APPLICATION NUMBER: 17/00886/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
17/00886/FUL	Kirsty Nicholls	9/02/2021

Address: Highfield Manor Residential Care Home 70 Manchester Road Heywood Rochdale OL10 2AN

Proposal: Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of new two storey rear extension to provide 40 bedrooms, including realignment of site access and formation of additional car parking spaces (resubmission of 15/01457/FUL)

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/A

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

RECOMMENDATION	**Grant subject to conditions**

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: EH **DATE: 17 February 2021**

SITE

The application relates to a detached, split-level two/single storey building set within a substantial, rectangular plot located between Manchester Road and Gooden Street, Heywood. The property is used as a care home for elderly residents and exhibits two distinctive styles and eras with respect to its layout, architectural style and design.

The eastern (front) portion of the building forms the original, former dwellinghouse (*circa* late 1800s) which has an imposing, balanced and symmetrical façade fronting onto Manchester Road including a central, stone entrance porch, stone window surrounds and protruding brickwork buttresses defining the northeastern and southeastern corners. This section of the building is topped by a hipped roof finished in a slate covering. A projecting, flat-roofed, two-storey 'wing' has been added to the southwest corner of the original building and a modern, hip-roofed extension has also been erected to the southeast corner at ground floor level.

In contrast, the western (rear) section of the building comprises a large 1980s, hip-roofed, single-storey extension of a modern construction which occupies an 'O-shaped' layout enveloping a central, open quadrangle. Previous permissions (D54232 and D54980) existed for substantial first floor/two storey extensions to the side and rear of the building, though neither of these has been implemented to date.

The two contrasting sections of the property are linked by a narrow, flat-roofed single storey extension occupying a central position to the rear of the original building. To the rear of the O-shaped extension, the building backs onto a 26 metre deep garden area which runs to the western site boundary abutting Gooden Street. The rear garden boundaries are formed by tall (up to approximately 3 metres) brick walls flanked by scattered planting to the borders of the outdoor amenity area. The curtilage of Highfield House backs onto the cul-de-sac of Gooden Street, with a row of garages located immediately to the west, beyond the boundary wall.

The building occupies a recessed position set back some 30 metres from the frontage of the A6045 (Manchester Road) and opens onto a rectangular forecourt comprising a combination of hard and soft landscaped areas including a car park. This car park is accessed via a narrow, single-track access branching off Manchester Road to the northeast corner. The eastern boundary treatment to Manchester Road is formed by a low (approximately 1 metre high) stone retaining wall backed by low-level hedging. A number of tall, mature trees run alongside the northern and southern boundaries of the forecourt.

Surrounding uses include an adjacent nursing home (Holly Bank) located to the south and a block of two-storey flats to the north (Springfield Close) forming sheltered accommodation and occupying an 'n-shaped' layout. A row of terraced dwellings are located some 52 metres to the east on the opposite side of Manchester Road. Two detached, two-storey buildings to the rear of the site no. 42 Gooden Street and The Coach House occupy offset positions to the northwest and southwest corners of the site respectively. A row of five bungalows (nos. 30-34 Gooden Street) are located some 23.5 metres to the northwest.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes the demolition of an existing single storey rear extension on the building and the erection of a new two storey rear extension to provide 40 bedrooms, including realignment of site access and formation of additional car parking spaces. The application is the resubmission of a previously refused scheme on the site (15/01457/FUL).

The original submission entailed a three storey extension, which incorporated a Mansard roof, linked to the host building by a glazed extension, comprising of 60 bedrooms. Amended plans were requested of which reduced the design and scale of the extension.

