

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2025/1311
Location: 120 HARE STREET, ROCHDALE, OL11 1JT
Proposal: Change of use from Nursing Home (Use Class C2) to Jewellers (Use Class E), part two storey part single storey side extension and alteration to fenestration
Recommendation: Refuse
Officer: Bob Melling

SITE DESCRIPTION AND CONTEXT

The application relates to 120 Hare Street, a substantial end-terrace property located at the junction of Hare Street and Milkstone Road in Deeplish. The property is vacant having last been used as a nursing home for elderly people approximately 10 years ago. The Deeplish Community Centre stands across Hare Street to the east and there is a Mosque across Milkstone Road to the south. The application property has an existing single-storey extension which adjoins 123 Milkstone Road and was constructed pursuant to application reference 10/D53643. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and the site is within the Defined Urban Area.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for the change of use and extension of a former residential care home to a jewellery shop (Use Class E) with ancillary storage accommodation.

The proposed development would involve the refurbishment and alteration of the existing building together with the erection of an extension to the western side of the property. The development would provide approximately 123 square metres of accommodation within the basement, approximately 229 square metres at ground floor level and approximately 200 square metres at first floor level, resulting in a total floorspace of approximately 552 square metres.

The proposed jewellery shop would occupy part of the ground floor, with the principal customer-facing retail sales area measuring approximately 137 square metres. The remaining accommodation would comprise ancillary storage, staff and operational areas associated with the proposed retail use. The basement and first floor would be utilised primarily for storage purposes.

Externally, the proposal includes the installation of a new shopfront facing Milkstone Road, alterations to the fenestration, construction of the proposed extension and the provision of a waste storage compound within the site. The proposal also includes alterations to the existing parking and servicing arrangements within the site curtilage.

RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

18/00547/ANM: Non material amendment to planning permission 10/D53643 to allow for new entrance to flats from Milkstone Road with re-location of bin area to Hare Street, revised layout of flats on first floor level, new shop front window to retail unit 4 and new layout. **Refused** June 2018.

15/01269/FUL: Conversion of 3 self contained flats into four at first and second floor including first floor side extension. **Withdrawn** January 2016.

13/01135/VRCON: Variation of condition 04 (Boundary Wall) and 05 (Window Details) of planning permission D53643, together with the submission of details to satisfy other conditions of that permission and various other non-material alterations to that approved scheme of works - resubmission of application 00743. **Approved** December 2013.

13/00743/VRCON: Variation of Condition 4 (Boundary Wall), 5 (Window Details) and removal of Condition 11 (Traffic Bollards) of planning permission D53643, together with the submission of details to satisfy other conditions of that permission and various other non-material alterations to that approved scheme of works - resubmission. **Refused** September 2013.

12/D55454: Variation Of Conditions 2(Plans List), 3 (Materials), 4 (Boundary Wall), 5 (Window Details), 13 (Bin Stores) Of Planning Permission 10/D53643 And Removal Of Conditions 7 (Shop Front Recess), 9 (One-Way System) And 14 (Amalgamation Of Units). **Refused** August 2012.

10/D53643: Change Of Use And Conversion Of Nursing Home To 5 Retail Units With 3 Apartments Above Including A Single Storey Extension And Reinstatement Of 118 Hare Street To One Dwelling. **Approved** December 2010.

88/D21476: Change Of Use To Residential Home For The Elderly. **Approved** March 1988.

82/D13927: Toilet Extension To Church. **Approved** July 1982.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Regional Guidance

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE):

JP-C8 Transport Requirements of New Development

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

E1 Establishing thriving town, district and local centres

G7 Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity

G9 Reducing the impact of pollution, contamination and land instability

P1 Improving image

P2 Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage

P3 Improving design of new development

T2 Improving accessibility

DM1 General Development Requirements

Appendix 5 Schedule of parking standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Shop Fronts and Security Shutters

Guidelines & Standards for Residential Development

PUBLICITY

Site Notice: 27/08/2026

Press Notice: N/A

Neighbour notification letters: 12/08/2026

Weekly List: 24/08/2026

SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

Highways (Summary): No substantive reason for refusal on highways grounds.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

One written objection has been received in relation to the proposal. The objection raises concerns that the development would exacerbate existing parking pressures and traffic congestion within the area and contends that additional parking provision should be provided as part of the scheme.

