

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.
24/01262/FUL

CASE OFFICER
Rachel Carney

DETERMINATION DATE 15.04.2025 **EXT OF TIME** 11.11.25

Address: Village Hotel And Leisure Club Waterfold Business Park Heywood
Rochdale BL9 7BQ

Proposal: Erection of a 30-bedroom extension to existing hotel and associated works

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
-----	--	---

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

RECOMMENDATION	APPROVE
----------------	---------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE: 10/11/2025

SITE

The Village Hotel is a 128 bedroom hotel that also includes conferencing meeting rooms, a gym, swimming pool, pub/grill and coffee shop as well as a 371 space car park.

The site sits to the north of Waterfold Business Park and it is flanked by the M66 to the east, the East Lancashire Railway to the south and the River Roch to the west. The business park is a relatively modern development that includes a variety of units and it is close to the border with Bury.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes the erection of a 30 bedroom extension to the hotel.

The extension would comprise a four storey development, with the ground floor (known as lower ground floor on the plans) providing an open area with supporting piers, where external access through the structure would be available. The remaining three floors would provide accommodation, with 10 rooms per floor, with the top floor (known as second floor on the plans) set within the roof space.

The front elevation of the extension would be designed to assimilate the fenestration to the existing building. To the ground floor this would include dummy windows set adjacent a real window.

Further windows are proposed to the side and rear elevations and the extension would be predominantly constructed in matching brick, with composite cladding detailing, stone coursing, coping stones and window surrounds (to the ground floor front elevation windows only) and aluminium window frames.

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-S4 Flood risk and the water environment
JP-J1 Supporting Long Term Economic Growth
JP-J2 Employment Sites and Premises
JP-G2 Green infrastructure network
JP-G3 - River Valleys and Waterways
JP-G7 Trees and woodland
JP-G8 A net enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity
JP-P1 Sustainable Places

JP-C1 An Integrated Network
JP-C4 The Strategic Road Network

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

E2 Increasing jobs and prosperity
E3 Focusing on economic growth corridors and areas
P1 Improving image
P2 Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
P3 Improving design of new development
G1 Tackling and adapting to climate change
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 instability
T1 Delivering sustainable transport
T2 Improving accessibility
DM1 General Development requirements
DM2 Delivering planning contributions and infrastructure

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

EC//2 Primary Employment Zone
EM/7 Development and Flood Risk
G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

99/D36905 - Erection Of 98 Bedroom Hotel And Leisure Facilities With Associated Car Parking - Approved
03/D42737 - 24 Bedroom, 4 Storey Link Extension To Rear Of Existing Hotel - Approved
04/D44181 - 28 Bedroom, 4 Storey Link Extension To Rear Of Existing Hotel. (Revised Proposal D42737) - Approved

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways And Engineering

The extension to the hotel is a small intensification of the use of the site. Whilst there is a reduction in parking provision the submitted Transport Statement includes a Parking Rationale which is robust and the parking provision is acceptable.

No objections.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

No objections following the submission of additional information.

Environment Agency

No objection. Advice provided.

Environmental Control (Landfill Gas)

The Phase 1 is acceptable. Recommended watching brief condition.

National Highways

No objection.

Gtr Manchester Ecology Unit

No objections. Protected species, loss to landscape/habitat and BNG can be controlled/protected through condition.

Urban Design

Initial concerns raised and amendments requested. Confirmation that the amended proposals are much more considerate in regards to scale, massing proportion and form. Recommended conditions to control materials.

REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised with a site notice, press notice and neighbour notification letters. No representations have been received.

ANALYSIS

Principle

The application site is located within a primary employment zone where saved UDP policy EC/2 applies, alongside Core Strategy Policies E2 and E2. These policies promote the development of industrial, business and warehouse uses and the increase of jobs and prosperity in the area. Policy JP-P1 of PfE also seeks to support a thriving, inclusive and productive economy and facilitates the development in key economic sectors and Policy JP-J2 offers a wide range of employment sites, protecting existing employment areas from redevelopment.

It is recognised that the existing hotel and leisure use of the site would not fall within the traditional employment uses expected within primary employment zones. Nonetheless, the existing business provides employment opportunities for the area and supports the use of the adjacent premises. Furthermore, extension of this use within the existing grounds of the hotel would further support the continued growth of this business and support the economic growth of the area and the wider Greater Manchester region. The application is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of saved policy EC/2 and policies under the Core strategy and PfE and the principle of development is acceptable.

