APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00409/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
21/00409/FUL	Rachel Carney	14 March 2022

Address: Land Opposite 11-15 New Street, Littleborough OL15 8LX

Proposal: Erection of one dwelling

PUBLICITY	**Weekly list expired?**	y	**Site notice expired?**	y
	Neighbour letters expired?	y	**Press Notice expired?**	n/a

DELEGATION	**Significant departure from local plan?**	n	**Contrary to national policy?**	n
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	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

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

RECOMMENDATION	**APPROVE**

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: AT **DATE: 22.03.2022**

SITE

The application relates to an area of land that is located towards the top (west) of New Street and behind Thamin Restaurant. The site is currently partly fenced-off

from New Street and is currently used by a fencing business for storage and production. There is also a flat roof detached building on the site and a number of mature trees.

To the side (east) of the site an unmade area of land is used for parking and this is probably used by residents of the houses that are located to the opposite side of New Street,

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for the erection of one dwelling on the site.

The dwelling would have a width of 7.5m and a maximum depth of 11.6m with the front of the property sited 0.7m from the boundary with New Road, at its closest point. The property would be constructed of facing brick and tile and include a projecting front bay window feature and front gable. It would have a dual pitched roof with a maximum ridge height of 8.2m.

Two parallel off street parking spaces would be provided to the side (west) of the property and a garden and bin storage would be provided to the rear.

The existing trees on site would be removed as part of the development.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

P1 Improving image
P2 Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage
P3 Improving design of new development
G6 Enhancing green infrastructure
G8 Managing water resources and flood risk
G9 Reducing the impact of pollution, contamination and land instability
DM1 General development requirements

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 General Development Requirements

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

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

01/D39406 – Erection of two/tree storey building comprising 10 apartments – Approved
05/D45009 – Renewal of outline planning permission D39406 for the erection of two/three storey building for 10 apartments – Approved
05/D45681 – Erection of a three storey block of 10 apartments – Approved

05/D46450 – Erection of a three storey block of 10 apartments – revised proposal of D45681 – Approved
06/D45791 – Erection of detached dwelling – Refused
07/D49309 – Erection of one detached dwelling – resubmission of D45791 – Refused and dismissed at appeal

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways And Engineering
No objection but request that the proposed driveway is SUDs compliant.

Env Health - Noise/Odours
No objections. Request for condition to control construction hours.

Tree Officer
The trees affected by the proposal are of poor quality, not worthy of retention or special protection measures. No objections on arboricultural grounds.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage
Suggested foul and surface water drainage conditions which will require the development to comply with the drainage hierarchy. Advised that there may be unknown drainage culverts in the vicinity of the site.

Environmental Control (Landfill Gas)
Request submission of a Phase 1 report.

The Coal Authority
No objections.

United Utilities
The development should comply with the drainage hierarchy. The development will also be required to take into account United Utilities assets.

REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised with a site notice and neighbour notification letters. Three letters of objection have been received and these are summarised below:

- The road is not in good condition to accommodate another household.
- Access is already limited with the existing fencing business (on the site) often blocking the road with HGV's bringing deliveries. This existing use is less than ideal
- The road is not wide enough for the extra cars and parking.
- Insufficient local infrastructure.
- The Planning Inspector identified that New Street is a substandard piece of road and any additional traffic would be a road safety issue.
- Reversing out of the site would be dangerous due to the lack of visibility and the difficulty for someone coming down New Street to stop when the see someone reversing out of the site.
- Any scheme which does not provide a long term solution for the road should be rejected.
- A smaller house with a larger garden might be more appropriate for the plot.

ANALYSIS

Principle of development

There is a relatively detailed site history for the application site and this sets out that historically the site was part of a larger storage yard. In the early 2000s it then comprised part of a development site for the erection of an apartment building on the adjacent land to the south west (now known as Ashely Dearnley Court). The planning permission for that development included the current application site as an area of landscaping that was to be used as amenity space by the residents. That landscaping has never been provided.