The proposal under consideration in this report is a two storey extension with a combination of dual-pitch and flat roofs. The extension will house an additional 40 bedrooms within the existing care facility.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – February 2019
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO1	**Delivering a more prosperous economy**
E1	Establishing thriving town, district and local centres
E2	Increasing jobs and prosperity
E5	Encouraging the visitor economy
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 green environment**
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
SD1	Delivering sustainable development
DM1	General development requirements

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
EM/7	Development and Flood Risk
EM/8	Protection of Surface and Ground Water

PUBLICITY

Site Notice: Major Application Date Displayed: 19 September 2017

Press Advert: Major Advert Date Published: 28 September 2017
Reason: Major Development

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

88/D21772	Change of use from dwellinghouse to aged persons rest home – Approved

88/D21773	Single storey extension to rear of premises including provision of car parking – Approved
88/D22844	Single storey extension to side and rear of rest home and provision of additional car parking space – Approved
92/D28029	Two storey extension to existing rest home – Withdrawn.
07/D49425	Outline application for the erection of extension to existing care home to provide 19 additional bedrooms – Approved
09/D52784	Application to extend the time limit for the implementation of outline planning permission D49425 for the erection of an extension to existing nursing home to provide 19 additional bedrooms – Approved
11/D54232	First floor and two storey extensions to rear of residential care home to provide 23 additional bedrooms – Approved
11/D54980	Two and single storey extensions to north side and first floor extension to rear, replacement single storey extension to south side and formation of hipped roof to existing flat-roofed, first floor projection to south side of building – Approved
12/56254/FUL	Three storey rear extension to care home to provide 20 additional bedrooms including realignment of site access and formation of six additional car parking spaces – Approved
15/00590/DOC	Submission of details to comply with condition 3 of planning permission 12/56254/FUL – Request Completed
15/01457/FUL	Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of new 3 storey rear extension to provide total 60 bedrooms - Refused

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation and Design -

I have considered this proposal for a 60 bedroom rear extension to Highfield House, which is an undesignated heritage asset.

The significance of this building and site lies in the high quality Victorian façade and high status entrance with stone gateposts along with some interior detailing. I do not consider the proposed rear extension to cause any harm, either physically or aesthetically, to the front elevation of the historic building and its view from Manchester Road. The roofline of the extension is lower than the roofline of the historic building and the extension is no wider than the historic building.

Where the access drive is re-designed it is important that the existing stone gateposts are retained.

I have no objections to this proposal.

Drainage - No objection subject to conditions in relation to foul and surface water drainage.

Env Health - Noise/Odours - No response received to date

Env Health - Air Quality - No response received to date

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – No response received to date.

Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service -

We can advise that there is no know archaeological interest for this proposal and therefore no archaeological mitigation is required.

Highways and Engineering -

I do not envisage problems with Traffic and Junction Capacity at this location.
Parking Provision for this proposal is inadequate and whilst the applicant begins to address this issue in his application not enough detail is provided to justify the lack of parking.

The access appears to be adequate but it is essential that a minimum visibility splay of 2.4 x 43m can be achieved and this will be conditioned as part of any planning permission that is granted.

I have no Refuse Collection concerns at this location.

The existing Highways Layout will not change as a result of this proposal.

Providing the access is suitable I have no road safety concerns at this location.
I have no concerns regarding Highways Drainage.

This application has insufficient parking provided on site and no justification has been made as to why no parking has been provided. I must defer my recommendation until the applicant has properly explained their parking strategy.

Prior to first occupation the applicant shall set out a visibility splay of 43m x 2.4m at the site access. This Visibility Splay shall be free of visual obstruction and retained thereafter.

Rochdale Development Agency - No response received to date

Strategic Transport Planning Co-Ordinator - No response received to date.

Street Lighting - No response received to date

The Coal Authority -

I have reviewed the proposals and confirm that the application site falls within the defined Development High Risk Area; therefore within the application site and surrounding area there are coal mining features and hazards which need to be considered in relation to the determination of this planning application.

The Coal Authority records indicate that the site is likely to have been subject to historic unrecorded underground coal mining at shallow depth and that a thick coal seam outcropped across the site.

The applicant has obtained appropriate and up-to-date coal mining information for the proposed development site and has used this information to inform the Coal

Mining Risk Assessment Report (August 2017, prepared by Demeter Environmental Ltd), which accompanies this planning application.

The Coal Mining Risk Assessment Report has been informed by an appropriate range of sources of information. Based on this review of existing sources of geological and mining information the Report identifies ground stability risks posed by potential shallow unrecorded coal mine workings.

