

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
22/01569/OUT	Ryan Grant	18 October 2023

Address: Land on Plot 3 of the South Heywood Masterplan, Off Pilsworth Road, Heywood

Proposal: Outline application (means of access only) for the erection of a Class B8 (storage or distribution) development 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?	Y	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?	Y
-----	--	---

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

RECOMMENDATION	GRANT subject to conditions
----------------	-----------------------------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: ML

DATE: 24 October 2023

SITE

The application site relates to an area referred to as Commercial Plot 3 of the South Heywood Masterplan (Referring to the development proposals approved under 16/01399/HYBR). It is an approximately 8.8 hectare parcel of land at the most westerly point of the masterplan, bound by Pilsworth Road and Heywood Distribution Park to the north and open fields to the east, west, and south.

The site lies on the rural urban fringe, however benefits from the existing permission 16/01399/HYBR and is included within a proposed allocation as part of the emerging Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

It currently comprises undeveloped agricultural land. The Public Right of Way HEY FP75 travels along the eastern boundary of the site.

The site features minor watercourses to the north and west of the site containing Brightley Brook and its Tributary. Utilities infrastructure is also present underground crossing the site, including gas and water mains.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks outline approval of a Class B8 storage or distribution development with a gross internal floorspace of up to 40,000sqm, along with associated infrastructure.

The application is intended as a 'drop-in' application that would sit cohesively alongside the existing permission 16/01399/HYBR, superseding that permission only so far as it relates specifically to the site area covered within this application's redline whilst allowing for the remainder of the existing permission to be built out in accordance with the approved parameters of that permission. As such the application represents a proposed uplift of 40,000sqm of commercial floorspace to be constructed on this part of the South Heywood Masterplan.

The application is submitted in outline with only access to be determined. The access point provided on the submitted plans remains consistent with the existing access point as shown on the approved parameters plan of 16/01399/HYBR (as subsequently amended).

The proposal would allow for a single unit which could potentially act as a regional base for a logistics operator. Whilst not for approval, the application is supported by illustrative materials to demonstrate how a unit could be accommodated on the site along with necessary infrastructure such as internal access roads and landscaping.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The extant consent (16/01399/HYBR) to which this looks to sit alongside was considered EIA development and supported by an Environmental Statement and subsequent ES Addendum.

Prior to this application, the applicant submitted an EIA screening request (22/01102/SO) with respect of the proposed development assessed under this application. The proposed development is not Schedule 1 development. However, Part 10(a) and Part 13 (b) of Schedule 2 of the Regulations were considered relevant to the proposals and as such the screening request considered the proposals under these grounds.

The screening opinion adopted pursuant to 22/01102/SO concluded that the proposed development had been screened in accordance with Schedule 3 and considered in cumulation with existing and proposed development. The assessment

concluded that the proposal, whether alone or in cumulation with the existing and proposed development, would be unlikely to give rise to significant effects on the environment. It was therefore confirmed that the proposed development is not EIA development within the meaning of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

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

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

DM1	General Development requirements
DM2	Delivering Planning Contributions and infrastructure
SO1	To deliver a more prosperous economy
E2	Increasing Jobs and Prosperity
E3	Focus on economic growth corridors and areas
E4	Managing the release of land to meet future employment needs
SO3	Improving design, image and quality of place
P1	Improving image
P2	Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
P3	Improving design of new development
SO4	Promoting a greener environment
G1	Tackling and Adapting to Climate Change
G2	Energy and new Development
G4	Protecting Green Belt
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
SO5	Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport
T2	Improving accessibility

Saved Policies of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

EM/7	Development and Flood Risk
EM/8	Protection of Surface and Ground Water

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Biodiversity and Development SPD (updated 2017)
Climate Change Adaption SPD 2012

Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan

Policy 8 Prior extraction of mineral resources within Mineral Safeguarding Areas

EMERGING PLANNING POLICY

Places for Everyone (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan is a strategic regional plan for all of the Greater Manchester Local Authorities with the exception of Stockport. It seeks to guide the largest and most strategic developments of housing and employment land across the region. This Plan will also set the housing requirements for each of the involved Local Authorities. At the time of this report, the Examination in Public hearing sessions have concluded. Following the hearings, the Inspectors issued a further actions note which the Combined Authority has since responded to through the preparation of the Main Modifications. Recently the Inspectors have published a note on next steps for the examination responding to the Main Modifications as below:

'We are satisfied at this stage of the examination that all of the proposed main modifications in PMM6/GMCA12.3.3 are necessary to make the Plan sound and/or legally compliant, and would be effective in that regard (subject to any grammatical or other minor changes that we may decide are necessary). That is, however, without prejudice to our final conclusions that we will reach following consideration of responses to the public consultation to be carried out on the main modifications (see below). Reasons for the main modifications that we do ultimately decide are necessary will be set out in our final report.'

The Inspectors go on to confirm the document updates required for publication by the Combined Authority. They confirm that unless they consider it essential to deal with substantial issues raised in representations about the proposed main modifications, or to ensure fairness, no further hearing sessions will be held after the consultation period.

The nine authorities have now published the Main Modifications Consultation which will end in December 2023.

The application site is included within the strategic allocations of this emerging plan under Policy JP Allocation 1.1. This allocation is the largest within PfE, covering an expansive area covering both Rochdale and Bury Council areas and includes the entirety of the previously approved South Heywood Masterplan.

Given the advanced stage of examination and the nature of the Inspectors' responses received to date, the emerging policy is afforded moderate-substantial weight in the assessment set out within this report. However, this is limited with consideration to the fact that the Inspectors have not yet issued their full report in response to the Public Examination.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

16/01399/HYBR – Part full/part outline planning application for the development of land at South Heywood, including the demolition of a number of existing on-site buildings and structures. Full consent sought for the construction of a new link road between Junction 19 of the M62 and Pilsworth Road, the widening of part of Pilsworth Road, together with associated junction improvements, landscaping, lighting and other works including the importation of material and engineering works in order to construct the link road. Outline consent (with all matters reserved for future approval except access) sought for a major mixed-use development comprising supporting residential uses comprising up to 1000 dwellings (Class C3); employment uses (Classes B2/B8) comprising up to 135,460m2 Gross Internal Area(GIA); a new primary school (Class D1); Class A1/A2/A3/A5 uses comprising up to 2500m2 GIA which includes no more than 499m2 of A1 uses; together with associated landscaping, open space and sports pitches, drainage, ecological enhancements, cycleway and footpath linkages, infrastructure and other works

ancillary thereto. (Application accompanied by an Environmental Statement) –
Granted Permission 31 March 2020

Further to the above permission a number of Non-Material Amendments have subsequently been granted: 20/00417/ANM, 20/00464/ANM, 20/00933/ANM, 20/01270/ANM, 20/01413/ANM, 20/01388/ANM, 21/00390/ANM, 21/01210/ANM, 22/00283/ANM, and 22/00500/ANM, and 23/00100/ANM. These amendments have covered a variety of non-material matters that have come about as the masterplan has progressed. These have included minor changes to the planning conditions and parameters plan, often dealing with matters prior to specific plots being brought forward through reserved matters.