In addition, a verbal representation has been received raising concerns regarding the condition of the existing building, including the presence of mice within the vacant property, existing damp issues associated with the building, parking pressures within the locality, the loss of the

former boundary wall to the site frontage and concerns regarding the overall design and appearance of the proposed development.

Officer's Response:

The concerns raised regarding parking and traffic generation have been carefully considered. The application has been reviewed by the Highway Authority, which raises no objection to the proposal. The Highway Authority advises that the proposed jewellery shop is likely to operate as a relatively low-intensity retail use and is not expected to generate significant traffic movements. Furthermore, sufficient hardstanding exists within the site to accommodate vehicles associated with the development and no unacceptable highway safety impacts have been identified. These matters have been assessed in detail elsewhere within this report.

Concerns have also been raised regarding the loss of the former boundary wall and the overall appearance of the development. These matters are addressed within the Character and Appearance section of this report.

With regard to the presence of mice within the existing vacant building and allegations of damp emanating from the application property, these matters relate to the current condition and management of the building rather than the planning merits of the proposed development. Such matters are controlled through separate legislation and are not material planning considerations in the determination of this application.

ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development

Permission is sought for the change of use and extension of a former residential care home to a jewellery shop (Class E) with ancillary storage accommodation. The site lies within the Defined Urban Area but is not located within any designated town, district or local centre.

CS Policy E1 seeks to focus retail and other main town centre uses within town, district and local centres in order to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability. The proposal constitutes a main town centre use and, as the site is located outside a designated centre, the sequential approach set out within CS Policy E1 and NPPF Policy TC3 is engaged. Policy TC3 requires a sequential test to be applied to proposals for main town centre uses located outside existing centres and requires applicants to demonstrate that suitable and available sites do not exist within designated centres or edge-of-centre locations before out-of-centre sites are considered. Policy TC3 also requires applicants and decision makers to exercise flexibility in relation to matters such as scale and format so that opportunities to utilise suitable sites within centres are fully explored.

The applicant has submitted a Sequential Test in support of the application. Whilst regard may be had to policies within the emerging Rochdale Local Plan as a material consideration, NPPF Policy DM4 confirms that the weight to be afforded to emerging policies depends upon their stage of preparation, the extent to which unresolved objections remain and their consistency with national policy. As the emerging Local Plan has not yet been examined or adopted, only limited weight can presently be afforded to its policies.

Furthermore, whilst the emerging Local Plan has evolved in its approach to Primary Shopping Areas and town centre regeneration, both the adopted and emerging policy frameworks

continue to recognise designated town, district and local centres as important elements of the retail hierarchy. The NPPF glossary expressly confirms that references to town centres and centres include town, district and local centres as defined within the development plan. Accordingly, the Local Planning Authority considers that opportunities within such centres should form part of any robust sequential assessment.

Particular concern arises from the failure to adequately assess opportunities within the nearby Milkstone Road/Maldon Street Local Centre. The application site lies approximately 105 metres from this designated local centre, which is protected under saved UDP Policy S/6. Despite its close proximity, the submitted Sequential Test contains no assessment of vacant units or development opportunities within the centre. The Local Planning Authority considers this omission to be significant and is not satisfied that all sequentially preferable opportunities have been fully explored.

This omission is particularly relevant when regard is had to planning permission 23/01023/FUL at 2 Salkeld Street. That proposal sought permission for a jewellery shop within the immediate locality and was supported by a Sequential Test which specifically assessed opportunities within the Milkstone Road/Maldon Street Local Centre. The Council subsequently accepted that assessment and granted planning permission. The Local Planning Authority therefore has a recent example involving an identical retail use within the same locality where the nearby local centre was treated as a relevant sequential destination. No satisfactory explanation has been provided as to why the same centre has not been afforded equivalent consideration in the current assessment.

