

Officer Report

Case Reference: PL/2026/0275
Location: 24A BARON STREET, ROCHDALE, OL16 1SJ
Proposal: Change of use from storage units to 7 self-contained apartments together with bin storage area and cycle storage. The installation of metal access-controlled gates and alterations to fenestration on all elevations.
Recommendation: Refuse
Officer: Anna Hayes

SITE

The application relates to 24A Baron Street, which comprises a part-three storey, part-two storey 'U' shaped building which fronts directly onto Baron Street in Rochdale. The building is vacant, but appears to have been last used for storage, with what is shown to be (on the existing plans) an existing studio flat at second floor level. The application property is within a small row of buildings that are in a state of disrepair. The principal front building is narrow in width and appears as two storeys in height with an uneven roofscape when viewed from Baron Street. At the rear, this section of the building is three storeys in height. This section of the building has numerous architectural features including brick detailing, a horse's head to the front elevation and a bull's head to the rear. The two projecting arms at the rear are brick and are both two storey in height with pitched roofs. To the rear of the building is a row of two storey shops on Oldham Road with various single storey and two storey projections. Access to the rear is through an alleyway from Oldham Road. Other than the front elevation, all windows face into the courtyard at the rear.

The site is located within the main town centre of Rochdale (saved UDP Policy G/S/1), the Defined Urban Area (saved UDP policy G/D/1), a Physical Regeneration Area (saved UDP policy R/3) and within Rochdale Town Centre Conservation Area. The application property, 24A Baron Street, as well as adjoining 28 Baron Street, are locally listed non-designated heritage assets. 24 Baron Street is a Grade II listed building (List Entry Number:1470833) which was recently listed in September 2020. On the opposite/north side of Baron Street, the area falls within a designated mixed employment zone according to the UDP Proposals Map.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the change of use of 24A Baron Street from storage to a residential use. The proposed use would comprise of 7 apartments, including:

Apartment 1 – 45.80m² 1 bedroom, 1 person

Apartment 2 – 84.09m² 2 bedroom, 3 persons

Apartment 3 – 64.89m² studio

Apartment 4 – 69.28m² 2 bedroom, 3 persons

Apartment 5 – 84.68m² 2 bedroom, 3 persons

Apartment 6 – 53.54m² 1 bedroom, 2 persons

Apartment 7 – 61.24m² 1 bedroom, 2 persons

Primary access to apartments 1-5 (inclusive), 7, and the internal courtyard would be taken directly via a communal entrance from Baron Street, with apartment 6 taking its own independent access also from Baron Street. Waste bins (3x 1100litre Euro bins) are proposed to be stored inside the under-croft passage between apartments 1 and 2, which are proposed to be taken over the adjoining courtyard through an alleyway onto Oldham Road for collection.

Proposed external alterations consist of the removal of existing roller shutters and the installation of new windows at ground floor level with matching sandstone heads and cills. All new brickwork is proposed to match the existing. Windows are to be installed with one-way privacy film.

Officer notes: During the course of the application, alterations were undertaken to the layout and size of the apartments proposed (reducing from 3 bed to 2 bed). The application is therefore assessed on the basis of the above, following the receipt of amended plans received 17 June 2026.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Development Plan

Under section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Planning decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making.

The development plan for the proposal consists of the Places for Everyone (PfE) Joint Development Plan, Rochdale Core Strategy (CS), adopted 2016, saved Unitary Development Plan (UDP) policies, and the Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan April 2013. The Council also has an adopted series of Supplementary Planning Documents and Supplementary Guidance Notes, which are other material considerations.