The wider Masterplan has been commenced through the construction of the Link Road that was applied for in full as part of the original hybrid, as well as two residential plots which lie to the east of the site and which have been consented through subsequent Reserved Matters applications. A further residential plot has Reserved Matters permission and is expected to commence onsite shortly. Of greatest relevance, the Commercial Plot 1 to the immediate northeast of this application site also benefits from Reserved Matters consent and is again likely to commence works in the near future.

CONSULTATION RESPONSE SUMMARIES

Highways and Engineering

No objections to the proposed development. Have reviewed the submitted information along with the responses of TfGM and National Highways and the responses to those provided by the applicant. The methodology used with respect of the trip model is considered appropriate and robust and has been demonstrated to comprise a likely worst-case scenario. Given the overall expected trip rate changes the proposed development is not expected to have a severe impact on the local highway network.

The access point is already established and accepted whilst further details on internal arrangements and exact parking numbers and servicing arrangements would be considered through the Reserved Matters stage.

Environmental Health

No objections to the proposals. Would recommend a standard condition for updated information to be provided on noise generation at the detailed design stage to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on any sensitive receptors.

Environmental Health (Land Contamination)

No objections to the proposals. Recommends a site investigations condition, consistent with the existing consent on the site.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

The site occupies former agricultural fields with rather limited current ecological value, although there are hedgerows at the site boundaries and watercourses to the north and south of the plot with local nature conservation value. The site also has some value for ground-nesting birds which prefer open habitats, notably lapwings and skylarks.

GMEU would advise:

- The hedgerows should be retained and protected and part of detailed site layouts. If any lengths of hedgerow do need to be removed, compensation will be needed through new hedgerow planting.

- ☐ The watercourses should be retained, protected and enhanced as part of any detailed landscaping plans for the site.
- ☐ No site clearance works should commence during the optimum time of year for bird nesting (March to August inclusive), unless nesting birds have been shown to be absent by a suitably qualified person. Note that the site is suitable for use by ground-nesting birds. All nesting birds, their eggs and young are legally protected.
- ☐ Reasonable avoidance measures should be implemented during any site clearance works to avoid possible harm to amphibians and small mammals.
- ☐ It is noted that this development proposal is part of a much larger scheme in the area involving both residential and business development, and that it is proposed to achieve an overall net gain in biodiversity through holistic landscaping of the wider site. Notwithstanding this, biodiversity enhancements should be sought from any detailed landscaping proposals which arise from this scheme, and these enhancements could form part of wider plans. The Brook corridors associated with this Plot offer local opportunities for landscape and biodiversity enhancement.
- ☐ Direct lighting of retained or newly created habitats should be avoided, particularly along the Brook corridors.
- ☐ The invasive plant Himalayan balsam is present on the site. A Method Statement will need to be prepared giving details of measures to be taken to avoid the spread of this plant during any works.

United Utilities

No objections to the proposals. UU have provided standard advice and recommended conditions which are consistent with the existing permission on the site in relation to detailed drainage design and protection of water mains.

Environment Agency

No objections but have requested a condition for further details on the treatment of the Brightly Brook waterbodies to ensure the main green and blue infrastructure assets are positively integrated and enhanced as part of new riparian development.

Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service

No objections to the proposals. GMAAS accepts the findings of the supplied report which confirm that the proposed development does not threaten the known or suspected archaeological heritage in the Plot 3 area of the wider scheme. On this basis there is no reason to seek to impose any further archaeological requirements upon the applicant.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

No objections to the proposals. Recommends a standard drainage condition, consistent with the existing consent on the site.

Rights Of Way Officer

No comments received to date

GMP - Design For Security

No objections to the proposals. Would recommend a standard condition requiring implementation of the security recommendations set out in the supplied report.

National Highways

No objections to the proposals. National Highways are content that the impact of development traffic is within the levels expected as part of the existing outline proposals for South Heywood and does not consider that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the safety of, or queueing on, a trunk road.

The Coal Authority

No objections to the proposals. TCA concurs with the recommendations of the Phase I report and that further investigations will be required. Recommends a standard condition, consistent with the existing permission on site.

Transport for Greater Manchester

TfGM recommended that updated count data was gathered to inform a new model and identify any changes to the current conditions in light of the changes in the local area such as the opening of the new Link Road. *Officer Comment: Considered in the analysis section of this report.*

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent widely to surrounding neighbours and businesses, Site notices were displayed in the vicinity of the site and a notice placed in the local press. One letter of representation was received in relation to the application.

The representation expressed concern over three elements of the applicant's submission. Firstly, their approach to EIA and the representor's view that the proposal would be EIA development. Secondly, that insufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate Very Special Circumstances for inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Lastly, that the proposals could generate Planning Contributions and it could not simply be assumed that the original consent could be relied on for these contributions. *Officer response: The matter of whether the proposed development would require an EIA has been considered through 22/01102/SO and this application, with consideration of the previous ES supporting 16/01399/HYBR, the conclusions of which are set out in the council's screening letter and earlier in this report. Matters of Green Belt and Planning Contributions are dealt with later in the analysis section of this report.*

ANALYSIS

In considering this proposal the Council as Local Planning Authority must apply section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which requires that the application must be determined in accordance with the development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Development Plan Policies

Rochdale Council's Development Plan comprises the Core Strategy (2016) and the saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan. The Core Strategy was adopted in October 2016 and as such has exceeded the 5 years in which the NPPF expects a Local Plan Review to have taken place. In such a circumstance NPPG provides clarification at Paragraph 064 of the Plan Making Section as set out below.

'The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that strategic policies should be prepared over a minimum 15 year period and a local planning authority should be planning for the full plan period. Policies age at different rates according to local circumstances and a plan does not become out-of-date automatically after 5 years. The review process is a method to ensure that a plan and the policies within remains effective. Applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework. It will be up to the decision-maker to decide the weight to give to the policies.'

It is therefore necessary to consider the policies of Rochdale Council's Core Strategy against the latest NPPF policies for consistency and whether they have been overtaken by any other events.

With regards to employment land policies, it is noted that the Core Strategy employment land supply requirement is now out-of-date. This is due to the substantial additional evidence gathered as part of the Places for Everyone evidence base on employment land requirements across Greater Manchester and which forms the basis for many of the strategic allocations within the emerging plan. On that basis, although Policies E2-E4 have been considered in the below assessment, they are each considered at least partially out of date. In particular, the quantitative elements are considered out of date, and whilst the principles are largely consistent with NPPF, there are elements which are considered out of step, particularly where these again are based on elements that have been demonstrated as out of date through work on PfE. These are explored in more detail at the relevant section in this assessment.

The remainder of relevant Development Plan policies as listed out previously in this report are considered to be largely consistent with the policy wording and objectives of the related sections of NPPF. Whilst amendments to the NPPF since the adoption of the Core Strategy have assigned greater weight to certain matters such as design, biodiversity net gain, making effective use of land, amongst others, these policies can still be read alongside the Core Strategy policies without inconsistency. In a number of Core Strategy Policies, measures have already been taken to provide consistency by referring to the NPPF on matters such as energy and flooding, ensuring up-to-date national guidance is always central to any assessment.