In 2006 and 2007 two applications for a detached dwelling on the site were refused. The latter application was also dismissed at appeal. At that time the Council's appeal statement said "*the appeal site consists of a partly demolished building and amounts of waste material that have presumably arisen from the construction of the flats."*

The Inspectors report for the above states *"Prior to the erection of the apartments, the appeal site was part of a larger storage yard….Although it is argued that this use continues on a smaller scale today, the documentation provided by the Council indicates that the land has been included within a recently constructed apartment development as part of its approved amenity area, and is required to be landscaped and retained for this purpose by condition 2 of planning permission re 05/D46450. On this basis, there does not appear to be a 'fallback' commercial use."*

The Inspector then continues in stating *"At the time of my visit, the appeal site had not been landscaped and appeared very much segregated from this development"* (referring to the apartments). He then concluded in stating *"I conclude that the proposed dwelling would be compatible with the neighbouring apartment block, and would not result in an unacceptable reduction in the level of landscaped amenity space available to its residents".*

The Inspectors decision was made on the 2nd April 2008 and therefore almost 14 years have now passed. In that time no enforcement action has been taken by the Council in regards the failure to provide the amenity space for the apartments. The appearance of the site has also not notably changed since that time and it appears that the current fencing business commenced around 5-6 years ago.

In light of the above, although the application site should have been included with the development of the adjacent apartments it is clear that a significant period of time has passed since that breach. Although the Council raised this a matter for concern under the previous applications submitted, no enforcement action was taken and the Planning Inspector made it clear that its exclusion from the apartment development did not prejudice the amenity of those residents. It is therefore considered that its failure to be included in the development of the apartments should not be given weight in the consideration of this application.

The site is currently used as a fencing business with fences stored and manufactured on the site. Although there is no planning history for this use it appears it has been operating for approximately 5-6 years. It is not known what use the land was under prior to this.

Given the above history and specifically the previous appeal decision it is considered that the principle of developing the site for residential use is acceptable. The site is allocated as Defined Urban Area and is in a sustainable location, sited within close walking distance of Halifax Road where regular bus services into Rochdale, Littleborough and beyond operate. Nothwithstanding the lawfulness of the existing use, the site comprises brownfield land, where the Council should support the re-use

of land and with the above in mind, the principle of developing this site for residential use is deemed to be acceptable.

Visual amenity

When looking at the visual amenity of the development it is important to ensure that the proposal contributes positively to the visual amenities of the area.

Currently the site is used for a fencing business and includes a small detached building and yard. The existing trees soften the appearance of the site slightly but in general the site has industrial type appearance that detracts from the surrounding residential development.

The dwelling as proposed would be a brick two storey property that would include a front facing projecting gable feature and a bay window. This style of property would be in keeping with the dwellings constructed to the opposite side of New Street, although smaller in scale.

Taking into account the existing development in the area it is considered that the introduction of a detached house on the site would be a positive feature within the existing street scene and one that would complement surrounding development. The scale of the property would be appropriate for the plot, ensuring that the site does not appear over developed, with sufficient space to the side of the house to provide off street parking. It is recognised that the set back of the property from the highway would be sufficient less than what is seen to the opposite side of New Street, but taking into account the layout of the adjacent Indian Restaurant (Thamin's) which abuts directly onto the highway, it is considered that the development would sit comfortably on the site and respond well to existing development.

It is recognised that the development would involve the loss of existing trees from the site and this matter is addressed in more detail below. However, notwithstanding any impact from the loss of the trees and taking into account the above, it is considered that the proposed dwelling would be a positive feature within the existing street scene and complement the surrounding development. Conditions will be required to ensure that appropriate building materials are used and that boundary treatment is also appropriate for the site, but notwithstanding these details it is considered that the development would be acceptable in regards visual amenity and accord, in this regard, with the requirements of policies P1 and P3 of the Core Strategy.

