

APPLICATION NUMBER: 23/00526/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DETERMINATION DATE
23/00526/FUL	Rosalind Gralton	24 October 2023

Address: Site Of The Former West Street Baptist Church Buckley Street Rochdale OL16 2EL

Proposal: Erection of no' 3 pairs of semi-detached dwellinghouses including erection of one detached garage - Resubmission of application 22/00676/FUL

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

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/A
-----	--	-----

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

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE
----------------	--------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: LA DATE: 29.08.24

SITE

The application relates approximately 0.1 hectares of vacant land, which is now overgrown by shrubs and foliage. The site has further waste ground to the rear (south) and is abutted by Buckley Street to the north and West Street to the west, with hardstanding to the east. This is the site of the former West Street Baptist Church, which was demolished in recent years.

The site is set to the south of the Yorkshire Street Local Centre, and whilst some mixed uses are in the vicinity, the area is predominately characterised by residential properties.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the erection of three pairs of semi-detached dwellinghouses including one ancillary detached garage, totalling 6 dwellinghouses (Use Class C3).

This application follows a refused scheme on the same site, refused 14/12/2022. The refused scheme, for three pairs of semi-detached houses however was a four storey design with a rear fourth floor terrace area. While the scheme has been reduced by a storey and by the massing to the rear, many similarities remain.

The proposed buildings are three pairs of semi-detached, three storey townhouse style dwellings with two front gables and vertical emphasis, exaggerated with the full height windows. The properties would face north onto Buckley Street.

All dwellings would have a box style, zinc cladded dormer on the rear roof slope. A basic flat canopy provides cover over the front door into the property on the front elevations of the dwellings.

Boundary treatment shows a timber fence dividing the properties.

Materials proposed include a Redland Cambrian Slate – Heather roof and an Ibstock Chailey Rustic Facing Brick to the main buildings. Contrasting stone is proposed to lintels and window sills.

One Category C2 tree is proposed to be felled to facilitate the development. The tree is not protected and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment was submitted as part of the application. A planning statement was submitted with the application.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – December 2023

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

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:

Policy JP-S1 – Sustainable Places

Policy JP-H1 – Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
Policy JP-H2 – Affordability of New Housing
Policy JP-H3 – Type, Size and Design of New Housing

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

- SO2 Creating successful and healthy communities**
C1 Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places
C3 Delivering the right type of housing
- SO3 Improving design, image and quality of place**
P1 Improving image
P3 Improving design of new development
- SO4 Promoting a Greener Environment**
G6 Enhancing Green Infrastructure
G8 Managing water resources and flood risk
- SO5 Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport**
T2 Improving accessibility
- DM1 General development requirements
- SD1 Delivering sustainable development

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

- GD/1 Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

- 12/D55453 Application For Outline Planning Permission With Some Matters Reserved For The Erection Of 6NO (3X2 Semi Detached) Houses. Resubmission Of D55148. Grant subject to conditions.
- 22/00676/FUL Erection of 3 pairs of 4 storey semi-detached dwellings with associated landscaping and boundary treatments – Refused 14/12/2022

Reasons for refusal of 22/00676/FUL:

- 1 *By reason of its siting, scale and design, the proposed development would not conform to the typical pattern of the surrounding area, which would not complement the existing streetscene, appearing as incongruous additions and constituting overdevelopment, contrary to the visual amenity aims of policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.*
- 2 *By reason of its siting, scale and design, the proposed development would unacceptably encroach on the side windows of no. 8 Buckley Street,*

becoming an unduly overbearing structure and severely restricting light and outlook, and would have an unacceptable impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties to the rear by reason of the proposed roof terraces. Furthermore, the limited outdoor amenity space proposed for Unit 1 and Unit 6 and would result in an unsatisfactory level of occupier amenity. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 *The proposal allows for an inadequate means of access to the parking provision for Unit 6, and would therefore not provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking to this dwellinghouse, in conflict with policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.*
- 4 *The proposed development would result in the loss of one tree which makes a positive contribution to the street scene, with no replacement tree planting proposed in mitigation. The proposed development would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity of the area, in conflict with policy G6 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways And Engineering

No objection subject to a condition requiring footway improvements along Buckley Street.