Further concerns arise regarding the applicant's stated floorspace requirements. The Sequential Test repeatedly asserts that units below 100 square metres are unsuitable and proceeds on the basis that a premises of between 100 and 300 square metres is required. However, the submitted plans indicate that the principal customer-facing retail area measures approximately 137 square metres, whilst substantial areas of the building are given over to ancillary storage accommodation. The proposed development would provide approximately 552 square metres of floorspace overall, comprising approximately 123 square metres at basement level, 229 square metres at ground floor level and 200 square metres at first floor level.

The Local Planning Authority is not persuaded that sufficient evidence has been provided to justify a requirement for a building of this scale. No retail needs assessment, operational statement, business appraisal or viability evidence has been submitted to demonstrate why the proposed use necessitates in excess of 552 square metres of accommodation, particularly given that only a relatively modest proportion of that floorspace would comprise active retail sales space. The applicant is also understood to operate an established jewellery business from significantly smaller premises elsewhere within Rochdale. Furthermore, the recently approved jewellery shop at 2 Salkeld Street occupies a substantially smaller building. These examples demonstrate that jewellery retailing is capable of operating from premises considerably smaller than that proposed and call into question the applicant's assertion that units below 100 square metres should automatically be discounted from consideration.

NPPF Policy TC3 equires flexibility in relation to scale and format when undertaking a sequential assessment. Similar principles were considered by the Planning Inspectorate in appeal ref. APP/P4225/W/24/3352971 (296 Yorkshire Street, Rochdale), where the Inspector concluded that insufficient flexibility had been applied where narrowly defined floorspace requirements and extensive ancillary accommodation were relied upon to justify a specific

operational need. The Inspector found that insufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate why smaller premises could not accommodate the proposed use. Similar concerns arise in the present case, where a restrictive set of occupational requirements appears to have been used to discount potentially suitable and available alternative premises.

The submitted Sequential Test also discounts a number of alternative premises on the basis that existing jewellers operate nearby and that a significant proportion of local demand is therefore already met. The Local Planning Authority affords very limited weight to this reasoning. Competition between existing and proposed businesses is not a material planning consideration and does not justify the exclusion of an otherwise suitable and available sequentially preferable site.

Furthermore, the Council notes that Barakat Jewellers, which benefits from planning permission under application 23/01023/FUL, is located within close proximity of the application site and serves the same broad catchment area. If the existence of an established jewellery retailer is relied upon to discount premises elsewhere in the borough, it is unclear why comparable provision in the vicinity of the application site should not similarly inform the assessment of need. This inconsistency further undermines the robustness of the submitted Sequential Test and suggests that the assessment has been influenced by commercial preference rather than an objective appraisal of suitable and available alternatives.

The Local Planning Authority also notes that several potentially suitable sites are discounted on viability grounds or because they were under offer. However, no objective viability appraisal, market evidence or operator evidence has been provided to substantiate those conclusions. Consequently, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that all potentially suitable and available sequentially preferable sites have been appropriately assessed.

For the reasons set out above, the Local Planning Authority affords limited weight to the submitted Sequential Test. The assessment fails to adequately consider opportunities within the nearby Milkstone Road/Maldon Street Local Centre, applies floorspace requirements that have not been robustly justified, relies upon self-imposed commercial preferences and fails to demonstrate the degree of flexibility required by national policy. Consequently, the Council is not satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated compliance with the sequential approach required by CS Policy E1 and NPPF Policy TC3. The proposal would introduce a main town centre use within an out-of-centre location without adequately demonstrating that suitable and available sequentially preferable sites do not exist.

NPPF Policy TC3(4) states that where a development proposal fails to satisfy the sequential test it should be refused. As the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the sequential test has been passed, the proposal conflicts with national policy. The principle of the development is therefore considered unacceptable.

Impact on Character and Appearance

CS Policy P3 requires development to achieve a high standard of design that responds positively to its context and contributes towards an improved image and quality of place. Policy DM1 similarly requires development to respect the character of the surrounding area and demonstrate high quality design. PFE Policy JP-P1 seeks development that positively contributes to local character and distinctiveness.