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) (2024)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

Sustainable and Resilient Places

JP-S1 Sustainable Development

JP-S2 Carbon and Energy

JP-S4 Flood Risk and the Water Environment

Places for Homes

JP-H1: Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development

JP-H2 Affordability of New Housing

JP-H3 Type, Size and Design of New Housing

JP-H4: Density of New Housing

Places for Jobs

JP-J1 Supporting Long-Term Economic Growth

JP-J4 Industry and Warehousing Development

Greener Places

JP-G7 Trees and Woodland

JP-G8 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Places for People

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

JP-P2 Heritage

Connected Places

JP-C1 An Integrated Network

JP-C3 Public Transport

JP-C6 Walking and Cycling

JP-C8 Transport Requirements of New Development

Rochdale Core Strategy (CS)

SO1 To deliver a more prosperous economy

E1 Establishing thriving town, district and local centres

E2 Increasing Jobs and Prosperity

E3 Focussing on economic growth corridors and areas

SO2 Creating successful and healthy communities

C1 Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places

C2 Focusing on regeneration areas and economic growth corridors/areas

C3 Delivering the right type of housing

C6 Health and well-being

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

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

Managing delivery and monitoring progress

DM1 General Development requirements

SD1 Delivering sustainable development

Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

G/R/1 Physical Regeneration

R/3 Drake Street Physical Regeneration Area, Rochdale

G/S/1 Hierarchy and Role of Centres

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

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

Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

None.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation Officer

Summary: No objection subject to conditions relating to materials.

Environmental Health – Noise/Odours

Summary: Confirms no objection to the proposal.

Greater Manchester Police – Design for Security (GMP)

Summary: Confirms no comments on the proposal.

Highways and Engineering

Summary: Confirms no objection to the proposal.

Historic England

No comments received.

NAS – Joint Committee of National Amenity Societies

No comments received.

Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)

Summary: Confirms no comments to make from a Metrolink perspective.

REPRESENTATIONS

In accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the application has been advertised by neighbour notification letters, site notice and a press notice.

Five separate letters of objection have been received. The comments are summarised below:

- Objection to the proposed bin collection route via the car park to Oldham Road.
- Concerns that the route would cause nuisance to neighbouring occupiers and businesses.
- Claims that the applicant has no legal right of way over the car park area and disputes any right of way for bin movements serving 7 apartments.
- Concerns regarding inadequate publicity and notification of the application.
- Risk of bins being left on the car park, alleyway, pavement or highway.
- Potential obstruction of car park access and inconvenience to pedestrians.
- Potential highway safety concerns in a busy commercial area.
- States that similar waste-related nuisance already occurs locally.

- Suggests bins should instead be stored and collected from Baron Street.
- Strong objection to the use of the car park and alleyway for refuse collection purposes.

Councillor Waqar Ali Khan made a representation requesting that the Council take into account further evidence and supporting documentation regarding waste collection and rights of access.

ANALYSIS

Principle

The site is situated within the Defined Urban Area according to the UDP Proposals Map. Policy G/D/1 of the UDP aims to locate new development in the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside.

Policy S3 of the NPPF establishes the presumption in favour of sustainable development and Policy S4 states that development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the Framework.

The lawful use of the building is unknown, but it is currently primarily vacant and being used for storage, with a studio flat located on the second floor. Historically, the site was known to be used as stables and a forge by Rochdale Horseshoeing Cooperative Society. As a result, in accordance with the definition set out in Appendix B of the NPPF, the site is considered to represent previously developed land.

NPPF policy L2 states that, amongst other things, substantial weight should be given to the benefits where a development proposal would make effective use of previously developed land and making better use of vacant and underutilised land and buildings, such as 'bringing back into residential use empty homes or other suitable buildings'.

Policy E1 of the Core Strategy also highlights that residential, amongst other uses, will be focused within town, district and local centres to promote the viability and vitality of these centres. Policy C1 of the Core Strategy outlines that the Council will promote the reuse and regeneration of vacant and underused previously developed sites and focus only on sustainable greenfield sites which provide the best access to a range of services, jobs and facilities and have limited impact on green infrastructure and amenity.

The latest published information suggests that the Council can demonstrate over 5 years' worth of deliverable housing sites, as required by national policy however, this does not preclude the promotion of sustainable development where this can assist in delivering additional housing to meet local needs. The recent adoption of PfE has also increased the housing requirement to an annual average of 616 new dwellings across the plan period, as set out in table 7.2.