Prematurity in respect of Places for Everyone

The broad extent of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester was established in the 1981 Greater Manchester Structure Plan and detailed boundaries were introduced in the Greater Manchester Green Belt Local Plan which was adopted in 1984. Whilst Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) indicated that a strategic review of the Green Belt would be needed by 2011, the RSS was abolished in 2010.

Places for Everyone is a long-term plan of nine Greater Manchester districts (Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan) for jobs, new homes, and sustainable growth. It has been published by the GMCA on behalf of the nine districts. The plan is a joint development plan of the nine districts which will determine the kind of development that takes place in their boroughs, maximising the use of brownfield land and urban spaces while protecting Green Belt land from the risk of unplanned development.

As set out by the GMCA this plan:

- ② sets out how the nine boroughs should develop up until 2037;
- ② identifies the amount of new development that will come forward across the 9 districts, in terms of housing, offices, and industry and warehousing, and the main areas in which this will be focused;
- ② supports the delivery of key infrastructure, such as transport and utilities;
- ② protects the important environmental assets across the city region;
- ② allocates sites for employment and housing outside of the existing urban area; and
- ② defines a new Green Belt boundary for Greater Manchester

The application site comprises a small area within the vast Policy JP Allocation 1.1 referred to as Northern Gateway and which is expected to deliver 1,200,000sqm of industrial and warehousing space.

NPPF sets out the following at paragraphs 49 and 50.

'49. However, in the context of the Framework – and in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development – arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than in the limited circumstances where both:

- a) the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging plan; and*
- b) the emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area.*

50. Refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a draft plan has yet to be submitted for examination; or – in the case of a neighbourhood plan – before the end of the local planning authority publicity period on the draft plan. Where planning permission is refused on grounds of prematurity, the local planning authority will need to indicate clearly how granting permission for the development concerned would prejudice the outcome of the plan-making process.'

The scale of the application proposals would comprise just 3% of the total commercial floorspace to be allocated under the PfE allocation JPA 1.1 and would be contained wholly within an area that has an existing permission for such uses. Given the nature and scale of the PfE joint plan it is not considered that this proposal for this site in itself, nor cumulatively with other currently progressing allocation sites, could undermine the plan-making process. As such, it is not considered that the proposed development could be refused on the grounds of prematurity.

Principle of Development

Green Belt

The application site is located within the Green Belt and does not meet any of the exceptions detailed in Paragraph 149. As such it is necessary to consider if the harm associated with the development by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, can be clearly outweighed by other considerations such that Very Special Circumstances exist which would justify the approval of the inappropriate development in the Green Belt, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 148.

It is important to note that there remains a fallback position with regards to the existing permission on site under 16/01399/HYBR. Under the fallback permission the proposed scale of development could be brought forward within this part of the site through an appropriate Reserved Matters submission. It is therefore necessary to consider the impacts of this increased quantum of development against Green Belt Policies to determine whether Very Special Circumstances have been demonstrated specifically for the proposed uplift and the benefits it can deliver whilst being cognisant of its inappropriateness by nature alongside any potential harms arising from the uplift.

The nature of the development as inappropriate within the Green Belt is afforded substantial weight as per NPPF. It is necessary to consider the resultant additional harms to the purpose of the Green Belt and any other harm.

The purposes of the Green Belt are considered in turn below:

a) *to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*

The fallback permission is critical to consideration of this point as it allows for development within the same site area as that proposed under this application. The application retains the perimeter landscape buffer proposals as those approved under the approved parameters plan and would have no greater impact on urban sprawl than the fallback permission. It is therefore considered there would be no additional harm under this purpose as a result of the application proposals.

b) *to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*

The application site does not lie within close proximity to any neighbouring towns with significant distances to the west and south before reaching the physical barriers of motorway infrastructure, beyond which lies the nearest neighbouring towns. Furthermore, the proposals do not extend beyond the fallback permission and as such there would be no increased harm to this purpose than that already approved.

c) *to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*

The fallback permission again acts as the marker for the potential levels of encroachment into the countryside. In that regard the approved permission shares the same outer red line boundary and flexibility in terms of building positioning within the site. As such, and as with above, the application proposals would not have any greater harm than the fallback permission with respect of encroachment into the countryside insofar as it pertains to physical buildings. There could be potential for some additional urbanising effects through the intensification of use within the commercial zone and any resultant impacts on the character of the area. This could be through environmental impacts such as increased traffic or pollution. However these matters have been considered as part of the adopted EIA screening opinion and later in this report. The assessment of these is that they are not significant in EIA terms and which seen in the context of the wider proposals would have a negligible effect on perceptions of urbanisation.

d) *to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and*

This purpose does not apply as Heywood is not a recognised Historic town. It is accepted that no harm arises in respect of this purpose.

e) *to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.*

The application proposals are wholly contained within an area with existing outline permission and as such is encouraging the more efficient use of land which already has recognised development potential. Whilst this does not fall under the recycling of derelict and other urban land, the proposals do not prevent or discourage other developments in these locations. Additionally, the site is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider site within the Green Belt where there is a recognised requirement for additional employment space beyond that which can be achieved through brownfield regeneration. The application proposals have no greater harm than the fallback position in relation to this purpose.

Concluding on the levels of harm to the purposes of including the land within the Green Belt, it is clearly demonstrated that the application would result in no greater harm to these purposes than the existing fallback permission 16/01399/HYBR.

It is therefore necessary to consider the application's potential harm to the openness of the Green Belt and any other harm. Beginning with openness, it recognised that

there are two main components from which there may be harm, these being spatial and visual.

The application proposals would result in a greater quantum of built floorspace within the commercial zone of the South Heywood Masterplan. This is expected to increase the overall footprint and built form when considered cumulatively across Plot 3 and wider commercial zone consented under 16/01399/HYBR. It is therefore considered that there is an inherent level of harm to the spatial element of openness in the Green Belt. It is however acknowledged that the applicant has set out that the increased quantum of development can be achieved for a number of reasons, including greater floorspace efficiencies including through the use of mezzanines and the inclusion of multi-level ancillary office and administrative spaces with the commercial developments. This would partly offset the additional quantum of development as far as it is read as a purely spatial footprint of buildings. The exact increase in footprint of the buildings across the wider site would not be known until the submission of reserved matters applications would fully articulate the format of each proposed commercial unit.

With respect of the application site as it relates solely to Plot 3 it is accepted that there is no greater spatial harm to this part of the site in that this area could already provide a development of this level of floorspace and with the same height parameters through the fallback position. The harm is therefore more broadly in relation to quantum of development across the commercial area of the masterplan.