National policy places significant emphasis on achieving high quality design. NPPF Policy DP3(1) requires development proposals to respond positively to their context, including the history, character and features of the site and its surroundings, so that development integrates with and enhances its setting. Policy DP3(2) requires development to reflect key principles of good design including appropriate built form, attractive public spaces and a strong sense of identity. Policy DP3(3) confirms that development proposals should be refused where, without clear justification, they conflict with these principles. The Council's Shop Fronts and Security Shutters SPD provides further guidance regarding the design and appearance of new shopfronts and seeks frontages that form an integrated part of the host building rather than appearing as standardised additions.

The application site occupies a prominent corner position at the junction of Milkstone Road and Hare Street and is highly visible from a number of public viewpoints. Whilst the building is currently in a poor state of repair, it nevertheless retains a recognisable architectural form and makes a positive contribution to the established built form of the area. The principle of refurbishing and reoccupying a long-vacant building is welcomed and moderate weight is afforded to the visual benefits associated with securing its restoration and ongoing maintenance. The proposal would also remove evidence of vacancy and dilapidation, which would represent a positive change within the street scene.

The proposed extension would broadly follow the established building line along this section of Milkstone Road. In principle, this approach is considered acceptable and would reinforce the continuity of the built frontage. The extension would therefore contribute positively towards defining the street edge and would remove an underutilised area of land which currently interrupts the urban grain.

However, notwithstanding these positive aspects, the detailed design of the extension is not considered to represent a high-quality design response. The overall composition lacks coherence and fails to demonstrate a clear architectural relationship with the host building. In particular, the proposed arrangement of roof forms appears awkward and visually unbalanced. The relationship between the various gables lacks a clear hierarchy and results in a roofscape that appears piecemeal rather than forming a unified extension of the existing structure. As a consequence, the proposal reads as an accumulation of separate elements rather than a considered architectural composition.

The proposal therefore fails to achieve the design objectives of NPPF Policy DP3(2)(e) relating to built form. Rather than creating a well-composed building that reinforces the character of the area, the extension introduces unnecessary visual complexity and detracts from the clarity and proportions of the existing building.

The proposed fenestration achieves mixed results. At first floor level, the proposed windows introduce a relatively consistent rhythm and broadly reflect the vertical proportions that characterise many traditional buildings in the surrounding area. This assists in reducing the apparent scale of the extension and provides a degree of visual continuity.

However, the treatment at ground floor level is significantly less successful. Extensive areas of blank brickwork are proposed with little articulation or architectural detailing. As a result, substantial lengths of the elevation would appear inactive and visually monotonous. Given the site's prominence at a road junction, the absence of architectural interest results in an overly utilitarian appearance that fails to positively contribute to the public realm. This is contrary to the objectives of NPPF Policy DP3(2)(f), which seeks attractive and engaging public-facing

environments, and Policy DP3(2)(g), which seeks visually attractive and distinctive development capable of creating or reinforcing local identity.

Further concern arises from the treatment of the land surrounding the building. Historically, the site incorporated a more attractive landscaped setting, including a boundary wall fronting Milkstone Road together with areas of planting containing shrubs and small trees. Whilst these features have largely been removed over time, they nevertheless demonstrate that the site previously benefitted from a softer and more visually attractive relationship with the public realm. The current proposal would introduce extensive areas of hardstanding around the building, with limited landscaping proposed to offset the visual impact of these works. As a result, the development would fail to take a valuable opportunity to enhance the setting of the building and improve the appearance of this prominent corner site.

NPPF Policy DP3(2)(c) requires development to incorporate and connect to high-quality green infrastructure, whilst Policies DP3(2)(f) and (g) seek attractive public-facing environments and visually distinctive development. The absence of a meaningful landscaping strategy results in a harsh and overly engineered appearance which detracts from the quality of the public realm, fails to reinforce local character and does not satisfactorily enhance the setting of the building. The proposal therefore conflicts with the objectives of NPPF Policies DP3(2)(c), (f) and (g).