Env Health - Noise/Odours

No objection subject to conditions.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

No objection subject to pre-commencement drainage condition.

Environmental Control (Landfill Gas)

No objections, the submitted PRA and recommendation is acceptable. Condition proposed for Phase II and III report to be submitted.

Gtr Manchester Ecology Unit

No objections. CEMP and biodiversity enhancements requested by condition.

United Utilities

No objections. Pre-commencement condition proposed.

GM Fire Service

No comments received to date

REPRESENTATIONS

The application was publicised by way of neighbour notification and site notice. Three objections were received and the concerns are summarised below:

- Concern regarding vehicle access to garage overstepping through private land
- Blockage of light into bedroom to properties on West Street

- Felling/cutting of a tree on West Street
- Increase in traffic
- Lack of parking and traffic congestion that already existing on West Street and surrounding streets
- Concern the applicant may also be responsible for previous poor upkeep on the site prior to demolition of the Baptist Church
- How will the burial ground opposite 12 West St be affected?
- Can the learner be turned into a small park and create a green space in the area

These matters are considered in the analysis section below.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The proposed application site is located within the Defined Urban Area as designated under the Proposals Map of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). New development, wherever possible and appropriate, should be concentrated within the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside.

Policy C1 of the Core Strategy outlines that the Council will promote the reuse and regeneration of vacant and underused previously developed sites, seeking to provide 80% of new housing on previously developed land.

The latest published information suggests that the Council can demonstrate more than a five year supply of housing land based on the Core Strategy target; however this does not preclude the promotion of sustainable development where this can assist in delivering additional housing to meet local needs.

The principle of redevelopment of the site for residential use would be compatible with the surrounding residential area. The site is located in close proximity to Yorkshire Street Local Centre. It is therefore considered that the site is well located in terms of access to jobs, shops and services by modes of transport other than the private car. The site is therefore in a sustainable location.

Furthermore, the proposal would make efficient use of land within the Defined Urban Area and would contribute to the supply of housing in a sustainable location within the borough. The principle of the development is therefore acceptable and in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy, saved policies within the Unitary Development Plan and the NPPF.

Visual Amenity

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 131 and 135 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.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, significant weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.

The application site is located within the Defined Urban Area and in an area of Rochdale which is characterised by residential development.

A single house type is included (but reversed over the semi-detached pairs) which presents an area of consistent appearance, split over 3 storeys.

Whilst it is recognised that there are some taller properties in the vicinity of the site, these are sited within the Yorkshire Street Local Centre. The area is predominantly defined by two-storey terrace dwellinghouses as seen on West Street, with a mixture of render and red brick facing materials used.

When examining the development spatially, it is considered that the proposal would not conform to the typical pattern of the surrounding area, and would result in a development of 6 houses which would not complement the existing street scene. No pattern of multiple semi-detached, or detached properties are identified within the surrounding vicinity. The closest semi-detached property is located 270m south east of the site in an entirely different context to that viewed of this application, which is just south of Yorkshire Street and Yorkshire Street Local Centre, characterised by terraced properties.

Spatially, the proposed narrow form of the dwellinghouses in conjunction with their excessive height and number of storeys would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area. It is noted the changes the applicant has made to the development compared to the previous proposals, which have reduced the height of the buildings to three storey rather than four, and removed the proposed rear terrace area. Nevertheless, the dwellings remain both visually and spatially at odds with the surrounding area, and would tower over and above properties on Buckley Street to the north, and over properties along West Street, where the side elevation of Unit 1 would be in full view on the prominent corner plot.

This issue of form is further compounded by the gable ended front facing element, which shares no similarity with properties in the surrounding area. It is noted the removal of the irregular gable ended roof forms from the previously approved application, which is welcomed, however the narrow and vertical emphasis only adds to the visual impact the proposals would have, and appear vastly out of scale by reason of excessive height. In addition, the topography of the site is flat, and is not downhill, which would only add to the proposed development appearing out of scale with neighbouring residential terraces. As a result, the proposed dwellinghouses would therefore appear as an incongruous addition to the streetscene, which would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Furthermore, whilst it is noted that the development of this brownfield site would be beneficial, it is considered that the proposed development would result in an overdevelopment of the site, as seen by the rather narrow widths of the property and excessive height in comparison to other properties in the vicinity. This can be particularly seen in Units 1 and 6, where to accommodate some form of parking provision, the properties would benefit from a limited amount of outdoor private amenity and garden space.