NPPF policy L3 also seeks to ensure efficient use of land by applying minimum housing density requirements to new residential and mixed-use developments within settlements and also those within 'reasonable walking distance' of 'well-connected stations'. In this instance, the proposal falls below the threshold for major development and comprises the conversion of an existing building where the established built form limits opportunities to alter density. Nevertheless, the number of units proposed is reasonable when considering the context (explored further within the Residential Amenity section of this report) and would make efficient use of the land and buildings supporting the aims and aspirations of policy L3.

The site falls just outside of an allocated mixed employment zone, however Core Strategy Policy E2 requires that existing B1-B8 sites (now use Class E(g), B2 and B8) outside employment zones which are most suited to continued employment use should also be

protected. However, the policy goes on to say that ‘uses other than employment will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that they would be more appropriate.’ With this in mind, Officers do not consider Policy E2 is relevant due to the town centre location and the size of the building and the constraints of the site.

Taking into account all of the above, the site is located within the defined urban area, and the site and building is not allocated for a specific purpose. The proposal would bring a mostly vacant and underutilised building back into productive use and deliver additional housing within a sustainable town centre location. Substantial weight is therefore afforded to the development’s contribution towards the efficient use of existing land and buildings, in accordance with NPPF policies S3, S4 and L2 and Core Strategy Policies C1, E1 and E2, as well as saved UDP Policy G/D/1.

Design and Heritage

The NPPF at chapter 14 seeks to promote high quality, healthy, inclusive and sustainable places, whilst chapter 20 seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Policy DP3(1) of the NPPF states that development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets. Policy DP3 (2) sets out a number of key principles in order to create well-designed places.

Similar objectives are reflected in Places for Everyone Policy JP-P1 (Sustainable Places), which supports development that respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size and scale and materials used. PfE policy JP-P2 seeks to ensure that the significance of key elements of the historic environment which contribute to Greater Manchester’s distinctive identity and sense of place are protected from harm. It notes that development proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets and/or their settings will be considered having regard to national planning policy.

At the local level, Core Strategy Policy P3 requires all development proposals, including associated landscaping, to adhere to a high standard of design and sets out the key design principles against which proposals will be assessed. Core Strategy Policy DM1 further requires development to demonstrate compliance with a range of general development criteria, including the delivery of high-quality design which takes the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Section 66(1) states: “In considering whether to grant planning permission [...] for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority [...] shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”.

The application building, and adjoining property 28 Baron street, are locally listed non-designated heritage assets. The site is also immediately adjacent to 24 Baron Street, which is a Grade II listed building. these buildings make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Accordingly, regard must be had to Core Strategy Policy P2, PfE Policy JP-P2 and Policies, HE4, HE5, HE6, HE7 and HE9 of the NPPF, which cumulatively seek to conserve, enhance, and promote key heritage assets; reinforce the importance of heritage in placemaking and require that the significance of heritage assets be understood and impacts assessed.

The Council's Conservation Officer has reviewed the proposals and confirms that there are no heritage objections to a residential use in this location, noting that the building is in relatively poor condition and not fully occupied. A residential use would provide a long-term use for the building and would help to ensure its ongoing maintenance.

To facilitate the 7no apartments, new window and door openings are proposed. The Conservation Officer advised that these should be kept to a minimum and existing openings should be re-used where possible. Amended plans were received 17 June 2026, reducing the number of new openings and retaining original windows. The revised elevation drawings show the new windows to be vertically aligned with those above with the proportions of the new window openings matching the existing. All new doors and windows include new sandstone heads and cills to match the existing. As a result of these amendments, officers are satisfied that the new fenestration/proposal is sympathetic to the historic character of the original building.