Moreover, the proposed bin store would be positioned in a visually prominent location and would form a conspicuous addition to the frontage and setting of the building. Whilst provision for waste storage is a necessary operational requirement, the submitted details indicate a functional and utilitarian structure that appears to have been designed with limited regard to the character of the building or the quality of the surrounding streetscene. Rather than being discreetly integrated into the overall design of the development, the enclosure would be readily visible from the public realm and would add visual clutter to a prominent corner site. The proposal would consequently detract from the appearance of the building and the quality of the streetscene.

Particular concern arises in relation to the proposed shopfront. The submitted design appears generic and lacks the depth, detailing and visual richness typically associated with a well-designed commercial frontage. The composition does not appear to have been developed in response to the character or proportions of the host building and instead reads as a series of standard glazed openings inserted within the elevation. The frontage therefore fails to establish a strong sense of place, fails to respond appropriately to the character of the host building and does not contribute positively to the architectural quality of the development.

This approach conflicts not only with the Council's Shop Fronts and Security Shutters SPD but also with NPPF Policy DP3(1), which requires development to integrate with and enhance its surroundings. The proposal misses a valuable opportunity to create a high-quality frontage capable of improving the appearance of a highly visible corner site.

There is also a lack of clarity regarding future signage. No dedicated fascia or signage zone has been incorporated into the overall composition of the shopfront and the submitted drawings provide limited information regarding how future advertisements would be accommodated. This further contributes to the impression that the frontage has not been comprehensively designed as part of the building as a whole.

The Local Planning Authority is also concerned that inconsistencies exist between the submitted plans and elevations. The proportions of several elements differ between the

documents submitted. By way of example, the principal entrance door appears materially narrower on the proposed elevations than on the floor plans, whilst the proportions of other elements are similarly inconsistent. These discrepancies create uncertainty regarding the final appearance of the development and prevent the Local Planning Authority from being satisfied that the submitted drawings accurately represent the development for which permission is sought.

Whilst moderate weight is afforded to the benefits of bringing a long-term vacant building back into productive use, those benefits do not outweigh the identified design shortcomings. The extension lacks a coherent architectural composition, the ground floor elevations present inactive and visually poor frontages, the extensive areas of hardstanding fail to provide an attractive setting for the building, the proposed bin store would appear unduly prominent, the shopfront fails to demonstrate an appropriately high standard of design, and the submitted drawings do not provide sufficient certainty regarding the final appearance of the development. Taken cumulatively, these shortcomings would result in a development that fails to positively respond to its context or enhance the appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to conflict with CS Policies P3 and DM1, PfE Policy JP-P1 and NPPF Policy DP3. The development fails to respond positively to its context, fails to achieve an attractive and distinctive form of development and would not deliver the high standards of design expected by national policy. In accordance with NPPF Policy DP3(3), the proposal should therefore be refused.

Residential Amenity

CS Policy DM1 requires development proposals to safeguard the amenity of existing and future occupiers. Policy P3 similarly requires development to respond appropriately to its surroundings, whilst PfE Policy JP-P1 seeks to ensure development provides a high quality living environment and does not result in unacceptable impacts upon neighbouring occupiers.

In assessing the proposal, particular consideration has been given to the relationship between the proposed extension and neighbouring residential properties. The proposed extension would broadly align with the established building line created by adjacent development along Milkstone Road. Owing to the existing setback between the application building and neighbouring dwellings, together with the orientation of the site and the separation distances achieved, the extension is not considered to result in an unacceptable overbearing impact upon neighbouring occupiers. Similarly, the proposal would not give rise to any significant loss of outlook or enclosure beyond that which presently exists.

With regard to privacy, the proposed first floor windows would predominantly serve ancillary storage and would face towards the public highway. Given the urban context of the site and the relationship with surrounding properties, the proposed fenestration is not considered likely to result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy.

Consideration has also been given to the likely effects of the proposed use upon neighbouring occupiers. The proposed jewellery shop would operate as a relatively low-intensity retail use and, by its nature, is not expected to generate significant levels of noise, odour, vibration or late-night activity. No servicing yard, industrial processes or other activities associated with elevated levels of disturbance are proposed. In this context, it is not considered that the operation of a jewellery shop would result in unacceptable noise or disturbance impacts upon neighbouring residential occupiers.