Design

Policies P1 and P3 of the Core Strategy require high quality design in new development. The requirements for high quality design is also clearly set out in the NPPF. Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and 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 application proposes a four-storey extension that would be sited to the south (side) elevation of the existing hotel. Three floors of the extension would provide additional accommodation to the hotel and the lower ground floor would be an open area, with supporting pillars, where external access through the structure would be available.

Upon the applications submission concerns were raised over the proposed design of the extension and how it would visually function with the existing building. In particular, there were concerns over the retention of the existing “tower” like feature between the extension and the existing building, the massing to the side of the extension, the layout of fenestration and relationship with the boundary. It was also noted that the design differed from that which was received largely positively at pre-app.

The Council subsequently provided advice on how the design and massing of the extension could be improved and amended plans have been submitted. With the amendments the scale of the extension has been reduced, the existing tower feature has been removed and the extension has been designed, from its front elevation, as a continuation of the existing design, with matching fenestration and detailing.

Through consultation with the Council’s Urban Design Officer it is considered that the amended plans provide a significant improvement on those first submitted. The proposals now respect the scale, massing, proportions and form of the building and through removal of the ‘tower’, the transition to the existing hotel is much more successful, with the proposed fenestration also matching with and complementing the existing features. It is noted that due to internal layout, some of the windows to the ground floor are ‘dummy’ features, and these are considered to be acceptable subject to the submission of further detail on their finish. This can be addressed through condition.

Through the amendments the depth of the extension has also been significantly reduced and this is a further improvement to the scheme, ensuring that the scale and massing of the extensions do not appear overbearing and dominating when viewed from the Waterfold Public House, Unit A3 and access road to the south.

For the extension to be successful it is important that the construction materials match well with the existing building and details of the soffit/underpass materials are required. Furthermore, specification of the piers depth/widths is necessary to ensure they also reflect the existing building. These matters can all be addressed through appropriately worded conditions.

Through the submission and amendments, the design of the extension is considered to be acceptable. The application therefore complies, in this regard, with policies P1 and P3 of the Core Strategy, PfE and the NPPF.

Trees, Landscaping and BNG

Policy G6 of the Council’s Core Strategy requires that development protects and improves green infrastructure and where trees are to be removed, these should be replaced on a 2:1 ratio. Policy G7 also requires that site and features of biodiversity are given full and appropriate recognition and protection and the NPPF under chapter 15 requires that planning decisions contribute to and enhance the natural environment. PfE policy JP-G2 also recognises that trees and woodland are a vital element of green infrastructure and policy JP-G7 aim to significantly increase tree cover, protect and enhance woodland and connect people to the trees and woodland around them.

As a result of the development two trees along the southern boundary of the site are to be removed and an existing hedgerow is to be cut back.

Consultation has been undertaken with GMEU in respect of the development and no specific concerns have been raised over the direct impacts of the proposed tree removal or hedgerow pruning and it is noted that the trees would not be worthy of protection.

GMEU have however considered the impact on trees and vegetation in the context of BNG legislation, which requires a statutory 10% BNG net gain across all new development unless it meets one of the exemptions. Policy JP-G7 also requires that new development proposals demonstrate a measurable net gain in biodiversity of no less than 10%.

The application has been submitted with the necessary BNG metric and through consultation with GMEU it is clear that 10% net gain is achievable within the extent of the land ownership and small area of habitat loss.

The metric provided indicates that no on-site mitigation measures are proposed. However, through consultation with GMEU, this does not appear to be the case, as although no biodiversity net gain assessment has been provided to show where the off-site measures would be proposed, the soft landscape plan clearly indicates new planting and habitat enhancement within the red edge, i.e. within the application site.

GMEU have advised that ideally the metric would be updated to and a BNG assessment provided to illustrate the above. Nonetheless, given the GMEU have advised that 10% net gain is clearly achievable on site, they have advised that subject to confirmation from the applicants that the BNG enhancements will be provided within the site (confirmation of this has been received) the final details can be sought through the statutory general biodiversity condition.

GMEU have further advised on the habitat creation and enhancement proposals and stated that given that medium distinctiveness habitats are proposed, they would be regarded as significant and therefore require control either via a condition of legal agreement. However, as less than 1 biodiversity unit is proposed for area based units and less than 0.1 unit of linear units, GMEU have advised that the use of a condition to control 30 years management and maintenance would be more proportionate in this instance.

