2 Digital Connectivity

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO3 Improving design, image and quality of place
P2 Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
P3 Improving design of new development
DM1 General Development requirements

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

N/A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation And Design

No objections

REPRESENTATIONS

The application was publicised by way of neighbour notification and a site notice was displayed in the vicinity. Two objections have been received and raised the following.

- Environmental concerns.
- Health impacts of the proposed development.
- Construction of the development may have a negative impact on surrounding businesses.
- Visually Intrusive

ANALYSIS

Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) states that development consisting of the installation, alteration or replacement of electronic communications apparatus (other than on a building) is not permitted by Class A(a) if –

- (a) in the case of the installation of electronic communications apparatus (other than a mast), the apparatus, excluding any antenna, would exceed a height of 15 metres above ground level;
- (b) in the case of the alteration or replacement of electronic communications apparatus (other than a mast) that is already installed, the apparatus, excluding any antenna, would when altered or replaced exceed the height of the existing apparatus or a height of 15 metres above ground level, whichever is the greater;
- (c) in the case of the installation of a mast, the mast, excluding any antenna, would exceed a height of—
 - (i) 30 metres above ground level on unprotected land; or
 - (ii) 25 metres above ground level on article 2(3) land or land which is on a highway; or
- (d) in the case of the alteration or replacement of a mast, the height of the mast, excluding any antenna, would when altered or replaced exceed the greater of the height of the existing mast or a height of—
 - (i) 30 metres above ground level on unprotected land; or
 - (ii) 25 metres above ground level on article 2(3) land or land which is on a highway; or
- (e) in the case of the alteration or replacement of a mast—
 - (i) the mast is on any land which is, or is within, a site of special scientific interest; and
 - (ii) the mast would, when altered or replaced, exceed the original width of the mast by more than one third.

The erection of a pole up to 20m in height on the highway to support electronic communications transmission apparatus with associated street cabinet would be development permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A.

The application is therefore for a determination whether the prior approval of the Council will be required as to the siting and appearance of the installation, as required under paragraph A.3 of the Order.

Siting and appearance

Paragraph 119 of the NPPF requires installations to be kept to a minimum and encourages the reuse of existing electronic communications infrastructure such as existing masts, buildings and other structures. Where new sites are required such as for new 5G networks, equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate.

Policies P1, P2, P3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy are material considerations as they relate to issues of siting, appearance and heritage. In addition, Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the recently adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) are relevant given their aspirations to achieve high quality places and to conserve, sustain and enhance heritage assets and their settings. PfE Policy JP-C2 emphasises the ambition for Greater Manchester to become a digitally connected city region, however does explicitly set out that this should not come at the expense of townscape quality. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is also a material consideration, and this includes a section on supporting high quality communications. Paragraph 139 of the Framework is explicit in that development which is not well-designed should be refused.

The application site sits outside Heywood Station Conservation Area. The proposed mast will be 20 m high and within the setting of the Conservation Area and non-designated heritage asset. The proposed development will be taller than the existing street furniture and immediate buildings. On balance, due to the immediate buildings and area being of an industrial nature it is not considered to have a negative effect on visual amenity as it has a slim and simple design. The upper part of the monopole will be most visible but will be seen against the backdrop of the sky. The proposed development will not appear alien within the context of the street or have an overbearing impact on pedestrians. The proposed development will be on the grass and not have an impact on pedestrians.

When considering the visual impact, the proposed development will be seen from the Conservation Area and within the context of the non-designated heritage asset. The cabinets will be located next to the monopole and are not considered to result in an over proliferation of street furniture at this location.

Heritage

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

The impact of the proposed development is a material consideration. As part of the application process the Conservation Officer has been consulted and requested the submission of a Heritage Statement. The applicant submitted a Heritage Statement, and the Conservation Officer raised no objections. The proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on the non-designated heritage asset or Conservation Area as it is set away from both. The proposed development will be in accordance Policy P2 of the adopted Core Strategy, PfE Policy JP-P2 and the NPPF.

Highways

Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states ‘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 would be severe.’

The Highways department has been consulted and raised no objections to the proposal as it will not have a negative effect on the highway.

It is considered, by reason of sitting the proposal is compliant with policies T2 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION

PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED AND GRANTED

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following:

- Proposed Site Plan
- 250 Proposed Site Elevation
- Heritage Statement
- Covering Letter

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and in compliance with Policy P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Report Author Aimee Bovaird