The proposed development would therefore not result in significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents through reason of overbearing impact, loss of outlook, loss of privacy, noise or general disturbance. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with CS Policies DM1 and P3, PfE Policy JP-P1 and NPPF Policies DP3 and P3 in respect of residential amenity.

Impact on Highway Safety

CS Policy T2 and PfE Policy JP-C8 require development to be safely accessible and not result in unacceptable impacts on highway safety or the operation of the highway network. NPPF Policies TR3 and TR6 similarly require development to avoid severe impacts on the transport network and unacceptable impacts on highway safety.

The application has been assessed by the Highway Authority, which raises no objection to the proposal. The Highway Authority advises that the proposed jewellery shop is unlikely to generate significant traffic movements, that adequate hardstanding exists within the site to accommodate vehicles associated with the development and that no significant concerns arise in relation to servicing arrangements. No alterations to the public highway are proposed.

Whilst the Highway Authority notes a theoretical concern that a future retail occupier could generate greater levels of activity, it concludes that this would not justify refusal of the current proposal. The Local Planning Authority agrees that the application must be assessed on the basis of the development proposed. A jewellery shop is generally a relatively low-intensity retail use and there is no evidence before the Council that the proposal would result in a severe impact on the highway network or an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered acceptable in highway and parking terms and complies with CS Policy T2, PfE Policy JP-C8 and NPPF Policies TR3 and TR6.

Conclusion

The proposal would secure the refurbishment and reoccupation of a long-term vacant building, and moderate weight is afforded to the benefits associated with bringing the property back into active use. However, these benefits are outweighed by the identified policy conflicts.

The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated compliance with the sequential approach required by CS Policy E1 and NPPF Policy TC3. Furthermore, the proposed design fails to achieve the high standards of design expected by local and national planning policy, resulting in a development that would not respond positively to its context or enhance the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered unacceptable and planning permission should be refused.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

Human Rights and Public Sector Equality Duty

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report. In particular, Article 6 (1), of the European Convention on Human Rights in relation civil rights and a fair hearing; Article 8 of the ECHR in relation to the right to respect for private and family life and Article 1 Protocol 1 of the ECHR in relation to the protection of property have all been taken into account.

In addition, the Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination in respect of certain protected characteristics namely: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, or beliefs and sex and sexual orientation. It places the Local Planning Authority under a legal duty to have due regard to the advancement of equality in the exercise of its powers including planning powers. Officers have taken this into account in the assessment of the application. In particular due regard has been afforded to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Officers are satisfied that the application material and Officers' assessment has taken into account these issues.

The application has been considered in accordance with the Rochdale Equity, Diversity and Inclusion policy – Embracing All Voices (2024-2026), which seeks to promote a culture of equity, diversity and inclusion that benefit the community as a whole.

Recommendation: Refuse

Refusal(s) (2)

- 1 The proposal constitutes a main town centre use outside a town centre. The applicant has failed to satisfactorily demonstrate compliance with the sequential approach required by Core Strategy Policy E1 and NPPF Policy TC3. In particular, the submitted Sequential Test fails to adequately consider opportunities within the nearby Milkstone Road/Maldon Street Local Centre and other sequentially preferable locations, applies insufficiently justified floorspace requirements, relies on self-imposed commercial preferences and fails to demonstrate the degree of flexibility required by national policy. Consequently, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that suitable and available sequentially preferable sites do not exist. The proposal would therefore introduce a main town centre use outside a town centre contrary to Core Strategy Policy E1 and NPPF Policy TC3.
- 2 The proposal, by reason of the poor architectural composition of the extension, the awkward arrangement of roof forms, extensive areas of inactive ground floor frontage, excessive hardstanding, limited landscaping, prominent siting of the bin store, poorly designed shopfront and inconsistencies within the submitted drawings, would fail to achieve a high standard of design or positively respond to the character of the site and its surroundings. The development would fail to sufficiently enhance

the appearance of this prominent corner site and would result in a visually poor and unsympathetic form of development. The proposal therefore conflicts with Core Strategy Policies P3 and DM1, Places for Everyone Policy JP-P1, the Rochdale Shop Fronts and Security Shutters SPD and NPPF Policy DP3.

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