Trees

As noted above, there are a number of non-protected trees on the application site and an arboricultural report has been submitted to advise on the quality of the trees and how these trees would be impacted by the proposed development. The report details that the trees to the site frontage, identified as T1, T2, T3, T4 and A1 (group of trees) would be felled to accommodate the proposed development. The trees have been categorised according to their quality and tree T2 is category C (low quality), the remaining are category U (poor quality).

The application and arboricultural report have been reviewed by the tree officer at Greater Manchester Ecology Unit. These comments have confirmed that the trees that will be affected by the proposals are of poor quality and not worthy of retention or special protection measures. The Ash trees which predominate are affected by Ash die-back disease and will need to be removed in any case.

Given these circumstances GMEU have advised that they have no objections to the application on arboricultural grounds and they would not require replacement planting on what is a tightly constrained site.

Further to the above, although policy G6 would normally require the replacement of felled trees at a ratio of 2:1 it is recognised that there are existing health concerns with the trees that would require their felling, irrespective of any application for development. Additionally, it is recognised that the highly constrained size of the site would mean that replacement on site planting would not be possible without impacting on the feasibility of developing the site as any replanting would significantly impact on the developable area. With these factors in mind, on balance it is considered that the arboricultural impacts of the development are acceptable and the application accords with policy G8 of the Core Strategy.

Residential amenity

One of the reasons the previous application was refused was due to the development being sited on an area which was approved as landscaping/outdoor amenity space for the adjacent apartment building, now known as Ashley Dearnley Court. This matter is discussed in the principle section of the report above and where the Inspector for the appeal stated *"I conclude that the proposed dwelling would be compatible with the neighbouring apartment block, and would not result in an unacceptable reduction in the level of landscaped amenity space available to its residents".*

Given the above and also the considerable period of time that has passed since the appeal decision (14 years) it is considered that the relationship with Ashley Dearnley Court, in respect of its development of land approved as amenity space, is acceptable. The development of this site, particularly after such a long period of time, would not result in a reduction of amenity space available to the residents of Ashley Dearnley Court and the proposed residential use would be compatible with the neighbouring apartment block.

An additional reason for refusal on the previous application related to the relationship of the application site with the bin storage (which is located in a building) at Ashley Dearnley Court. A similar relationship is proposed on the current application and bin storage for the apartment block is situated behind the bin store proposed in the current application. Under the previous application the Inspector noted that the bin store (for Ashely Dearnley Court) is sited closer to the apartment block than it would be to the proposed dwelling and as such, any inconsiderate storage of bins or disposal of refuse would have a greater effect on the occupiers of the nearest apartments than the occupiers of the proposed dwelling. Furthermore, he noted that the bin storage would be partially screened from the proposed dwelling and its garden by a timber boundary fence, which could be improved if necessary. The bin store would also be separated from the dwelling by the access part, the proposed drive and garage and as such, the Inspector concluded that the bin store of the apartments would not cause undue disturbance for residents of the proposed dwelling.

Under the current application the layout proposed is very similar to that previously considered, albeit the current application does not include a detached garage and the previous dwelling was greater in width. With this in mind it is considered that the relationship of the proposed dwelling with the bin storage at Ashely Dearnley Court would be acceptable. There is no justifiable reason to conclude that the relationship of the development with the adjacent bin store would cause any undue disturbance to future residents other than what would be expected in a normal urban setting through the collection of bins on a regular rota. There is no reason to suggest that

undue noise, odours or other disturbances associated with use of the bins would cause undue harm and this relationship is therefore acceptable.

It is noted that the application site is also located adjacent a restaurant and takeaway. To assess the acceptability of this relationship consultations have been undertaken with the Council's Public Protection Officer (Noise and Odours), through which no objections have been received. The case officer notes that sited to the rear of the site, the development is away from the majority of the activities associated with the restaurant, although it is noted that bin storage and air conditioning unit are located to the rear. Nonetheless, it is considered that this relationship would be similar to that already experienced with the adjacent Ashley Dearnley Court and that residents of the proposed dwelling would not be adversely affected by activities associated with the continued operation of the adjacent restaurant.