In terms of the visual aspect of openness, there are a number of important factors in the assessment. This includes the retention of the existing approved parameters in relation to building heights and landscape buffers. Another important consideration is that the fallback permission included no restrictions on the placement of units within the masterplan other than the broadly defined land use areas. This has the effect of allowing units to be placed in locations that would allow for greater visual impact on openness as long as they conform to the land use and landscape buffer areas. The application proposals retain these same parameters but would allow for a greater quantum of development which has a spatial impact on the wider commercial area as set out above. When considering visual impact from other areas within the Green Belt the views would be within the context of the existing fallback permission, beyond which lies a major new link road and extensive established commercial areas beyond the site boundaries. These views would also be at least partially screened by the proposed landscape buffer zones that would be delivered alongside any new commercial units. When considering views out of the site towards the Green Belt, it is again relevant that the parameters of the fallback permission would allow for these views to be screened by built development and landscape buffers and thus there is no additional impact on these views from the application proposals when compared with the fallback permission.

Overall the impact on the openness of the Green Belt is considered to be primarily a spatial impact. Given the previous conclusions on the impacts on purposes of the Green Belt, the spatial impact on openness is considered to be the main element of harm to the green belt. This harm is afforded substantial weight in the planning balance later in this report. It is therefore accepted that Very Special Circumstances will need to exist which clearly outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt and any other harm.

To consider whether any other harms to the Green Belt exist it is necessary to consider the technical aspects of the application proposals as are considered in the following sections of the report.

Employment Development

With respect of the use of the land for employment generating uses, this has already been accepted under the original fallback permission. Nonetheless, assessment has been made of the updated proposals against the relevant policy framework.

Policies E2 and E3 of the Core Strategy focus on delivering land for employment development and increasing jobs and prosperity. As part of this it identifies the expected level of need at that time and provides an overarching spatial strategy for its delivery. Whilst the amount of employment land required is now considered to be out of date given the significant progress of PfE and its supporting evidence base, the overall strategy and principles of these policies are still considered relevant. Both of these policies highlight the need to focus on strategic areas which includes South Heywood employment areas. Whilst the policy predates the fallback permission and refers to Heywood Distribution Park and the adjacent industrial parks, the fallback permission acts as a natural extension of these employment areas and as such, a continued focus on providing employment generation in this location is considered to accord with the spatial principles of these policies.

Policy E4 goes into further detail on the circumstance under which future employment needs may be met through additional release of employment land beyond those specifically referred to in the preceding policies. This policy was central to the consideration of the previous fallback permission albeit it is now considered to be partially out of date given it relates to an employment land requirement that has been superseded in the evidence base for PfE and requires a sequential assessment that, whilst not wholly contradictory, goes beyond the requirements of the NPPF. In the assessment of the fallback permission it was demonstrated that the application site, as part of the wider masterplan could demonstrate compliance with all qualitative elements of policy E4, which includes criteria c, d, e, f, and g.

With respect of criteria a to show a need for additional land for employment development to meet the target the previous officer's report highlighted evidence that the then 210ha target would not be fully met within the plan period based on the trend forecast, whilst also highlighting that this 210ha target would be appropriate until 2021 but highlighting a significantly increased forecast need in future years as shown through Greater Manchester level studies that had been undertaken at that time. For these reasons it was established that the inclusion of the land as new employment land was justified under criteria a. In the years since that permission was granted, this case has only been strengthened by the increased employment land requirement that has been established through the PfE evidence base and the proposed allocation of the land at JPA1.1. The advanced stage of PfE and the moderate-substantial weight it can now attract confirms that there is a strongly evidenced need for additional land to be released to meet employment needs in the borough and the wider city-region.

With respect to criteria b, the fallback permission assessment highlighted that whilst not complied with at the time of determination, there was clear evidence that take-up rates at Kingsway would continue and that the criterion would be met within a year. The applicant has provided further information within Appendix 3 of the Planning Statement that these trigger points have indeed been met.

Whilst the fallback permission has already demonstrated accordance with this policy element, the need for a sequential assessment under Policy E4 is not considered to be an up-to-date requirement. Whilst there is some broad accordance in the general principle of brownfield first approach, the NPPF sets out at sections 6 and 11 the need for a flexible approach to employment needs whilst making best and efficient use of land. Furthermore, PfE has been supported by a significant evidence base that has included location assessments for all proposed allocations and identified sites for Green belt release that now attract moderate-substantial weight based on the updated requirement for employment land in the borough. This process has

already identified the need for release of Green Belt to meet these employment land requirements. This application site would be wholly within a site that has existing permission for such an employment development.

Overall, the increased employment provision on this site continues to accord with the employment policies of the Core Strategy and the NPPF, albeit it has been noted above how elements of these local policies are considered to be out-of-date given the age of the plan, the lack of a review of these policies, and the superseding evidence prepared as part of PfE.

Transport and Access

The application is supported by a Transport Assessment that considered the impacts of the proposals on the wider transport infrastructure, including the impact on all key junctions and routes as a result of any increase in vehicular movements. This has built upon and supported the applicant's EIA screening Request in order to consider the impacts in the context of the likelihood for potentially significant effects as well as its compliance with relevant planning policies.

The report has considered the cumulative traffic impact from the proposals against the previous assessment which accounts for background growth in network traffic demand, committed developments, and the South Heywood Link Road (SHLR) at the 2038 future year assessment point. The applicant have highlighted that the methodology used for the original assessment is likely to be a worst case scenario and is well in excess of average demand values for the proposed use and the trip rates used by TfGM to inform the locality assessments for allocations in the emerging Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan. Nonetheless they have used this same methodology for consistency of approach and to allow for a direct comparison with the consented scheme. Overall the proposals would generate 124 and 123 additional movements in the AM and PM peak periods respectively, with half to these being HGV movements. The distribution and impact of these movements has been considered on the local highway network including all key routes and junctions, including accesses to the motorway network. In all instances the changes do not give rise to any potentially significant impacts nor require any additional mitigation measures to be implemented.

TfGM had raised an initial query which requested that an updated model be used given the age of the existing South Heywood Trip Model and the changes in local infrastructure. The applicant has responded to this request with further justification of the use of the existing model. This justification sets out how the preliminary surveys undertaken to produce a wider model for North Gateway demonstrates that the TA has considered the worst case scenario. This methodology was therefore considered appropriate at its stage of preparation and has been agreed with the local Highway Authority and National Highways as part of the wider network discussions. On this basis it is considered that the TA and supporting information are robust and allow for a considered assessment of the highway network.

The application would benefit from the same pedestrian, cyclist, and public transport infrastructure that exists and is to be implemented as part of the existing permission 16/01399/HYBR.

The submitted information has been reviewed by the council's Highways Officers, TfGM, and National Highways. It is accepted that the increased traffic movements would not result in unacceptable impact on highway safety, and that the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not be severe.

On the basis of the above, the proposals comply with the requirements of CS Policies T1 and T2, the NPPF, and PfE policies JP-C4, JP-C5, and JPC7.

Flood Risk and Drainage

The application has been supported by updated flood risk and drainage information that confirms that as with the fallback permission the development proposals would not increase flood risk on or offsite and would be subject to standard drainage mitigation measures to be detailed within a subsequent Reserved Matters submission.

