

APPLICATION NUMBER: 23/01241/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

23/01241/FUL

CASE OFFICER

Rosalind Gralton

DETERMINATION DATE 06.02.2024 EXT OF TIME 26.03.2024

Address: Heywood Civic Hall Church Street Heywood OL10 1LW

Proposal: Refurbishment of existing Civic Centre including a single storey extension to north facing elevation to create new glazed atrium/entrance

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

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: LA

DATE: 12.04.24

SITE

The site relates to Heywood Civic Centre, a 1960s building located within Peine Square, Heywood, south of Lance Corporal Stephen Shaw MC Way, Heywood.

The site fronts onto Peine Square.

To the west of the site and square is Heywood Library (Grade II listed).

The entire site is located within the Defined Urban Area, and is located within Heywood Town Centre. The civic centre building is not listed nor in a Conservation Area. The site has no other designations.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a single storey extension to the front entrance of the building as part of the refurbishment of the internal civic centre building.

The proposal would be constructed in matching brickwork, with glazed detailing, curtain walling and a bronze metal canopy atop the building.

Internally works would include the reorganisation of spaces to accommodate the refurbishment. An ancillary café would be sited in the new entrance way.

The proposal would not alter any landscaping works outside the building.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

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

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO1 – To deliver a more prosperous economy

E1 – Establishing thriving town, district and local centres
E2 – Increasing jobs and prosperity
E5 – Encouraging the visitor economy

SO2 – To create successful and healthy communities

C2 – Focusing on regeneration areas and economic growth corridors/areas
C8 – Improving community, sport leisure and cultural facilities

SO3 – To improve design, image and quality of place

P2 – Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
P3 – Improving design of new development

SO4 – To promote a greener environment

G6 – Enhancing green infrastructure

SO5 – To improve accessibility and deliver sustainable transport

T2 – Improving accessibility

DM1 – General development requirements

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 – Defined Urban Area

G/S/1 & S/5 – Heywood Town Centre

G/R/1 – Physical Regeneration – Central and East Heywood

Places for Everyone (PfE)

Places for Everyone is a joint development plan for 9 boroughs within Greater Manchester over the period up to 2039, and follows the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF), which was dropped following the decision of Stockport Council to drop out of GMSF in December 2020.

The plan was adopted on 21 March 2024. The relevant policies within PfE are:

JP-P1 – Sustainable Places

JP-J2 – Heritage

JP-P3 – Cultural Facilities

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

77/D05486 – Installation of Two new windows – Grant 31/10/1977

94/D31161 – Single storey extension to rear of building to form disabled persons WC

98/D35607 – Closure of Wood Street to form additional parking area and civic/ open space events area. Installation of ramp to front of library and erection of two pole mounted CCTV cameras. – Granted subject to conditions 08/09/1998

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation and Design

Heywood Civic Hall was constructed in the 1960s, to a design by eminent national architects Lyons, Israel and Ellis. This architects' practice, which is synonymous with postwar Brutalism, is responsible for a number of listed buildings across the country and many famous British architects such as James Stirling, Neave Brown and James Gowan worked there.

Given the architectural interest of the building; its links to an eminent national architect and its communal interest as a community building, it is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset and the provisions of NPPF paragraph 209 apply. This requires a balanced judgement to be had, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset.

Part of the setting of the Civic Hall is Peine Square, onto which the Hall fronts. This provides an important area of public space within the civic area of the town centre.

To the west of the site and Peine Square is Heywood Library. The library was constructed with a grant from the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust and was completed in 1905. It was officially inaugurated in 1906. The library has an ashlar front with two large mullioned and transomed bays framing an Ionic doorcase with a hood. The side elevations are a mix of brick and stone work. The roof is Westmorland slate. The library has undergone various alterations, the most significant of which, being the construction of an extension linking the library to the NHS centre to the southwest. The library is listed at grade II for its special

architectural and historic interest. The impact of the proposal on the setting of this listed building is also a material planning consideration. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that “in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority [...] shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”. The relevant provisions of NPPF Chapter 16 also apply.