It is acknowledged however, that the design of the proposed garage to the rear would be considered acceptable due to its siting behind each property, and that it is not visible from the streetscene.

The Council's SPD 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Adopted June 2011, provides guidance on dormer extension designs. At paragraph 5.16 it states *'Dormer extensions can be visually prominent, particularly where they can be seen from the public highway, and therefore it is important that they are carefully*

designed and sited. Dormers to the front elevation will not normally be permitted. Rear dormers should be modest in size and not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof.'

Additionally at 5.17, it is stated the following principle should apply

- (i) They should not exceed the height of the ridge and where possible, should be sited below the ridge line of the dwelling;*
- (ii) They should be set back from the eaves line;*
- (iii) They should be set in from the party/side walls of the house;*
- (iv) Dormers with flat roofs should be avoided, unless they are considered to better respect the design of the host building and character of the area;*
- (v) Dormers which wrap around the side ridges of a hipped roof are not acceptable;*
- (vi) Dormer windows should normally line up vertically with existing windows and/or be smaller than existing openings and the window design should match the existing window style;*
- (vii) The materials used in the construction of dormers should match those of the existing roof; and*
- (viii) Dormer extensions should protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants and should achieve the minimum space standards set out in Section 4. Side facing windows should be obscurely glazed.*

The proposed box dormers would have a flat roof and while would be set down from the ridge height of the roof and set back from the eaves line, the dormer design would encompass the entire roofspace of the rear roofslope. The roof of the dormer, would have the appearance of a flat roof box dormer when viewed from pedestrian level, and would be highly visible given the prominence of the plots. The proposed material is zinc cladding; which contrasts from the proposed Redland Cambrian Slate – Heather of the main roof. The dormer windows would not be set in away from the shared party wall dividing the two properties, and the window on the rear of the dormer would not line up with any of the windows on the rear elevation of the dwelling.

Overall, by reason of the proposed scale and design, the proposed dwellinghouses would not conform to the typical pattern of the surrounding area, and would result in a development of 6 dwellinghouses which would not complement the existing streetscene, appearing as incongruous additions and constituting overdevelopment, contrary to Rochdale Core Strategy Policies DM1 and P3, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential Amenity

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' which states that new developments "*should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.*"

Space Standards & Privacy

Section 4.1 of the SPD sets out minimum distance standards which all new residential developments should adhere to in order to ensure a satisfactory standard of amenity for surrounding, existing and future occupiers.

The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document '*Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development*' (2016) contains a number of guidelines and requirements for the design and layout of new housing in order to preserve the amenity standards for surrounding residents. The SPD at section 4.1, establishes that the following minimum space standards will be applied to all new residential developments and development which affect existing residential properties:

- 21m between directly facing principle windows of habitable rooms, at an upper floor level and 10.5m between a principal window at an upper floor level and a directly facing boundary of the curtilage.
- 14m between a principal window and any directly facing two storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.
- 10m between a principal window and any directly facing single storey elevation which does not contain a principal window to a habitable room.

Section 4.2 also states that where buildings of three or more storeys are proposed, or there is a marked difference in levels, it may be necessary for the minimum distances set out in (ii) and (iii) above to be increased.

From the front elevation of Units 5-6, to the rear elevation of the first floor properties on Yorkshire Street, a minimum distance of approximately 29 metres will separate the properties. From the front elevations of Units 3-4 to directly facing windows on the rear elevations of properties on Buckley Street, a 9.2m distance is present. Units 1-2 have a 12.46m distance to the facing rear fire exit to the building opposite of Buckley Street. These distances, on the basis the windows are habitable room windows, would therefore fail to meet the standards as outlined in section 4.1 of the SPD. From the rear elevation of the proposed dwellinghouses to the closest neighbouring properties sited to the rear of the application on West Street and North Street, an approximate minimum distance of 30 metres will separate the properties. These distances would exceed the largest distance required between principal rooms as outlined in the *Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD*, and as such the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of facing principal rooms to the front and rear.