The updated strategy has been reviewed by the LLFA and United Utilities who have both concurred with the overall strategy and provided suggested planning conditions to secure the detailed drainage scheme. These conditions would replicate the existing conditions attached to 16/01399/HYBR and provide a consistent approach which ties in with the remaining masterplan area.

The Environment Agency have also reviewed the information and recommended a condition controlling the detailed design of works to and in the vicinity of the Waterbodies onsite.

The proposed development, subject to a final detailed drainage scheme, is therefore in accordance with the requirements of CS Policy G8, the NPPF, and PfE JP-S5.

Ecology and Trees

The application is supported by updated ecological and tree survey information. The site is predominantly clear agricultural land with some limited ecological value through hedgerows to its borders and the watercourses onsite as well as for ground nesting birds.

GMEU have reviewed the supplied information and have no objections to the proposals. They have requested a number of standard conditions on best working practices as well as further information to be provided at the detailed design stage which should provide a detailed assessment of how Biodiversity Net Gain will be delivered. Additionally conditions and recommendations are made with respect of external lighting and invasive species.

Subject to final designs at Reserved Matters stage and the inclusion of conditions consistent with the existing consent on site, the application proposals are considered capable of delivering biodiversity net gain in line with CS Policies C6, G6, G7 & DM1, NPPF, and PfE policies JP-G2, JP-G3, JP-G7, and JP-G9.

Energy and Sustainability

Rochdale Council declared a climate emergency in 2019. The council has a responsibility to take meaningful action to reduce carbon emissions, alongside preparing the borough for the impacts of a changing climate. This is a key consideration in development proposals across the borough.

Whilst detailed information will be provided through the detailed design at Reserved Matters stage, the application proposals have sought to follow the energy hierarchy in line with local and national policy. This will ensure performance that meets and exceeds building regulation requirements. The applicant is targeting Net Zero Carbon in construction, and EPC rating of A and a BREEAM 'Excellent' rating.

These measures show a commitment to improving energy efficiency and sustainability in accordance with NPPF, Core Strategy policies G1 and G2, and the council's Climate Change Adaption SPD and will be expanded upon further at the Reserved Matters stage.

Contamination and Coal mining

The application is supported by initial site investigations documentation that has identified the requirements for further survey works to be carried out with respect of land contamination and coal mining risks. There is no additional impact on these matters than that which was assessed during the existing consent 16/01399/HYBR. As such the council's environmental health team and the Coal Authority have both reached the same conclusions and recommended conditions consistent with those attached to the existing consent. As such the proposed development remains in accordance with Policies G9 and G10 of the CS and the NPPF.

Noise and Air Quality

The application is supported by a Noise Impact Assessment and Air Quality Assessment. Compared with the existing consent, the primary change in these contexts will be the increased traffic generation from the proposals.

The NIA identified that given the location of Plot 3 and its distance from any sensitive noise receptors, the proposed development would not require any specific building mitigation. The key source of noise would be from HGV movements on the local highway network. The uplift in floorspace was not considered to result in an adverse impact with only an imperceptible 0.5dB increase above those previously assessed.

The AQA considered any adverse impacts at sensitive locations during the construction and operational phases. This found that during construction dust emissions would be the primary cause of potential air quality impacts. The assessment concluded that with appropriate best practice mitigation measures the residual impact would however be not significant. During operation, the primary emissions would be from traffic movements associated with the use. The review of the dispersion modelling results indicated that impacts on NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations as a result of traffic generated by the development were predicted to be negligible at all sensitive receptor locations. As such the assessment reaches the same conclusions as that of the existing consent.

On the basis of the above assessments and in consultation with the council's environmental health team, the potential impacts of the development can be controlled where necessary through suitable planning conditions that would be consistent with the approach of the existing consent. As such the proposals accord with the Core Strategy Policies C6, G9, DM1, NPPF, and PFE JP-S6.

Heritage and Archaeology

The application is supported by a Heritage Statement which considers the impact of the proposed development on heritage assets and archaeology.

With respect of Archaeology it sets out how previous assessments have identified that the Plot 3 site area requires no further investigations and this position is supported by GMAAS.

The application is not located within close proximity of any designated heritage assets. Three non-designated heritage assets were identified within the assessment however one of these, The Three Arrows Inn, has since been demolished. The remaining two are Coal Pits Farm and Higher Fields Farm. No direct impacts will result from the proposals and each is set some distance from the site with Higher Fields Farm the closest at 175m.

The non-designated assets are primarily appreciated within their existing/historic farmsteads and the proposed development would not be within any of the fields immediately surrounding these assets. There may be limited impact on views of Higher Fields Farm from Pilsworth Road to the north and some impact on views away from the assets, however given the local topography, existing commercial developments at Heywood Business Park, Birch Industrial Estate, and the fallback position, it is not considered there is any significant impact on these views. Additionally, it must be noted that through the PfE allocation JPA1.1 which is afforded moderate-substantial weight, the views noted above would be entirely severed.

Overall it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any significant additional harm to the non-designated assets above the original proposals. Nonetheless there is some very limited harm to the setting, in the immediate term prior to delivery of the wider PfE allocation. In accordance with NPPF a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the assets. Consideration of the public benefits are considered later in this report.

Minerals

The existing consent onsite has already considered the potential for mineral extraction and concluded that this would not prevent the development proposals. That decision was also taken against the same local policy framework of the GM Joint Minerals Plan. The application proposals result in no change in circumstances regarding minerals and would therefore raise no issue.

Socio Economic

The applicant has produced updated socio-economic evidence to support the application. This study has found that since the previous assessment the degree of deprivation within the borough, as compared to other areas has worsened between the 2015 and 2019 Indices of Deprivation. Rochdale is one of the most deprived areas in England, ranked as the 15th most deprived local authority area. Looking more closely, 30% of Rochdale's neighbourhoods ranked within the top 10% most deprived neighbourhoods in England. Looking at the impacts of unemployment, Rochdale has an unemployment rate of 6.0% which compares to an unemployment rate of 5.1% in Greater Manchester and 4.6% in England. Youth unemployment is of particular issue in Rochdale with 21% of residents aged 16-19 who are unemployed and 15% of residents aged 20 – 24 are unemployed. These issues are longstanding require significant intervention. Whilst total unemployment rate has followed national trends in falling slightly since the original assessment, Rochdale continues to lag behind other areas and has recognised issues in unemployment, economic inactivity, number of claimants, and general deprivation.

Looking at the context of available employment space within the borough and GM, PfE has identified a huge shortfall in existing sites capable of accommodating growth demands and has sought to allocate a number of large strategic sites to deliver its updated targets. The largest of these allocations is JPA1.1 in which this site is located.

It is within this existing context that the socio-economic benefits of the proposals are considered. The applicant has undertaken an analysis of the economic benefits and identified the following:

- Total construction cost estimated at £52 million.
 - o Resulting in 86 direct FTE construction jobs per annum

- o Additionality and multiplier effect benefits in the form of local supply chain investments, local employment and expenditure
- 2 Occupation by a major employer providing:
 - o 519 gross FTE jobs onsite
 - o Additionality and multiplier effect benefits in the form of local supply chain investments, local employment estimated at 104 further FTE jobs, and local expenditure
 - o Estimated GVA of up to £26million per annum
 - o Business rates generation of £900,000 per annum

Furthermore, these benefits would be delivered at a site which is located within an emerging policy allocation, which is seeking to rebalance the GM level north/south divide. The site is already consented for employment development so would generate significant land use efficiencies in line with NPPF.