In light of the above, it is considered that the changes to existing landscape/trees at the site are considered to be acceptable. However, 10% BNG net gain is required and this should be controlled through condition.

Ecology

Policy G7 of the Core Strategy requires developments to protect existing biodiversity including trees and vegetation. The NPPF also requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment and policy JP-G8 of PfE requires that through local planning a net enhancement of biodiversity resources will be sought.

PfE policy JP-G2 also recognises the importance of river valleys and waterway as priority green infrastructure and requires that new development to be designed to ensure river corridors and their habitats are integrated within development and enhanced wherever possible.

A bat survey has been submitted with the application. This identified no potential bat roosting features and therefore assessed the building as no risk. Nonetheless, given the scale of the development and the proximity to the River Roch, a likely high value foraging and commuting habitat, GMEU have advised that the building is negligible risk, as it is difficult for such large buildings to totally rule out usage by individual bats. Nonetheless, GMEU have also advised that no further information is required in respect of bats but they have advised that an informative be included upon any approval, advising the applicants of the protected status of bats and their habitat. Bat and bird boxes are also recommended and this can be controlled through condition.

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal submitted with the application also confirmed no evidence of other protected species, with the site assessed as unsuitable and sufficient distanced from suitable habitat. GMEU have confirmed agreement with this assessment and advised no further information or measures are required.

Notwithstanding the above, the application includes the removal of trees and shrubs. To protect any nesting birds within these GMEU have advised inclusion of a condition that prevents removal of shrubs and trees within the bird nesting season, unless they have first been surveyed by a suitable qualified ecologist. Furthermore, the dense shrubs on site provide potential cover for species such as hedgehog and other small mammals. It is an offence to inflict unnecessary suffering to wild mammals and therefore GMEU have recommended that a condition requiring precautionary measures for small mammals, in accordance with the preliminary ecological appraisal, be included upon any approval.

In other matters, no invasive species have been identified on the site. Nonetheless, GMEU have recommended a footnote that advises of the requirements in respect of invasive species. Furthermore, it is recommended that a Construction and Environmental Management Plan be conditioned upon approval to ensure protection of the River Roch corridor.

Further to the above, subject to appropriate conditions, the impact on ecology and protected species on the site is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the Core Strategy, PfE and NPPF.

Flooding 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, is itself well protected from flood risk and ensures prudent use of water resources. Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future).

Part of the application site is located in Flood Zone 2, with areas close to the River Roch designated as Flood Zone 3. A Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Surface Water Drainage Strategy, together with a SuDS Proforma have been submitted with the application and consultations undertaken with the Environment Agency and the Council's Lead Drainage Officer.

The proposed drainage strategy identifies that there would be no significant change to the impermeable area of the site and as such, surface water runoff from the extension

is proposed to drain into the existing surface water drainage system, with the applicants concluding that the proposed extension would have no effect on the surface water system.

Upon first submission additional information was requested by the Council's Lead Drainage Officer to demonstrate that the proposals provided a sustainable drainage solution for the site. In particular, additional information was requested to demonstrate why infiltration and discharge to a watercourse had been discounted, in accordance with the drainage hierarchy set out in the NPPF. Furthermore, additional information on the existing drainage regimes was required and the proposals needed to be updated to allow for 45% climate change factor.

Additional information was subsequently submitted and reviewed by the Lead Drainage Officer as acceptable. The Environment Agency have also confirmed no objections to the proposals.

Further to the above the proposed drainage scheme is considered to be acceptable and the development would not result in any unacceptable increase to flood risk in the area. The Drainage Officer has confirmed that no pre-commencement condition is required and that the details submitted are acceptable in accordance with the requirements of policy G8 of the Core Strategy.

Highways

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

As referenced in the site description, the site is flanked by the M66 to the east, with direct access available on junction 2. The application proposes no alterations to the existing access arrangements through the Waterfold Business Park and access to the site would also be retained in its existing position with no changes to servicing and access for emergency vehicles.

The proposed extension would be sited to the southern side of the existing hotel, where the site is currently used for parking and access to the rear of the site. Through the proposals the development would result in the loss of 12 existing car parking spaces.