In order to protect the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and ensure the development would not harm the significance of the Rochdale Town Centre conservation area as a designated heritage asset, the following details are recommended to be secured by condition:

- Details of window materials. Windows should either be fabricated in either timber or aluminium and should be of a design appropriate to the age and historic use of the buildings;
- Samples of brickwork to be reinstated. The replacement brick should match in colour, form and texture the existing;
- Details of new doors. As with the windows, these should be fabricated of timber and of a design suitable to the age and historic use of the building;
- Details of the new gates.
- A schedule of external repairs including details such as brick and stone cleaning, repairs of features of special interest, including the bull and horses head over the entrances. The use of render is not appropriate and would obscure many of the brick and stone detailing (as discussed on site with the applicant).
- Details of hard and soft landscaping. The existing cobbles and York stones should be retained wherever possible.

Overall, subject to conditions, the removal of the roller shutters, insertion of new window and door openings, and proposed brickwork cleaning would enhance the appearance of the non-designated heritage asset and would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and would have a positive effect on the setting of the Grade II listed building, 24 Baron Street. The proposal therefore has a positive heritage impact and is supported in accordance with Policy HE6, HE7 and HE9 of the NPPF, as well as in accordance with PpE policy JP-P2 and Core Strategy policies DM2, P1, P2 and P3.

Residential Amenity

NPPF Policy P3 sets out that development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site; and whether this is as a result of the development itself or the product of preexisting conditions in its vicinity.

Core Strategy policies DM1, G9, C1 and C6 cumulatively seek to reduce air and noise pollution, and DM1 in particular requires development to not adversely affect the amenity of

residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

The SPD – Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development provides advice on the acceptability of proposed living accommodation, taking account of amenity of future occupiers and those surrounding.

Noise

The application has been supported by a Noise Impact Assessment prepared by Acoustic Solutions (Ref: AS26-07V1, dated 6 February 2026). The assessment identifies road traffic on Baron Street and the nearby Cask & Feather Public House as the principal noise sources in the vicinity of the site. Noise monitoring was undertaken as part of the assessment and the report concludes that acceptable internal noise levels can be achieved within the proposed dwellings in accordance with relevant guidance.

Environmental Protection initially raised concerns regarding the adequacy of the Noise Impact Assessment, particularly in relation to noise arising from the nearby Cask & Feather public house and the proposed glazing and ventilation strategy. Following receipt of further clarification from the applicant's acoustic consultant regarding testing and the results, Environmental Protection confirmed that they had no further issues with the proposal. Environmental Protection are therefore satisfied that the development would provide an acceptable standard of residential amenity in respect of noise and raises no further issues in relation to the application. It is also noted that planning permission has recently been obtained for the conversion of the Cask and Feather public house to residential (HMO).

Overall, the property lies on the edge of Rochdale Town Centre, where a degree of activity, noise and disturbance is reasonably expected. Having regard to the surrounding context, including the adjacent mixed employment area (which are commonly found adjacent to residential uses in the borough), the proposed residential use of the building at the scale proposed would not harm the character or amenity of the area. The existing storage use could generate regular comings and goings throughout the day, and by comparison, the proposed residential use would not be detrimental to surrounding occupiers or uses.

Objections have also been raised on the basis that the proposed bin collection route would cause nuisance to surrounding residents and businesses. Bins would be stored on the site within the under-croft of the building and secured behind gates. Bins would be taken out for collection and then returned to the site. This is a common arrangement for businesses in this location and Officers do not consider that this arrangement would be unduly harmful and cause undue disturbance. Other issues have been raised relating to land ownership, which is considered in more detail below.

Living Conditions

The Government's technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (NDSS) document sets out requirements for the Gross Internal (floor) Area of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy as well as floor areas and dimensions for habitable rooms.