In line with the consideration of the previous consent, these socio-economic benefits are afforded significant weight in the planning balance.

Planning Obligations

As an employment development the council does not have specific planning contribution requirements in the way that housing is expected to deliver infrastructure such as education and open space. As such each development of this kind is considered on its own merits and whether there are identified impacts which require mitigation through contributions. The letter of representation received as part of the public consultation of this application correctly identified that the application would require consideration as to whether the additional development beyond that already approved would generate its own contribution requirements either in addition to or different from the approved masterplan.

This application sits within the context of the major infrastructure, the new link road, having been delivered as part of a previous consent in which it has been part-funded through contributions levied against the residential elements of those proposals. Similarly bus stops and services were also levied against the residential elements of those proposals. As such there is a basis of infrastructure in the form of the link road, bus stops, and bus services in place because of the previous permission. Consideration has therefore been given to whether the increased floorspace has generated any additional impacts which would require mitigation themselves.

With regard to highways infrastructure, the submitted information and subsequent review by consultees has identified no further mitigation required in order to make the proposed development acceptable in terms of highways impacts. With regards to bus stops, the proposal sits within the same spatial context as the existing permission and there are therefore no additional requirements generated. Finally, as new bus services, the proposed development cannot be demonstrated to result in a lack of capacity. The services which will be initially subsidised by the existing consent, would potentially benefit from the greater use which could support the viability of the services.

In summary it is not considered that the proposals give rise to any impacts which would require contributions towards any mitigation.

Compliance with Places for Everyone Draft Allocation JPA 1.1

As set out previously within this report the PfE Joint Development Plan is now considered to hold moderate-substantial weight. As such it is considered appropriate

to assess the proposals against the current draft allocation policy as set out at the time of this report within the main modifications.

With respect of all technical assessments including, highways, flooding, ecology, and heritage, these have been considered in full through this report. The remaining points of relevance for this application is the requirement for comprehensive masterplanning and the principle of employment space delivery.

The requirement for comprehensive masterplanning requires that the future development of the wider allocation is brought forward cohesively and with a clear vision. The original consent 16/01399/HYBR is in effect a first phase of this allocation and has already been masterplanned through that consent. The nature of a drop in application such as this inherently means alterations to this masterplan. However the applicant has demonstrated a clear consideration for how the proposals fit the wider consented scheme and have sought to tie the two together through more efficient use of land whilst maintaining the same key parameters in terms of land use locations, building heights, and landscape buffers. As such the proposals are considered to be a natural evolution of the comprehensive masterplan for the South Heywood Masterplan which is the initial phase of JPA 1.1. A comprehensive Masterplan is not considered a barrier to future evolution and response to changing practices, updated policy frameworks, or business requirements and this amendment which is 7 years after the originally submitted draft of the masterplan for the South Heywood is considered appropriate.

Lastly, the allocation seeks to deliver 1.2million sqm of industrial and warehousing space. The application proposals would represent an early but small part of this overall requirement. Clearly the proposals will directly deliver towards this policy and will seek to establish the area as an area for investment from the commercial sector.

In conclusion the proposals will actively work towards delivery of the policy allocation which is afforded moderate-substantial weight in the planning balance.

Planning Balance and Conclusions

The Green Belt balance requires an assessment of whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm would be clearly outweighed by other considerations to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

The report has addressed each relevant matter in turn. Listed below are the key benefits that have been identified from the application proposals:

□ Economic Benefits as follows:

- o 86 FTE jobs per annum during the construction of the development
- o 519 FTE jobs per annum when the end use is operational
- o 104 FTE jobs per annum in the wider economy through additionality and multiplier effects
- o £26m GVA per annum during operation and temporary increase in GVA during construction
- o Additional business rates of circa. £900k
- o Provision of space for new or existing employers to expand presence and operations in the local area

□ Social Benefits

- o Increased availability of local employment, alongside training and upskilling programmes aimed at bringing in local unemployed residents
- o Investment and employment's contribution towards improved living standards in the local area and reduction of deprivation

- o Contributing towards the much needed employment space delivery identified through PfE and allocation JPA1.1
- ☐ Spatial benefits
 - o Delivery of the benefits in a location with an existing permission through improved land use efficiencies in line with NPPF
 - o Contribution of JPA1.1 ambitions of rebalancing the economy of GM across the north/south divide

The individual benefits listed attract varying degrees of weight in the planning balance however the overall socio-economic benefits are considered to attract significant weight. The spatial benefits provide the context in which these benefits could be achieved with the delivery in a location with existing permission acting to greatly reduce any levels of additional harm, whilst directly according with the principle of making efficient use of land in NPPF. These are also afforded considerable weight in the balance.

It is noted that there will be further benefits associated with the proposals, including the incorporation of sustainable drainage systems and biodiversity net gain. These are noted although they are afforded more limited weight in the overall balance as these do not materially differ from the benefits already assessed as part of the existing permission.

It is also necessary to consider the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harms identified from the application proposals. These are summarised below:

- ☐ Inappropriateness in Green Belt
- ☐ Other total Green Belt Harm as identified earlier in the report and limited to the spatial element of openness
- ☐ Impact on the setting of non-designated heritage assets
- ☐ Short term harms from construction activities onsite
- ☐ Impacts on noise and air quality within the local area

By definition and in line with NPPF, the nature of the development being inappropriate in the Green Belt attracts substantial weight. Other Green Belt harms have been assessed in the report with regards to the impact on the purposes of Green Belt that the site serves. Overall, due to the context of the existing permission this assessment found that aside from a limited spatial impact on openness, there would be no additional harms than that already allowed for under 16/01399/HYBR.

The other identified harms are all considered to attract very limited weight in the balance. The impacts on non-designated heritage assets is considered very limited given the existing context, the existing permission, and the longer term likely impacts from PfE allocation JPA1.1. Similarly, the impacts on noise and air quality have been assessed and mitigated where necessary resulting in a residual impact which is negligible. The short term impacts of construction are afforded mitigation through planning conditions and the residual impacts would be negligible. These matters are therefore afforded very limited weight

Overall the proposed development would deliver significant benefits on a site with an extant permission and as part of a wider emerging allocation that will itself bring very significant future benefits, subject to adoption of PfE. The proposals are well considered in how they would fit as a natural part of the masterplan approved under 16/01399/HYBR including sharing the development parameters set out on the approved parameters plan. The harms identified as a result of the uplift in floorspace are afforded substantial weight but are found in the detailed assessment to be very limited in most regards.

Having considered the benefits and green belt harms, it is officers' view that Very Special Circumstances do exist and in this instance these clearly outweigh the identified harms to the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT, subject to the following conditions:

1. Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") in any phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development in that phase begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: The application is granted in outline only under the provisions of Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and details of the matters referred to in the condition have not been submitted for consideration.