Accordingly, and in order to mitigate potential workings, the Report recommends intrusive site investigation works prior to development in order to establish the exact situation regarding ground conditions and to enable appropriate remedial measures. However, and in terms of the proposed scheme of site investigations proposed (i.e. one borehole), the potential need for further boreholes will be dependent on the results of that single borehole. This can be addressed through The Coal Authority's Permitting process and by the imposition of an appropriate planning condition.

The applicant should ensure that the exact form of any intrusive site investigations are agreed with The Coal Authority's Licensing and Permitting Department as part of their permit application. The findings of these intrusive site investigations should inform any mitigation measures which may be required in order to ensure the safety and stability of the proposed development.

The Coal Authority has no objections subject to conditions.

Tree & Woodland Dev. Officer – No response received to date.

United Utilities - No objections subject to conditions.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours, notices displayed in the vicinity of the site and a notice placed in the local press. One neutral representation was received as summarised below:

- The boundary wall between the property, and the neighbouring building of Springfield Close Sheltered Housing scheme owned by Rochdale Boroughwide Housing Ltd) is very unstable and we would like the rebuilding of this wall to be a stipulation of the planning permission being granted.

Officer's response: This is not considered to be an appropriate requirement of the application and would be inappropriate for such a stipulation to be added.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The application site is allocated as Defined Urban Area under the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan. Policy G/D/1 is therefore relevant to any applications on the site and in the supporting text to this policy it is established that new development should be located in the urban area, so as to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside. The extension would be constructed on the footprint of an existing single storey extension to the original house, and therefore represents an area of Brownfield, or previously developed land.

Siting, Design and Layout

Paragraph 197 of the NPPF outlines that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining applications. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The original (eastern) section of the building fronting onto Manchester Road has an attractive, imposing façade which, by virtue of its architectural style and features, makes a significant contribution to local distinctiveness and, as a result, is considered to be locally important, representing a non-designated heritage asset.

The applicant has submitted a Heritage Statement in support of their application, which sets out that Highfield House was built around 1900 as a single residence but was first converted into a care home in 1984 when the single storey rear and side extensions were added. It would appear that at least one earlier building had been on the site, as a property is shown on the 1893 OS map for the area adjacent to a large property set in extensive grounds known as Gooden House. The immediate area on this side of Manchester Road at the turn of the C20 had many fine Victorian villas and detached houses, and was populated by a mixture of professional people (for example, properties nearby were occupied by the clergy and a solicitor) as well as the nouveau riche who had found fortune in the booming cotton trade of the C19 in and around Heywood and Middleton.

It is noted within the statement that the original house has suffered a number of poor quality extensions and alterations, which the LPA do not dispute. The property is configured in two blocks. The portion situated to the front of the site facing onto Manchester Road is the original house which is built out of red brick and has classical overtones. However, the original frontage would have originally been symmetrical across the entire elevation, and this symmetry has been lost in part by virtue of later additions and alterations.

The site benefits from an implemented planning approval (2013) for a 3 storey scheme which formed the first phase in a development scheme to replace the single storey existing rear extension with a 3 storey extension on the same footprint. This first phase adopted the rear part of the footprint established under a 2011 approval, providing an additional 20 bedrooms.

The current application is for the second phase which includes for the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension and the erection of a 3 storey infill extension in the same idiom as that consented in 2013. The 3 storey scheme submitted incorporated a structure which facilitated a third floor through the use of dormer windows in the roof space.

Planning permission was previously refused on the site for a three storey rear extension. It was concluded that the proposed three storey rear extension, by virtue of its excessive height, size, scale, massing and design, failed to complement the original host building. The flat roof element design of the extension was concluded to be prominently sited above the eaves height of the existing manor house and would dominate the attracted front elevation to the detriment of the character and appearance of the property and the area.

Taking the above into consideration, discussions took place between the Council and the developer as it was considered that the scheme as originally submitted was not of a design that could be considered appropriate. Amended plans were submitted of which reduced the scale in terms of height, removing the third floor dormer detail. The amended plans have extended the extension in length to accommodate for the loss of the third floor. The scheme under consideration in this report is the amended plans which constitute a two storey rear extension.