The proposals comprise of the following units:

Apartment 1 – 45.80m² 1 bedroom, 1 person

Apartment 2 – 84.09m² 2 bedroom, 3 persons

Apartment 3 – 64.89m² studio

Apartment 4 – 69.28m² 2 bedroom, 3 persons

Apartment 5 – 84.68m² 2 bedroom, 3 persons

Apartment 6 – 53.54m² 1 bedroom, 2 persons

Apartment 7 – 61.24m² 1 bedroom, 2 persons

All of the units meet the required minimum standards prescribed by the NDSS. Amendments have been undertaken during the course of the application to provide a better ratio of living space to bedroom space in a few of the apartments – increasing the size of the living area to improve living conditions for the future occupiers.

All habitable rooms have satisfactory access to natural light and ventilation. This is supported by the submitted Daylight and Sunlight assessment dated 15 April 2026 which demonstrates that the daylight and sunlight provision to the internal habitable rooms of the proposal is compliant with the guidance set out in the BRE BR209 (2022). Those apartments with obscure film would still achieve the relevant standards.

In terms of privacy and outlook, Officers recognise that the existing 'U'-shaped form of the building around the central courtyard creates some constraints. In some instances, the separation distances between directly facing habitable room windows fall below the guidance in paragraph 4.1 of the SPD. However, amendments have been made to improve the relationship between rooms, with bedrooms now generally facing opposite living spaces rather than other bedrooms or directly facing living areas, reducing the potential for overlooking and amenity conflict during daytime and evening use. One-way privacy film is also proposed which offers some mitigation.

The future occupiers would benefit from the use of a shared external courtyard and note the site's sustainable urban location within proximity to Rochdale Town Centre.

Overall, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Core Strategy policy DM1 and the NPPF in regard to amenity.

Access and Highway Safety

Policy TR6 of the NPPF states that development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network or an unacceptable impact on highway safety. This applies both during the construction phase and following completion.

Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to improve accessibility by locating development where good access to public transport is available or can be provided and, in all circumstances, prioritises the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live or have business in the area. Policy DM1 also states that all development proposals should provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has been consulted and raises no objection to the proposal. It is noted that the site is on the edge of Rochdale town centre, with many local amenities within walking distance along with Rochdale bus station, train station and Metrolink tram stop and is therefore a sustainable location in transport terms. There are no changes to site access as a result of the proposal and no additional parking is required.

Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) have confirmed that they have no comments to make from a Metrolink perspective.

The proposal to be acceptable in regard to highway safety and would not be in conflict with the NPPF and Policy T2 of the Core Strategy.

Ecology and Biodiversity

Chapter 19 of the NPPF seeks new development to contribute positively to the natural environment and support nature's recovery, through conserving or enhancing the environmental qualities of the land proposed for development.

In England, biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, subject to some exceptions including 'developments below the threshold', every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met. This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved through onsite biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits.

PfE Policy JP-G8 also states that through local planning and associated activities a net enhancement of biodiversity resources will be sought where relevant. Development will be expected to achieve a measurable net gain in biodiversity of no less than 10%.

The proposal is exempt from the statutory biodiversity net gain requirements, due to impacting less than 25sqm of onsite habitat, and therefore the biodiversity gain condition under Schedule 7A does not apply. However, the proposal remains subject to PfE Policy JP-G8, which seeks biodiversity enhancement and a measurable net gain in biodiversity. The biodiversity impacts of the proposal have therefore been considered against that policy on a proportionate basis. The proposal seeks to deliver a net gain for nature conservation including the provision of four bat/bird boxes as shown on the proposed elevation drawings.

Subject to a condition securing these measures, the proposal is acceptable in relation to ecology and biodiversity matters.

Other

Design for Security

PfE policy JP-P1 and CS policy P3 also seek to design out crime and reduce opportunities for anti-social behaviour. The submitted plans and accompanying Crime Impact Assessment detail the installation of a new security gate at the entrance of the courtyard, with an open design so that users can be seen, with motion sensor lighting and amenity lighting to the rear courtyard. Greater Manchester Police (Secure by Design) have reviewed the submission and statement noting that the primary access is to be taken from Baron Street. On this basis they have confirmed that they have no comments to make.