The only potential area of concern raised by Public Protection relates to the period of construction and given the close relationship with surrounding dwellings it has been requested that a condition be included on any approval to control the construction hours. This is considered to be a reasonable request in the interests of visual amenity and can be included on any decision for approval.

The spatial relationship of the proposal with surrounding development also needs to be given consideration.

The SPD 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development establishes minimum space standards that should be applied to all new residential development and requires the following:
- 21m between directly facing principal 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.

The principal windows for the dwelling would be to the front and rear elevation, with secondary windows located to the elevations. To the front of the site the development would be sited approximately 18.6m from no. 11 New Street when measuring directly facing principal elevations. This would then be reduced to 15.7m when measuring the oblique angle between the projecting gable and the garage at no. 11 and around 17m when discounting no. 11's garage.

It is clear that the above distances would be a slight shortfall from those recommended under the SPD but when considering that the highway would separate the two sites, it is considered that this shortfall would be acceptable and would mirror similar relationships around the borough. It is also noted that this relationship was similar on the last application at the site and was not included as a reason for refusal by either the Council or the Planning Inspectorate when recommended separation standards were similar. Somewhat confusingly the officer report for that application did state that 21m could be provided but the stamped up refused plan clearly shows and annotated separation distance of 18.5m.

In regards other relationships, the rear elevation of the property would be sited approximately 6.4m from its rear boundary. This is again a clear shortfall in the distances recommended in the SPD however, as is detailed above, it is a relationship that is very similar to that which was accepted by the Planning Inspector in the last application. In respect of this it is recognised that 10.5m separation distance would normally be sought but when looking at the layout of the amenity

space for Ashley Dearnley Court it can be seen that this is provided along the full rear elevation of the apartment building and the area that is closest to the application site, while landscaped and clearly for the use of external amenity, it will be affected, to some extent, by the fencing business that is currently operating. It is also noted that as shared amenity space for the apartments, the area does not currently provide private amenity space for only one household.

Given this existing relationship and the comments raised by the Planning Inspector it is considered that the Council could not justifiably refuse an application based on the relationship of the development with the amenity space to the rear of Ashley Dearnley Court and this relationship is acceptable.

In regards other relationships, the side elevations would include secondary windows only and not overlook existing dwellings. The relationships to the side elevations are considered to be acceptable.

Highways

One of the reasons for refusal on the application which went to appeal was the impact on highway safety. At appeal the Inspector stated that although the development would result in only a modest increase in vehicular traffic, he was of the view that any increase in the intensity of the use of this substandard stretch of road would exacerbate the instances of vehicle conflict and the associated risk to highway safety would rise accordingly. Part of the reasoning behind the Inspectors reasoning was that there was no 'fallback' commercial use on the site, and in any event, vehicle movements associated with a family dwelling are likely to be greater than those generated by the commercial activity.

In respect of the current application the proposal is very similar to that previously dismissed at appeal. However, the activities of the application site have changed and the site is currently run as a fencing business where fences are manufactured and materials stored. Planning permission has not been sought for the fencing business but local knowledge of the site indicates that the use has been operating for 5-6 years. It is not known if there were any commercial activities taking place prior to the fencing business but the Inspectors report does refer to the appellants claim that the previous commercial storage use (that existing prior to the development of Ashley Dearnley Court) continued on a smaller scale.

The objections received to the application refer to the existing fencing business and raise concerns over its current operations blocking the highway by HGV vehicles making deliveries.

The current application has been assessed by the Council's Highway Service. They have noted that the opposite residential development along New Street received no objections from Highway Services and at that time, any impact on the junction of New Street and New Road was taken into account. Highway Services have also noted that the existing site is operating as a fencing business for a period of approximately 5 years, albeit without planning permission.