Consultation has been undertaken with Highway Services and they have confirmed that the extension to the hotel would be a small intensification of the use of the site but that this would not be to the extent where there are concerns about increased traffic generation, particularly noting the good connections of the site to the motorway network and its links to local centres.

Highway Services have also advised that as well as an intensification in the use of the site, the proposals would result in a reduction in parking provision. However, the submitted Transport Statement includes a Parking Rationale which Highways Officers have confirmed is robust and that the parking provision proposed is acceptable.

In light of the above it is considered that there would be no undue highway safety impacts as a result of the development and in this regard the application accords with the requirements of policies T2 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Contamination

Policy G9 of the Core Strategy requires that any risks arising from contaminated land are identified prior to development taking place, with identified actions taken. Policy JP-S1 of PfE also requires that appropriate contamination mitigation and remediation is implemented.

A Phase 1 report has been submitted with the application and reviewed by the Council's Contaminated Land Officer who has confirmed that the report and its recommendations are acceptable. This confirms no credible sources of contamination on the site. Some historic and current sources of contamination have been identified in proximity to the site. However, on review of these sources in conjunction with the hydrological characteristics of the site and wider area, no plausible significant contamination links have been identified.

In light of the above the Contaminated Land Officer has confirmed that only a watching brief condition is required and this requires that any suspected contamination found during works be immediately reported and that suitable investigation and any necessary remediation be undertaken.

The contamination risks of the proposals are considered to be acceptable in accordance with the requirements of policy G9 of the Core Strategy and policies in PfE and the NPPF.

Neighbour amenity

Policy G9 of the Council's Core Strategy requires that development will reduce all forms of pollution in the area, and to this extent new development should not have impacts that lead to an unacceptable increase in air, water, noise, light or other pollution.

Located within an existing employment allocation the site does not have any immediate residential neighbours, with the nearest sensitive located to the opposite side of the River Roch, approximately 150m from the proposed extension.

Given the existing and well-established use of the site alongside the distance to the nearest sensitive properties it is considered that the development would not result in any adverse disturbances and the application is acceptable in regards the requirements of policy G9.

Summary

The application would provide for appropriate extension and development of the existing Village Hotel to provide and support growth of the existing use at the site. Amendments to the design of the extension have been provided to ensure that the development would positively contribute to the visual amenities of the area and the proposal would also ensure to protect highway safety, amenity, biodiversity, flood risk and ecological features within the site and the surrounding area.

RECOMMENDATION

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. The permission relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan / Site Plan as Existing – Drawing no. AS863 13 Revision P1
- Site Plan as Existing – Drawing no. AS863 01 Revision P2
- Site Plan as Proposed – Drawing no. AS863 07 Revision P5
- Lower Ground Floor Plan as Existing – Drawing no. AS863 02
- Ground Floor Plan as Existing – Drawing no. AS863 03
- First Floor Plan as Existing – Drawing no. AS863 04
- Second Floor Plan as Existing – Drawing no. AS863 05
- Elevations as Existing – Drawing no. AS863 06
- Lower Ground Floor Plan as Proposed – Drawing no. AS863 08 Revision P3
- Ground Floor Plan as Proposed – Drawing no. AS863 09 Revision P4
- First Floor Plan as Proposed – Drawing no. AS863 10 Revision P4
- Second Floor Plan as Proposed – Drawing no. AS863 11 Revision P4
- Elevations as Proposed – Drawing no. AS863 12 Revision P6
- Lower Ground Floor General Arrangement as Proposed – Drawing no. AS863 14 Revision P2
- Ground Floor General Arrangement as Proposed – Drawing no. AS863 15 Revision P3
- First Floor General Arrangement as Proposed – Drawing no. AS863 16 Revision P2
- Second Floor General Arrangement as Proposed – Drawing no. AS863 17 Revision P2
- Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals – Drawing no. P23-2674_EN_001 Rev A
- Baseline Habitats Plan – Drawing no. P.2010.24.E02