There are a number of other listed buildings within the vicinity of the site, which contribute towards the civic quarter of Heywood town centre. These include: St Luke’s Church (grade II*), St Luke’s Church Sundial (grade II), Former Union Bank (grade II) and the War Memorial (grade II). However, given the nature of the works and their position in relation to the site, it is not considered that their significance would be materially impacted by the proposal.

The proposal is for the construction of a new entrance to the Civic Hall facing onto Peine Square, replacing the existing porch. The construction of the new entrance foyer offers an opportunity to enhance the frontage of the building and improve the visual relationship between the Square, Civic Hall and library.

There is no objection to the asymmetric form of the extension. I do have some reservation about the eastern elevation. Opportunities should be taken to introduce more glazing, so that the eastern portion of the Square does not become isolated. I also have some concerns with the proposed use of brick, which result in an addition, which is overly heavy and uninviting. I am also not necessarily convinced that this would blend well with the existing. If the brick blend is not done effectively, then the delineation between old and new could become somewhat blurred. An alternative material, such as metal cladding should be considered, along with additional glazing. If brickwork is proposed, then a sample panel should be provided on site for consideration.

As part of the works, it would be welcomed if the exterior of the existing building could be enhanced. It is suggested that this include the cleaning of existing stained brickwork and the removal of any redundant equipment.

I note that the Council’s Urban Design Officer has been consulted on this application. I advise that their comments are taken on board to ensure an acceptable relationship between the heritage assets and the proposals.

Following amended plans:

The revised proposal would have a neutral impact on the significance of the listed building. There may be some minor harm to the significance of the NDHA and a balanced judgement should be had. It is noted that there are considerable public benefits in this case.

Environmental Health (Noise and Odour)

‘There are no issues with the NIA as such we have no objections to the proposals. The resultant noise from plant will be well below the measured background and as such difficult to monitor, however if you are minded to add a numbered condition I would suggest the following:

Noise levels of fixed plant will not exceed 28 dB(A) measured 1m from noise sensitive receptors.’

Highways And Engineering

The proposed extension to the Civic Hall does not appear to have any impact on the current servicing arrangements and although there may be a slight increase in servicing demand we raise no concerns on this issue.

As the application site is within Heywood Town Centre it is in a sustainable location with good access to public transport and local amenities. There are a number of public car parks in close proximity and we raise no concerns regarding parking provision.

Although the area into which the building is to be extended has public access is not a registered public highway therefore no formal highway closure will be needed.

We would not expect that the development would have any impact on highway capacity or road safety.

As the construction would take place in the public realm we would suggest that the applicant produces a Construction Method Statement for approval to ensure public safety during the construction period.

Highways raise no objection to this application subject to the suggested planning condition.

Tree Officer

Extension to the Civic Centre:

I have some concerns that the extension to the Civic Hall will substantively affect two prominent mature Sycamore trees, marked as T1 and T2 in the Arboriculture Survey / Method Statement. These trees make a significant contribution to the local streetscape.

Both trees will as a minimum require pruning of the canopy to facilitate the development, but even following pruning on completion of the development the trees will be much closer to the building frontage and will require likely monitoring and further future pruning if encroachment over the building is to be avoided (although mature, both trees have some significant growth potential remaining). This will inevitably compromise the future potential and aspect of the trees. In addition, T1 will require root pruning and careful construction if the tree is to be successfully protected and retained; any works will need to be carefully overseen by an Arbor clerk of works. Following any pruning works the tree will need to be monitored for recovery.

So although I would accept that the development could be permitted and the trees retained, to avoid harm to the trees, possible future encroachment over the building, and to avoid compromising the future contribution that these trees could make to the locality, I would prefer it if the extension to the building could be re-considered.

If there are overriding reasons to permit the development proposals, I'd recommend –

- ② *That the implementation of the Arboricultural Method Statement dated Sept 2023 is required by Condition*
- ② *Any works affecting trees must be overseen by a suitably qualified Arborist*
- ② *Trees T1 and T2 as identified in the Arboriculture Report should be monitored annually post-completion.*

The Coal Authority

As you will be aware, the Coal Authority's general approach in cases where development is proposed within the Development High Risk Area is to recommend that the applicant obtains coal mining information for the application site and submits a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to support the planning application

*However, and whilst a Coal Mining Risk Assessment does not appear to accompany the planning application, when considering the nature of the proposal the Coal Authority does not consider that a Coal Mining Risk Assessment would be proportionate in this particular instance and **do not object** to this planning application*

Urban Design Officer

First comments summary:

The scheme would benefit from greater design development to justify the design rationale. The design as it currently stands is not fully resolved, particularly in terms of materiality and detail. Ultimately, there is a huge opportunity missed to intrinsically improve the permeability of the site and develop the building identity to make it more visually stimulating. To help clarify many of the comments, a demonstration of the design process and wider precedent exploration would be prudent.