2. Application for approval of the reserved matters application shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To be imposed pursuant to Section 92 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 for those parts of the application submitted for outline permission only, and that the time period reflects the separated, phased development programme.

3. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than two years from the date of approval of the reserved matters.

Reason: To be imposed pursuant to Section 92 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 for those parts of the application submitted for outline permission only, and that the time period reflects the separated, phased development programme.

4. The development hereby permitted shall provide no more than 40,000m² of floorspace (GIA) for use within Use Class B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) order (as amended).

Reason: In the interests of the safe operation of the highway network and in compliance with policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework

5. The development and all reserved matters applications shall accord with the following approved plan and parameters:

☐ Land Use and Height Parameters Plan Drawing No 4846_SP(90)44-P1

Reason: For the avoidance of any doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved parameters and specifications.

6. The submission of any reserved matters application shall include plans showing the finished floor levels of the proposed building/s. No development shall take place until the submitted plan is approved by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved plan.

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

Reason for pre-commencement: Setting of finished floor levels is an early activity in the construction process and it is in the interest of all stakeholders to ensure that levels are appropriately set and agreed before development commences on site.

7. No development shall take place in any phase of development until an investigation and risk assessment (in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall investigate the nature and extent of any contamination on the site (whether or not it originates on the site). The assessment shall be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development takes place. The submitted report shall include:
- i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination
 - ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:
 - o human health,
 - o property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland, and service lines and pipes,
 - o adjoining land,
 - o groundwaters and surface waters,
 - o ecological systems,
 - o archaeological sites and ancient monuments;
 - iii) where unacceptable risks are identified, an appraisal of remedial options and proposal of the preferred option(s) to form a remediation strategy for the site.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the duly approved remediation strategy and a verification report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any of the building(s) hereby approved are first occupied.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment and to ensure the safe development of the site in the interests of the amenity of future occupiers in accordance with Core Strategy Policy G9, saved UDP Policy EM/8, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: To ensure contamination is appropriately identified and a strategy is in place before works commence on site for the protection of controlled waters and to prevent pollution of the water environment and to ensure the safe development of the site in the interests of the amenity of future occupiers.

8. No development shall take place on any phase of development until the following information has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority for that particular phase:
- i) The submission of a scheme of intrusive site investigations for the mine entry for approval;
 - ii) The submission of a scheme of intrusive site investigations for the shallow coal workings for approval;
 - iii) A plan detailing the timetable and methods of undertaking of both of the schemes of intrusive site investigations.

In the event that the site investigations confirm the need for remedial works to treat the mine entry and areas of shallow coal mine workings to ensure the safety and stability of the proposed development, the following information should be included with the submission of any reserved matters application:

- i) The submission of a report of findings arising from both of the intrusive site investigations;
- ii) The submission of a layout plan which identifies an appropriate zone of influence for the mine entry on site, and the definition of a suitable 'no-build' zone;
- iii) The submission of a scheme of treatment for the mine entry on site for approval
- iv) The submission of a scheme of remedial works for the shallow coal workings for approval;

The remedial works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of any development on site.

Reason: To address any issues of unstable land and ensure safety and stability of new development in accordance with policies DM1 and G9 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: To ensure the need for any remedial works is appropriately identified and a strategy is in place before works commence on site to ensure the safe development of the site in the interests of the amenity of future occupiers.

9. No development shall take place (including any site clearance works) on any phase of development until a Construction Method Statement (CMS), which shall include the following:

- i) the amount of construction vehicles movements and vehicular routes
- ii) construction delivery hours
- iii) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- iv) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- v) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- vi) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
- vii) wheel washing facilities;
- viii) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- ix) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
- x) details of noise reduction measures
- xi) measures for the protection of the natural environment from accidental spillages, dust and debris;
- xii) hours of construction, including deliveries; and
- xiii) measures for protection of the existing water mains and sewers within the site.
- xiv) Details of post construction restoration of public rights of way.

For that particular phase has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CMS during the construction period.

Reason: In order to ensure that appropriate measures are put in place to limit noise, nuisance and disturbance to the adjacent premises and users during

the construction of the development in accordance with the requirements of Core Strategy Policy G9, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: As the development will include site clearance, demolition works, ground works and engineering works an understanding will therefore be necessary of what measures will be put in place to protect the amenity of adjacent premises and users, prior to commencement of any works taking place.

10. No development shall take place within any phase of development, including any works of excavation or demolition, until a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to include the following:

- i) Construction operating hours and vehicle delivery hours.
- ii) Location of proposed construction compounds and lay-down areas.
- iii) On-site construction vehicle parking and manoeuvring.
- iv) Staff parking arrangements and details of supporting staff /operative travel management initiatives, including encouraging staff travel outside of the traditional AM & PM 'rush hour' periods.
- v) Off-site construction HGV routing for each delivery phase.
- vi) Driver incentive / disciplinary procedures to ensure suitable HGV routing.
- vii) Construction HGV haulage route signage strategy.
- viii) Construction vehicle cleansing procedures and details of load sheeting / covered load policy.
- ix) Management and procedures for access by abnormal loads.
- x) Programmed duration and timing of short term material import / export HGV campaigns.
- xi) Programmed temporary road closure / temporary traffic management works and details of supporting information campaigns as relevant.

For that particular phase has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CTMP during the construction period.

Reason: To minimise detrimental effects to the neighbouring amenities, the amenities of the area in general, detriment to the natural environment through the risks of pollution and dangers to highway safety, during the construction phase in accordance with Policies DM1, P3, T2, G8 and G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: As the development will generate a number of vehicular movements an understanding will therefore be necessary of what measures will be put in place to protect the amenity of adjacent premises and users, prior to commencement of any works taking place.

11. No development shall take place on any phase of the development (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: biodiversity) for that particular phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) for each phase shall include the following:

- i) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
- ii) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).

- iii) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- iv) The times during construction when specialist ecologists may need to be present on site to oversee works.
- v) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- vi) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP for each phase shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To minimise detrimental effects to the neighbouring amenities, the amenities of the area in general, detriment to the natural environment during the construction phase in accordance with Policies DM1, P2 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: As the development will include site clearance, demolition works, ground works and engineering works an understanding will therefore be necessary of what measures will be put in place to protect the amenity of the natural environment and the area in general, prior to commencement of any works taking place.

12. Prior to occupation of the development details shall of any fixed plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details shall demonstrate that noise from fixed plant does not exceed the existing background levels of 38dB from the nearest residential property and would not adversely impact any noise sensitive receptors.