However, the property at No. 8 Buckley Street, whilst formerly under another use, has been converted into a residential property. Between the closest proposed dwellinghouse, Unit 6, and a principal room window at this neighbouring property a distance of approximately 8 metres is proposed. It is considered that the very limited separation (8m) set against a requirement of at least 14m that would result between the side elevation of the closest proposed dwellinghouse and this neighbouring property, would result in unacceptable harm to the light and outlook enjoyed from side windows of this property, which is further compounded by the proposed excessive heights of the proposed dwellinghouses.

The application shows a dormer window to the rear. There would be at least an 18m distance from the rear dormer window to the rear of the property at 30 North Street. As such, this distance between neighbouring properties to the rear would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the privacy of adjacent properties.

Occupier Amenity

The Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) is a technical standards document produced to ensure internal space within new dwellings is suitable for application across all tenures. Table 1 of this document sets out the minimum gross internal floor area requirements for dwellings, and setting out the requirements for dwellings which include a variety of room numbers, bed spaces and storeys.

Number of bedrooms (b)	Number of bed spaces (persons)	3 storey dwellings	Built-in storage
4	7p	121sqm	3.0sqm

It is noted that no details on the intended number of occupants have been submitted. However due to the sizing of the proposed units, each dwellinghouse would be able to accommodate approximately 7 individuals.

Each dwellinghouse would have an internal floorspace of approximately 123sqm. 1.7sqm of built in storage is provided in addition to adequate internal space, and Officers therefore consider that the internal occupier amenity would be satisfactory. The proposal would provide adequate light and outlook for all habitable rooms.

The below table provides the measurements for the proposed private amenity space provided for each proposed dwellinghouse.

Unit	Private Amenity Space
Unit 1	14 sqm
Unit 2	37 sqm
Unit 3	41 sqm
Unit 4	41 sqm.
Unit 5	41 sqm
Unit 6	23 sqm.

Section 5.4 of the SPD states '*5.4 It is important that sufficient garden space is retained for purposes of sitting out, drying clothes and for children to play. An amount of garden area should be retained to meet the reasonable needs of existing and future occupiers. An extension that does not leave sufficient private garden space is unlikely to be acceptable.*'

Due to the size of the proposed dwellinghouses, there is a strong likelihood that they would be occupied by large families. With this in mind, Officers consider that the level of private amenity space proposed for Unit 1 and Unit 6 would be insufficient for typical family requirements such as refuse storage, drying washing, sitting out areas and space to play and as such, fails to provide a satisfactory level of occupier amenity.

To conclude, the proposal would fail to accord with the requirements of section 4.1 and 5.4 of the SPD and would result on the unacceptable level of amenity for the occupiers of Units 1 and 6. Compounding this, the proposal would unacceptably encroach on the side windows of no. 8 Buckley Street, becoming an unduly overbearing structure and severely restricting light and outlook, and would result in an unacceptable impact on the privacy to neighbouring properties to the rear by reason of the proposed roof terraces. Furthermore, the limited amenity space proposed for Unit 1 and Unit 6 and would result in an unsatisfactory living conditions for the occupants, contrary to the aims of policies DM1 of the Adopted Core Strategy, the SPD and Paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Highways

Core Strategy policy T2 states that development will be appropriately located to minimise the need to travel by car and the number and length of car trips. Core Strategy policy DM1 requires all development proposals, provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring and servicing arrangements, taking into account the proposed use and location. Developments are required to

provide parking in compliance with the Council's Car Parking Standards as set out in Appendix 5 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy. Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the NPPF require that safe and suitable access to a site can be achieved for all users and 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 of the road network would be severe.

The proposed development has been designed with dwellings fronting Buckley Street. Access into the private driveways is taken from Buckley Street. This is a narrow adopted highway with demand for on-street parking along its length.

The proposals indicate that parking would be provided to the side of the proposed dwellinghouses, with 2 spaces each for Units 2-5. Unit 1 is served by parking to the rear of the site, and Unit 6 is served by a standalone rear garage again containing 2 spaces. The Council's parking standards require 2 spaces per dwelling and this has been achieved.

The application has been reviewed by the Council Highway's Engineer who raised no objection to the proposal. Due to existing traffic calming measures within the vicinity of the proposed development, Highway Officers consider the proposed visibility at the Junction of West Street and Buckley Street would be acceptable. Furthermore the site is situated within a sustainable area, in relation to terms of access to local amenities and public transport. In addition servicing arrangements to the proposed development would be considered acceptable.