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

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

3. No above ground construction works shall take place until samples or full specification of materials to be used externally on the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt this shall include matching brick, stone detailing, cladding and roof tiles as well as detail of the underpass materials. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-S1 of Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. No above ground works shall take place until a scheme for the full specification of the windows and doors have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The specification shall include, at a scale of not less than 1:20 the longitudinal and cross sectional detailing with the depth of the reveal shown, cill and lintel detailing and means of opening together with any finished treatment and shall also include detail of the dummy windows and their external finish. The window and doors

shall be installed in accordance with the approved specification prior to first use of the extension and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with policies P1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-S1 of Places for Everyone and policy in the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. No above ground works shall take place until a scheme for the specification of the underpass supporting pillars has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt the specification shall include, at a scale of not less than 1:20 the longitudinal and cross sectional detailing of the pillars and their external finish. The pillars shall be first installed in accordance with the approved specification and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with policies P1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-S1 of Places for Everyone and policy in the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. No clearing of vegetation shall occur between the 1st March and 31st August in any year unless a detailed bird nest survey by a suitably experienced ecologist has been carried out immediately prior to clearance and written confirmation provided that no active bird nests are present which has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to prevent disturbance to any nesting birds that may be present in accordance with Policies G6 and G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-G8 of Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. No above ground works shall be submitted until a scheme for the inclusion of bat and bird boxes on the extension has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved bat and bird boxes shall be installed prior to first use of the extension and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the development provides sufficient habitat for protected nesting bats and birds and in accordance with Policies G6 and G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-G8 of Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. The development shall be fully carried out in accordance with the recommendations for small mammals contained in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Day time Building Inspection Report, Ascerta reference: P.2020.24 Section 5.2.

Reason: To ensure adequate protection of small mammals at the site and in accordance with Policies G6 and G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-G8 of Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until such time as a Habitat Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Habitat Management Plan shall detail the ongoing maintenance of on-site habitat pursuant to the statutory Biodiversity Net Gain condition. The approved plan shall be adhered to for a period of 30 years following the completion of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure that the requirements of The Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 are fulfilled

and in order to ensure the delivery of a net gain in biodiversity in accordance with the requirements of Policy G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-G8 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Prior to commencement of development a Construction and Environmental Management Plan that demonstrates how the River Roch will be protected from impacts from the construction works associated with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To ensure that the River Roch is not adversely impact by dust, runoff or other pollutants that may arise as a result of the development and to accord with policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Measure set out in the Construction and Environmental Management Plan will need to be in place prior to development to ensure no pollution of the river environment.

11. Surface water drainage for the development shall be fully installed and completed in accordance with the details set out in the Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy, prepared by Pegasus Group, dated 16/12/2024, reference P23-2674 and be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To reduce flood risk and ensure that water is drained in the most sustainable and in accordance with policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Places for Everyone and the National Planning Policy Framework.

12. A watching brief for contamination shall be maintained when carrying out the approved development. If during any works on site contamination is suspected or found or contamination is caused, the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately. A suitable investigation and/or risk assessment and/or any remedial action shall be carried out in accordance to an agreed process and within agreed timescales to the approval of the Local Planning Authority. If contamination is not suspected, found or caused during development this must be confirmed in a completion letter which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

To ensure that the development is appropriately protected from any contamination of the site in accordance with policy G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, The 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.

Notes for Applicant:

Bats

Whilst the building to be extended has been assessed as negligible risk for bats, the applicant is reminded that under the 2019 Regulations it is an offence to disturb, harm or kill bats. If a bat is found all work should cease immediately and a suitably licensed bat worker employed to assess how best to safeguard the bat(s).

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

1. Prior to the commencement of development, a Biodiversity Gain Plan shall be prepared and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition (biodiversity gain condition) that development may not begin unless:

(a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority,

and;

(b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan, if one is required in respect of this permission would be Rochdale Council.

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because none of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements listed below are considered to apply.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity gain condition.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and

(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or

(ii) the application for the original planning permission* to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

- i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
- ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
- iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

- i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and
- ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

- i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
- ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
- iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.6 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

*original planning permission means the permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

For the purposes of paragraph 13 (a) above, a biodiversity gain plan is a plan which:

- (a) relates to development for which planning permission is granted,
- and;

(b) specifies the matters referred to in sub-paragraph 14(2) below:

The matters are:

- (g) information about the steps taken or to be taken to minimise the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the onsite habitat and any other habitat;
- (h) the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;
- (i) the post-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;
- (j) any registered offsite biodiversity gain allocated to the development and the biodiversity and the biodiversity value of that gain in relation to the development;
- (k) any biodiversity credits purchased for the development; and
- (l) any such other matters as the Secretary of State may by regulations specify.