Reason: To safeguard the living conditions of future residents in accordance with Core Strategy Policy G9 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. No development shall take place on any phase of development until a Landscape and Habitat Creation and Management plan (LHCM) for that particular phase has been submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The content of the LHCM shall include the following.
 - a) Description and evaluation of features to be created and/or managed.
 - b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
 - c) Aims and objectives of management.
 - d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
 - e) Prescriptions for management actions.
 - f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).
 - g) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.
 - h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The LHCM should set out how net gain in biodiversity (habitat enhancement) will be achieved on the site and include details of the legal and funding mechanisms by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The Plan should also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the Plan are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning

biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved Plan should be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the protection of wildlife and supporting habitat and to secure opportunities for the enhancement of the nature conservation value of the site in accordance with Core Strategy Policies G6 and G7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: To ensure satisfactory details for that phase or plot which will enhance nature conservation value.

14. No development shall take place, until a scheme of works, which shall include a detailed method statement, for the control and disposal of the invasive plant species, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme of works and method statement shall be implemented in full throughout the course of the development.

Reason: To secure the satisfactory disposal of this invasive species of plant, which under the terms of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended, it is an offence to be caused to spread in the wild, in accordance with the general principles of Policy G6 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: To ensure satisfactory details for the control of invasive species and prevent spread during the construction phase.

15. No development shall take place until a further Arboricultural Impact Assessment report detailing the impact on the trees within and adjacent to the site relating to that particular phase of development has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall include a scheme of tree and hedgerow protection measures in accordance with BS 5837:2012 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction' incorporating both above and below ground measures to be implemented during the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with the protection measures contained within the duly approved scheme throughout the construction period.

Reason: In order to protect existing trees on the site and ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies P3, G6 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: As the development will include site clearance, demolition works, ground works and engineering works an understanding will therefore be necessary of what measures will be put in place to protect the amenity of the natural environment and the area in general, prior to commencement of any works taking place.

16. No development (excluding site clearance) shall take place until details of the means of ensuring the water mains within the site boundary are protected from consequential damage during the construction and operational life of the development or details of the means of diverting the water main, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure protection of the public water supply, and as required by United Utilities.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: To ensure the public water supply is appropriately identified and a strategy is in place before works commence on site to ensure the safe development of the site in the interests of the amenity of future occupiers.

17. Prior to the occupation of the development, details of all external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The lighting shall be installed, operated and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and highway safety in compliance with policies DM1,P3, T2 and G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

18. Prior to the occupation of the approved building of Use Class B8, a subsidiary Full Travel Plan(s) (FTP) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and shall be implemented and reviewed in accordance with the timetable set out in the Framework Travel Plan. The FTP shall then be implemented as approved.

Reason: To provide for sustainable travel and to limit the effects of the increase in travel movements in accordance with Policies T1 and T2 of Rochdale Core Strategy.

19. The submission of the reserved matters application shall include a full Crime Impact Statement, which appraises the design and layout of the developed proposals should be submitted. The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of public safety and security in accordance with Core Strategy Policy P3, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Design and provision of adequate protection for future residential occupiers is fundamental to good design practice and it is necessary to understand the performance of a future phase or plot prior to its construction.

20. No clearance of trees and shrubs in preparation for (or during the course of) development shall take place during the bird nesting season (March - August inclusive) unless an ecological survey has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to establish whether the site is utilised for bird nesting. Should the survey reveal the presence of any nesting species, then no development shall take place during the period specified above unless a mitigation strategy has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which provides for the protection of nesting birds during the period of works on site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with any agreed mitigation strategy.

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 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

21. The building/s submitted with the reserved matters application for use within Use Class B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) order (as amended) shall achieve Excellent rating under BREEAM (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainable building which replaces that

scheme). The building/s shall not be brought into use until a final Certificate has been issued certifying that a BREEAM (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainable building which replaces that scheme) rating of Excellent has been achieved by the development and a copy of the Certificate has been provided to the local planning authority. Where the BREEAM requirement is not achieved, a scheme to offset the development's impact on the global environment, in accordance with the advice and standards set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, 'Energy and New Development,' shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any building/s or that part of the building/s under construction is first occupied. The approved scheme shall thereafter be fully implemented before the relevant building is occupied.

Reason: to support sustainable development objectives in accordance with Core Strategy Policy G9, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

22. Prior to the commencement of development (excluding site clearance), details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme shall be based upon WSP document:-

☐ South Heywood Plot 3 Outline App. FRA and Drainage Strategy Rev B Nov 2022 by WSP

The application shall be accompanied by the provision of MicroDrainage® model or any other software or calculations that have been used for the drainage design and the provision of a Maintenance Document explaining how the surface water scheme will be maintained and managed after completion.

The approved scheme shall also be in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacement national standards. Prior to occupation/ use of the proposed development, the drainage scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the appropriate disposal of surface waters and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution in accordance Core Strategy Policy G8, saved UDP policies EM7 and EM/8, the National Planning Policy Framework and as required by United Utilities.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Drainage is an early activity in the construction process and it is in the interest of all stakeholders to ensure that an acceptable scheme is agreed before development commences on site.

23. Prior to occupation of the development a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development shall be submitted to the local planning authority and agreed in writing. The sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan shall include as a minimum:
- a) Arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, or, management and maintenance by a management company; and
 - b) Arrangements for inspection and ongoing maintenance of all elements of the sustainable drainage system to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

The development shall subsequently be completed, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To ensure that management arrangements are in place for the sustainable drainage system in order to manage the risk of flooding and pollution during the lifetime of the development.

24. No development (excluding site clearance) shall take place until a detailed River Corridor Strategy for the Plot 3 development site has been submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority in consultation with the Environment Agency. The content of the strategy shall include the following:
- i) Full details of earthworks including any required land remodelling or remediation works, and vegetation clearance on and adjacent to both Brightley Brook waterbodies.
 - ii) details of any required diversion of waterbodies associated within plot 3 development, based on sound geomorphological understanding of both existing and new channel hydrology; and based on design using more environmentally sympathetic bio-engineering solutions.
 - iii) Provide pre and post scheme detailed cross-sections (a minimum 6 cross-sections along both stream corridors, and particularly at pinch points of scheme design), showing the new commercial scheme; including new landform or retaining solutions (if required) along both northern and southern reaches of Brightley Brook.
 - iv) Construction details for the formation of any new embankments, retaining structures and revetments.
 - v) details of enhancement opportunities integrated into overall scheme proposals i.e., sky lighting of existing culverted sections of waterbody, ecological/geomorphological improvements to existing modified agricultural channels etc.
 - vi) Measures adopted to protect and preferably improve Brightley Brook's water quality, during both scheme construction and operation.
 - vii) Full details of proposed new soft landscaping scheme including planting schedule predominantly based on native species along both ecological corridors.
 - viii) Integrated invasives non-native species (INNS) treatment programme within riparian corridor.
 - ix) details of any new surface water connections to rivers; and
 - x) Biodiversity enhancement strategy for the Brightley Brook waterbodies and key green infrastructure assets; that ensures a gain for biodiversity in the riverine environment for Plot 3 development site.

The development shall be undertaken in full accordance with the approved strategy and the measures retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the protection of onsite water bodies throughout the construction and operational stages of development.

Reason for Pre-commencement condition: The initial construction stages have the potential to impact upon the water bodies and will need to be carried out in accordance with best practice for their protection.

Procedure Statement

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable

development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

Report Author Ryan Grant