Highway Services have reviewed accident data for the junction with the main road and during the period that the application site has been occupied there have been no reported injury incidents. Therefore, taking into account the existing unauthorised use would generate more vehicle movements, including larger vehicles that the proposed use, Highway Services have advised that the road safety impact is likely to be reduced and they therefore raise no objection on this basis.

Highways have also confirmed that the servicing of the site would be acceptable and the property would have adequate off street parking provision.

There are therefore no undue highway concerns associated with the current application and in this regard the application is considered to comply with the requirements of policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Drainage

Sustainable drainage of the site is also an important consideration. The Council's Drainage Officer and United Utilities have commented on the application. United Utilities need to minimise surface water flows from entering the foul sewerage network in order to avoid a detrimental impact on the public sewer network. At this location only a combined sewage pipe is present and there is no surface water pipe.

Prior to considering discharge of surface water to the public sewer, the application will be required to consider the drainage hierarchy which promotes infiltration. Permeability tests in accordance with BRE 365 will therefore need to be undertaken to establish whether infiltration is a suitable surface water disposal method on the site. The approval of foul and surface water discharge can be appropriately managed through conditions.

In addition to the above, the applicant is advised that there may be unknown drainage culverts (pipes) in the vicinity of the site. If such a drain culvert is discovered, the applicant should contact the drainage officer to discuss.

Further to the above, subject to appropriate conditions it is considered that drainage of the site can be appropriately managed in accordance with policy G8 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Coal Mining Risk Zone

The application site is located in a Development High Risk Area and as such a Coal Mining Risk Assessment has been submitted with the application and consultations with the Coal Authority have been undertaken.

The Coal Authority records indicate that a thick coal seam outcrops at or close to the surface of the site and this may have been worked in the past, posing risks of ground instability. The submitted report has undertaken further investigations and the report indicates that due to the Lower Mountain Coal and Little Foot Coal immediately sub-cropping the Devensian Till, it is unlikely that these seams would have been worked directly under the site. Subsequently, the competent report author states that *'The data reviewed to date has identified 3no. coal seams below the site in exceedance of 30mbgl. On the basis of the information reviewed and available to date, we are of the opinion that the mining risk posed by the strata beneath presents a low risk to the proposed development'.*

Based on the above, the Coal Authority have advised that the content and conclusions of the Coal Mining Risk Assessment Report are sufficient for the purposes of the planning system and meets the requirements of the NPPF in demonstrating that the application site is, or can be made, safe and stable for the proposed development. The Coal Authority have therefore confirmed no objection to the proposed development and no conditions have been sought. It is however advised that more detailed consideration of ground conditions and/or foundation design may be required as part of any subsequent building regulations application.

Further to the above, the potential risks associated with historic mining have been considered and deemed to be low. The application is therefore acceptable in this regard and in accordance with policy G9 of the Core Strategy.

Contamination

Contamination of the site is also an important consideration and a through consultation with the Council's Public Protection Officer – Contamination it is considered that any approval should be accompanied by a Phase 1 contaminated land report condition. This will ensure that any contamination on the site is appropriate identified and addressed in accordance with policy G8 of the Core Strategy.

Fire Service

Greater Manchester Fire Service have provided comment on the application and advised on their access requirements for fire appliances. It is recognised that this site is upon an existing highway with surrounding dwellings, as such access for emergency vehicles would be no different than for existing properties. A footnote should however be included on any approval advising of the Fire Services support for the installation of domestic sprinkler systems.

RECOMMENDATION **APPROVE**

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of
this permission.

Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act
1990 (as amended).