Second comments summary following submission of amended plans:

The front elevation has improved with the architect addressing some of the concerns flagged from the initial consultation. The design as it currently stands is still not fully resolved, particularly in terms of materiality and detail. As a result, an opportunity has been lost to develop the building identity to make it more visually stimulating. The elevations resubmitted have not helped argue the materiality. The concerns about the permeability of the site remain.

REPRESENTATIONS

The application was publicised by neighbour notification, site notice and press notice. No responses were received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The site falls within Heywood town centre as set out under saved UDP Policy G/S/1. Policy E1 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to maintain town centres as thriving and sustainable centres, and the preferred shopping and leisure destinations for people visiting, living and working in the borough. Policy E5 supports development which promotes the visitor economy of the borough including improving linkages across Heywood, and seek to support proposals which improve the visitor economy and resist those that could adversely affect it. Policy C8, Improving community, sport, leisure and cultural facilities, seeks to work with services agencies and business to ensure needs and demands of communities are met. Arts and cultural facilities are vital to attract residents and visitors to support local culture and improve the boroughs image.

Paragraph 97 of the NPPF states 'To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:

a) plan positively for the provision and use of ... community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments'

Policy C8 of the adopted Core Strategy relates to improving community, leisure and cultural facilities. The policy states it will work with agencies, services and businesses responsible for providing facilities to ensure needs and demands of communities are met, and require facilities to be within towns to be located in or adjacent to the town centres. The proposal would build upon the existing infrastructure of the Civic Centre and provide much needed upgrades to enhance the building and improve the facilities and access of facilities to residents.

The proposal would utilise and provide significant improvements to an existing cultural facility in Heywood, to expand upon existing arts and cultural facilities and support the boroughs image. Heywood Civic Centre, in tandem with Your Trust, would become one of the borough's 'Culture Hubs' and would expand the venue, provide a new base for 'Cartwheel Arts' a local community group in partnership with the Council, upgrade quality of the existing performance facilities, and also deliver on improved accessibility of the venue. The project is supported by Arts Council England and Capital Investment Programme funding.

With the above policies in mind, it is considered that subject to the appropriate assessment of development management matters as considered in detail below, the principle of the development is acceptable.

Heritage

In considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that the Local Planning Authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or and special features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72 of this Act goes on to state that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Furthermore, the Court of Appeal has held that decision-makers should give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise.

PfE Policy JP-P2 requires the significance of a heritage asset to be considered in accordance with national planning policy and seeks to deliver positive benefits that sustain and enhance the historic environment as well as contributing to g positive benefits that sustain and enhance the historic environment, as well as contributing to the economic viability, accessibility and environmental quality of a place.

The proposal is for the construction of a new entrance to the Civic Hall facing onto Peine Square, replacing the existing porch. The Council's Conservation Officer was consulted on the proposals in relation to the siting adjacent to Heywood Library (Grade II listed), however through the course of the application it was identified the existing building is a Non-Designated Heritage Asset by its architectural interest, with both links to an eminent national architect and its communal interest as a community building. Therefore paragraph 209 of the NPPF is relevant.

Paragraph 209 states *'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated*

heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'

The application building is sited adjacent to Heywood Library, and would impact the setting of the building. The Conservation Officer does not object to the asymmetric form of the extension, however did provide comments regarding opportunities to improve the eastern elevation by additional glazing be added to the proposals, in order to improve the visual relationship of the civic hall, square and the library. Amended plans have sought to address this concern. It is concluded the revised proposal would have a neutral impact on the significance of the listed building. A balanced judgement should be given to the significance of the NDHA, as stated in paragraph 209 of the NPPF.