Highway Officers have requested a condition be attached to the permission in the event of an approval that a detailed drawing outlining a scheme to resurface the footway along the developments sites frontage onto Buckley Street. It was also requested that the development shall not be occupied until the footway has been resurfaced in line with the approved drawing. Furthermore, it was requested that it be ensured that the proposed driveway are SUDs compliant. Planning officers concur with the requested conditions and are satisfied that they are necessary, should the application be approved.

It is noted the submitted objection concerning the access into the garage at Unit 6 over private land. This area has been included within the red line on this application and a Certificate B has been served. It is possible to apply for planning permission on land outside of an applicant's ownership provided that the correct certificate is signed and notice served. Officers are satisfied that the correct process has been followed. It is a matter for the applicant to obtain the necessary ownerships or permissions to construct the development.

As such, the proposal would provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking and comply with policies T2 and DM1 of the Adopted Core Strategy, policies JP-S1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan along with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Drainage

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF 2018 states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Policy G8 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's strategy for managing water resources and flood risk more effectively in the interests of public safety, protecting property and infrastructure and the conservation of the natural environment.

The site does not lie within a Flood Zone or Critical Drainage Area. The Council's Drainage Engineer has been consulted and has provided guidance to the applicant in relation surface and foul water runoff as well as permeable paving.

It would be considered suitable, that a pre-commencement condition requiring the submission and written approval of a detailed drainage scheme prior to any development taking place in the event that permission is granted for the proposed development.

Trees

Policy G6 establishes that development should protect and improve green spaces and where trees are to be removed they should be replaced at a ratio of 2:1. 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.

The application identifies that one tree would be removed. The Greater Manchester Ecological Unit have been consulted on the application and concluded that the tree should be retained or replacements provided.

Two replacement trees are proposed in mitigation, in accordance with the replacement ratio at 2:1 which is in accordance with the policies identified above.

Contamination

Policy G9 requires that any risks arising from contaminated land are identified and that any appropriate actions are taken.

The application has been reviewed by a Council Environmental Health Officer, who raised no objections to the proposed development subject to a condition being attached to the permission in the event of an approval for an investigation and risk assessment regarding land contamination be carried out on site.

Other matters

Concerns were raised within the submitted representations stating the ownership of the land is incorrect, and access to the private detached garage would be over private land not in the applicant's ownership. A Certificate B has been signed, listing all other landowners that have been served notice on, including the Council. Officers are satisfied that the applicant has followed the correct procedure in regards to ownership certificates.

Concerns were raised the applicant is responsible for the current appearance of the former Baptist Church. This is not a material planning consideration in the determination of the application.

Conclusion

A residential development on this brownfield site, within a sustainable location is acceptable in principle. However, the scale of the dwellings proposed are out of keeping with the pattern of development in the locality and the dormers to the rear are excessive in size. Together this results in a development that is harmful to the character and appearance of the area. In addition, the dwellings will cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours at 8 Buckley Street and 2 of the 6 dwellings are served by inadequate private gardens to serve the intended occupants – large families.

Officers consider that the site could reasonably accommodate a residential development, but of a smaller scale with larger rear gardens, and sufficient distance away from no. 8 Buckley Street, to ensure that occupiers and neighbours achieve acceptable living conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1. By reason of its excessive height, scale, massing and appearance, including the proposed rear dormers, the development comprises poor design which fails to respect the site's context and surrounding built form. The scale of the development as a whole is out of proportion with the locality and fails to make a positive contribution to the street scene. The development is contrary to policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-S1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. By reason of its siting, scale and design, the proposed development would unacceptably encroach on the side windows of no. 8 Buckley Street becoming an unduly overbearing structure and severely restricting light and outlook. The proposal would directly impede privacy due to the substandard distance to the facing windows of 3 Buckley Street, resulting in an unacceptable level of overlooking. Furthermore, the limited outdoor amenity space proposed for Unit 1 and Unit 6 would result in an unsatisfactory level of occupier amenity. The proposed development therefore fails to deliver satisfactory living conditions for its occupiers and neighbours, and is therefore contrary to the residential amenity aims of policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-S1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure Statement

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

Report Author Rosalind Gralton