2. This permission relates to the following plans:-

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

- Location Plan
- Existing Site Plan and Proposed Elevations – Drawing no. 1702/2
- Proposed Site Plan and Floor Plans – Drawing no. 1702/1
- Existing Levels – Drawing no. 1702/3

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

3. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specifications of materials to be used externally on the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Full details of any boundary treatments, including siting, heights, design and materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their installation. The boundary treatments shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The off street parking spaces as shown on drawing no. 1702/1 (Proposed Site Plan and Floor Plans), shall be provided prior to first occupation of the dwelling hereby approved and be made solely available for the parking of motor vehicles thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that there is sufficient off street parking provision in the interests of highway safety and to accord with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and policy in the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. No development shall take place until a foul and surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, foul and surface waters shall be drained on separate systems and the surface water drainage scheme shall include:

(i) An investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Policy Framework (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This investigation shall include evidence of an assessment of ground conditions and the potential for infiltration of surface water.
(ii) Results from permeability testing in accordance with BRE365 for designing roof and hard-paved area drainage for the development.
(iii) The background calculations of the MicroDrainage® model or any other software or calculations that have been used for the drainage design.
(iv) Construction details for permeable paving.

The approved scheme shall be fully implement prior to first occupation of the dwelling hereby approved and be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the appropriate disposal of foul and surface waters and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution in accordance with Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

7. Prior to commencement of the development an investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced and shall have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The report of the findings must 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 archeological sites and ancient monuments;
iii) where unacceptable risks are identified, an appraisal of remedial options and proposal of the preferred option(s)

The development shall thereafter be completed in full accordance with the approved recommendations.

Reason: To protect residents from any unknown contaminants on the site and to accord with policy G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and policy in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Contamination investigation and any required mitigation measures will require investigation before the significant disturbance to ground and removal of material.

8. Hours of construction at the site shall be limited to 08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday, 09:00 – 14:00 on Saturdays with no work on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and to protect neighbouring residents from undue levels of noise and disturbance and to accord with policies G9 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

Notes for Applicant:

There may be unknown drainage culverts (pipes) in the vicinity of the site. If such a drain-culvert is discovered you should contact the Council's Drainage & Flooding Officer, Stephen McCann, tel 01706 924606, email stephen.mccann@rochdale.gov.uk.

United Utilities Property, Assets and Infrastructure

United Utilities will not allow building over or in close proximity to a water main. United Utilities may not allow building over or in close proximity to a public sewer.

It is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate the exact relationship between any United Utilities' assets and the proposed development. Developer's should investigate the existence and the precise location of water and wastewater pipelines as soon as possible as this could significantly impact the preferred site layout and/or diversion of the asset(s) may be required. Where United Utilities' assets cross the proposed red line boundary, developers must contact Unities Utilities Developer Services team prior to commencing any works on site, including trial holes, groundworks or demolition.

Unless there is specific provision within the title of the property or an associated easement, any necessary disconnection or diversion of assets to accommodate development, will be at the applicant/developer's expense. In some circumstances, usually related to the size and nature of the assets impacted by proposals, developers may discover the cost of diversion is prohibitive in the context of their development scheme.
Where United Utilities' assets exist, the level of cover to United Utilities pipelines and apparatus must not be compromised either during or after construction and there should be no additional load bearing capacity on pipelines without prior agreement from United Utilities. This would include earth movement and the transport and position of construction equipment and vehicles.
Consideration should also be applied to United Utilities assets which may be located outside the applicant's red line boundary. Any construction activities in the vicinity of United Utilities assets must comply with their 'Standard Conditions for Works Adjacent to Pipelines' or national building standards.
The applicant or developer should contact United Utilities Developer Services team for advice if their proposal is in the vicinity of water or wastewater pipelines and apparatus. It is their responsibility to ensure that United Utilities' required access is provided within their layout and that United Utilities infrastructure is appropriately protected. The developer would be liable for the cost of any damage to United Utilities' assets resulting from their activity.

The Fire Service strongly supports the installation of domestic sprinkler systems as a positive measure to protect persons. At a small cost occupants can be given the reassurance of a high level of protection. All developers should positively consider the viability of installing domestic sprinkler systems.

Report Author Rachel Carney