Regarding materiality, concerns were raised with the choice of brick; however an acceptable sample panel of a 'Classic Blue Multi – Wienerberger', which would match the existing building, was presented to the Council on site; and has subsequently been secured to the decision via condition.

Minor enhancements to the building can also be secured via condition through the cleaning of existing brickwork and removal of redundant paraphernalia affixed to the external elevations. Appropriate conditions are to be attached to the permission to reflect this.

A balanced judgement is therefore required regarding the scale of harm to the non-designated heritage asset. The revised proposal acts upon the comments from the conservation officer, and relevant conditions are secured seek to mitigate any harm to the asset. In addition, as a result of the proposed benefits set out within the proposals section of this report, on balance, subject to conditions, the proposed works to the NDHA would be considered acceptable.

As such, it is considered the proposals would comply with Policy P2 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the paragraphs contained within the National Planning Policy framework.

Design

Policy P3 of the adopted Core Strategy requires all new developments, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to high standards of design. Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy states that all development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they are of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area, in addition to requiring a number of other basic planning considerations.

Paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, which is largely reflected within Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy, which requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design.

PfE Policy JP-P1 is consistent with the aims of the NPPF requiring new development to be well-designed in that it too seeks to ensure that new development is distinctive with a clear identity that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality and is visually stimulating, creating interesting and imaginative environments.

The proposals seek to erect an asymmetric flat roof extension, built in matching brick to the existing building. The building would have glazed detailing, curtain walling and

a bronze metal canopy atop the building. Aluminium lettering of 'Heywood Civic Centre' would be positioned atop the new entrance.

Concerns were raised by the Council's Urban Design Officer in relation to the form of the extension, in addition to the material choice of brick. Following discussions with the applicant, the materiality was established as acceptable, subject to an appropriate brick sample panel being presented on site. An appropriate brick was identified and is secured by condition.

Concerns were raised also about the permeability of the extension and the relationship to Peine Square. It is noted the application does not seek to alter Peine Square, which is to be redeveloped under a separate forthcoming application. Subsequently, no landscaping conditions are required.

On balance, the proposals would seek to extend the Civic Centre building with a sensitive palette of materials. The amendments sought have provided an improved arrangement of glazing and a brick has been presented which would match the existing. As such, it is not considered the proposal would be unacceptable in respect of design, and would comply with Policies P1, P3 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

Arboriculture

The Council's Arboricultural Officer was consulted regarding the application. Concerns were raised about the close proximity of the extension to the two existing sycamore trees located in Peine Square. Neither trees are protected by a tree preservation order. Both trees are located within the Council's ownership. Subsequently the Council's Arboricultural Officer held concerns regarding the extension form as a result of the proposals and recommended the conditioning of the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement, and continued annual monitoring of the trees post completion.

Officers have given due regard to the comments from the Arboricultural Officer however, they are also mindful that the Council is due to submit a planning application in the summer of 2024 for landscaping works to Peine Square, which will remove the two sycamore trees, in order to open up the space and improve the visibility of the building from Lance Corporal Stephen Shaw MC Way. The works as part of the application will incorporate replacement tree planting, which should compensate for the loss of these two trees and the Local Planning Authority will determine this application. As such, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to require the trees to be protected during construction via a tree protection condition.

As such, it is not considered the proposals would result in any unacceptable impact in accordance with Policy G6 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

Residential Amenity

Core Strategy policy DM1 requires all development proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact upon the amenity of future residents and occupiers. Policy G9 requires that sensitive new developments such as housing are not adversely affected by existing sources of pollution, including noise, from certain types of industry. Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should result in places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The proposal is located within Heywood Town Centre, and is sited between Heywood Library, Peine Square and multiple commercial uses. It is noted that to the

south, a residential area is present along Stanley Street. The Council's Environmental Health Officer was consulted regarding the application and has not proposed any objections. A condition was suggested, however given the challenges of monitoring the noise from the plant which would be below the measured background noise, it would not be enforceable or reasonable.

The extension is located to the northern elevation of the site, and therefore would not be visible on the residential properties to the south, nor would it result in any unacceptable overlooking impact.

While the proposal would re-furbish the civic centre and introduce a cafe, intensifying the current use of the building, it is not considered the proposal would not incur any unacceptable residential amenity impact upon these occupiers due to the distance.