Affordable Housing

In consideration of Core Strategy Policy C4, this application does not meet the requirements for the provision of affordable housing

Bin Collection/Access and rights of way

The application raises complex land ownership and access issues in relation to the proposed refuse collection arrangements. The Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the appropriate ownership certificate has been completed and the requisite notice served based on the information submitted. However, the proposed waste management strategy relies upon refuse

bins being transported across adjoining land that is outside the applicant's ownership and control to be presented on Oldham Road for collection. Due to constraints, it is not possible for waste to be stored or collected on Baron Street.

The applicant contends that a right of access exists over this adjoining land (car park) through long-standing use. However, no formal deed, easement, legal agreement or other definitive evidence has been provided to demonstrate a secure and enforceable right of access for the movement and collection of refuse associated with the proposed development. Furthermore, the claimed right is disputed by the adjoining landowner.

Having considered the matter, including advice from the Council's Planning Solicitor, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that the necessary access arrangements exist or would remain available for the lifetime of the development. As a consequence, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that refuse, in association with the proposed 7 apartments, can be collected and managed in a reliable and sustainable manner for the lifetime of the development.

In the absence of satisfactory and deliverable waste collection arrangements, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the proposed apartments would be capable of being adequately serviced, where waste can be stored and collected in an efficient manner, resulting in a poor standard of design with associated impacts on residential amenity, neighbouring occupiers, and the quality of the surrounding environment. This would be in conflict with NPPF policies TR4(d) and DP3(2), and section M5 (para 121) of the draft Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance which requires access for servicing, including refuse collection, deliveries and removals to be suitably integrated into the development. In this case, where bin collection points cannot be secured, there is risk that waste would be inadequately stored on the street, be visually obtrusive, or the proposed units would not be adequately serviced. Substantial weight is therefore afforded to this harm.

Planning balance and conclusion

The proposal would deliver benefits through the re-use of a vacant and underutilised building, the efficient use of previously developed land and the provision of seven apartments in a sustainable town centre location. The proposal would also secure a long-term use for a locally listed non-designated heritage asset and, subject to conditions, would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Rochdale Town Centre Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed building. Substantial weight is afforded to these benefits, particularly having regard to Policies S3, S4 and L2 of the NPPF.

However, the proposal has not demonstrated acceptable and deliverable waste collection arrangements. The submitted strategy relies on refuse bins being moved across adjoining land outside the applicant's ownership and control, with no definitive evidence of a secure and enforceable right of access and with that right disputed by the adjoining landowner. The Local Planning Authority is therefore not satisfied that refuse associated with the proposed apartments could be stored, moved and collected in an efficient, reliable and sustainable manner for the lifetime of the development, contrary to NPPF policies TR4(d) and DP3(2), and section M5 of the draft Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance document.

This represents a fundamental issue with the functionality of the proposal and therefore engages the provisions of Policy DP3(3) of the Framework. The wording of DP3(3) requires the development proposals to be refused, and discounts the presumption set out under Policy S4 as per the contents of paragraph 2(c) of the same policy. Overall, the adverse impacts arising from the inadequate waste arrangements substantially outweigh the identified benefits of the scheme. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies S3, S4, TR4(D) and DP3(2) of the NPPF and Policies DM1 and P3 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and is unacceptable in planning terms.

Recommendation: Refuse

Refusal(s) (1)

- 1 The application fails to demonstrate that acceptable, efficient and deliverable waste collection arrangements can be provided for the proposed development. The submitted strategy relies on refuse bins being moved across adjoining land outside the applicant's ownership and control to be presented on Oldham Road for collection, without definitive evidence of a secure and enforceable right of access. The Local Planning Authority is therefore not satisfied that the proposed apartments could be adequately serviced in an efficient, reliable and sustainable manner for the lifetime of the development, which could also result in bins being stored on the street in a visually obtrusive manner. The proposal would therefore result in an unacceptable form of development contrary to Policies S3, S4, TR4(d) and DP3(2) of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

- 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.