The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the requirements of Core Strategy Policies P1, P3 and DM1, and the policies within the NPPF.

Highways

Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to improve accessibility by locating development where good access to public transport is available or can be provided and in all circumstances, prioritises the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live or have business in the area. Policy DM1 also 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.

The Council's Highways Officers were consulted on the application and stated the proposed extension would not affect the current servicing arrangements even with the additional cafe.

No concerns are raised in regard to car parking and it would not be expected that the development would have any impact on highway capacity or road safety. Given the proposed construction will happen within Peine Square it is expected a Construction Method Statement is provided to ensure public safety.

No objections are raised.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve with 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 and documents:-

Proposed Site Location Plan - 564- K2A-B1- 02- 90-202 – Rev P01
Received by the Council on the 15th March 2024

Existing Basement Floor Plan - 564-K2A-B1-BM-DR-A-20-000 Rev P02
Demolition Basement Floor Plan - 564-K2A-B1-BM-DR-A-20-100 –Rev P02
Proposed Basement Floor Plan - 564-K2A-B1-BM-DR-A-20-200 – Rev P05
Existing Elevations - 564-K2A-B1-ZZ-DR-A-20-050 – P02
Existing Sections - 564-K2A-B1-ZZ-DR-A-20-070 – P02

Proposed Elevations - 564-K2A-B1-ZZ-DR-A-20-300 – P06
 Proposed Sections 1 of 2 - 564-K2A-B1-ZZ-DR-A-20-400 – P03
 Proposed Sections 2 of 2 - 564-K2A-B1-ZZ-DR-A-20-401 – P04
 PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR SOILS LAYOUT - 4026-SHA-XX-00-DR-M-4000 – Rev P1
 PROPOSED BASEMENT SOILS LAYOUT - 4026-SHA-XX-B1-DR-M-4001 – Rev P1
 Demolition Viewing Booth Floor Plan - 564-K2A-B1-01-DR-A-20-103 – Rev P02
 Proposed Viewing Booth Floor Plan - 564-K2A-B1-01-DR-A-20-203 – Rev P04
 Existing Viewing Booth Floor Plan - 564-K2A-B1-01-DR-A-20-003 – Rev P02
 Proposed Ground Floor Plan - Day time - 564-K2A-B1-00-DR-A-20-201 – Rev P05
 Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Evening - 564-K2A-B1-00-DR-A-20-202 Rev P04
 Proposed Roof Plan 564-K2A-B1-02-DR-A-20-204 P04
 Proposed Site Context Plan 564-K2A-B1-02-DR-A-90-200 – P04
 Existing Site Context Plan - 564-K2A-B1-02-DR-A-90-000 – P04
 Design and Access Statement – prepared by K2 Architects
 Received 11 March 2024

‘Classic Blue Multi – Wienerberger’ Brick Sample Specification Received by the Council 20th March 2024

and the development shall be carried out in complete 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 adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Notwithstanding any description in the application, no above ground works shall take place until full product specifications for the canopy, windows, external doors or any other glazing, and detailed designs of the window and door reveals, 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 development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained and / or replaced as approved thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Prior to any brick cleaning works taking place, a method statement detailing the proposed method of cleaning, including the display of a 1sqm test area on site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure the quality of the non-designated heritage asset is not diminished as a result of any cleaning, and in accordance with policies P2 and P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until such time as a plan detailing the removal of redundant external wiring, CCTV cameras, or any other paraphernalia affixed to the external elevation of the building and details of how the building is to be made good have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measure shall be carried out in full prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In the interest of securing and enhancement to the Non-Designated Heritage Asset and in accordance with Policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. The extension hereby approved shall be constructed in 'Classic Blue - Multi' Wienerberger brick, as shown on a sample panel on site to Council Officers 20/03/2024, and as the brochure listed within the approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, and in accordance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy 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:

1. The applicant is reminded of the need to ensure that any advertisements are accompanied with the necessary advertisement consents prior to their installation. Planning permission does not infer consent for such installations nor does it infer that the installations would be acceptable. Details of the advertisements which require express consent can be found in the "Outdoor Advertisements and Signs: A Guide for Advertisers," document here: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a755a88e5274a3cb2869c26/326679.pdf>

Report Author Rosalind Gralton