The two storey rear extension would occupy a similar (though higher) footprint to the single storey extension. The extension will serve to re-introduce an element of symmetry to the front elevation and re-balance the appearance of the building on the street scene. The existing building contains a number of features of architectural interest such as cornices, eaves-level brackets, recessed sash windows (though top-opening), stone window surrounds with protruding lintels, a continuous stone string course between ground and first floor level and a stone plinth. These features are to be carried through to the proposed extensions, which would make use of fenestration of proportions which would accord with the existing, and use materials and detailing to match in appearance.

The proposed extensions would respect the architectural and historic significance of the building by virtue of their siting, scale, height, massing, alignment, fenestration and materials, and would not adversely alter its character and proportions. The extensions would be subordinate to the scale of the existing building and would not have a dominant or incongruous appearance which would detract from the character of the street scene. In accordance with paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework, it is considered that considerable favourable weight can be applied to these extension elements, in that they would serve to re-balance the appearance of the front elevation of the dwelling and seek to mitigate the harm which existing poor-quality, insensitive additions to the building have on the significance of the heritage asset.

Given the status of the building, as a non-designated heritage asset which contributes significantly to the character and appearance of the area, consultation has been carried out with the Council's Conservation and Design officer. It is noted that any interventions that affect the setting of the building, or the building itself, should be considered carefully.

The Heritage Statement submitted by the applicant contends that the proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset. The original building has suffered from insensitive extensions in the past that have severely diminished its architectural quality. This is particularly relevant on the front elevation i.e. the view from Manchester Road, which remains the most prominent elevation in terms of public views. They opine that the proposed development to the rear is therefore considered to have little impact on the architectural significance of the heritage asset, particularly given recent planning approvals for development to the rear of the original building.

It is noted that permission has been granted for a three-storey extension on the site (12/56254/FUL), the proposed section of building was to be sited approximately 16.5m from the rear elevation of the original manor house, and as such would not have been overly visible from the street scene by virtue of the setback of the extension from the main building. The currently amended proposed two-storey extension would, however, directly connect to the original house and would therefore be read in conjunction with the front elevation of the manor house.

The extension would follow a regimented internal layout with bedrooms and communal areas branching off a series of long internal corridors. The uniformity and repetition in the internal layout is mirrored in the external elevation. Floor levels would be defined externally by continuous stone strings across the elevations, with a stone-capped parapet surrounding its flat roof. The scale, features, character, layout, materials and elevational treatment would largely reflect the existing manor house. It is considered that the proposal would represent a suitable addition to the original host building in terms of its height, depth, scale and character.

The applicant has identified the opportunity to provide for the long-term viability and sustainability of the property, by ensuring its continuing use as a care home. It is considered that the proposal represents a scheme of which would result in less than substantial harm to the appearance and visual significance of a building of such character. The proposal therefore accords Policies P2 and P3 of the Core Strategy and the requirements of paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework in causing less than substantial harm to a non-designated heritage asset.

Landscaping

Highfield House benefits from a landscaped front garden onto Manchester Road and a communal outdoor amenity area to the rear. The realignment of the access would result in the formation of a narrow strip of additional landscaping within an embankment flanking the north side of the route. Whilst the revised layout of the access would result in the loss of two existing trees within the site, these are immature specimens set back from the road and screened by other vegetation along the frontage and this re-aligned access has already been accepted under permission 12/56254/FUL.

The extension is approximately 0.5m wider than the existing single-storey extension on site and would therefore result in the narrowing of the existing passageways between the front/side of the house and the communal garden area to the rear of the site. However, given that this does not represent an area of viable amenity space, and instead is more focussed on providing access, it is not considered that this would unduly reduce the amenity space available to residents. It is considered that the areas of private garden/amenity space to be retained within the site would be satisfactory in accordance with the requirements of UDP policies H/10 and BE/2

Impact upon Surrounding Land Uses

The two-storey extension is located to the west of the host building and would share facing (side) elevations with the sheltered housing property to the north (Springfield Close) and the adjacent care home to the south (Holly Bank). The separation distance to the facing south elevation of the sheltered housing complex to the north would stand at a minimum of 4.6m, however, this section of the neighbouring building contains only a service staircase, and as such it is not considered that the proposed extension to the application property would have an undue impact by virtue of this relationship. The separation distance from the side elevation of the extension to the nearest directly facing elevation of the neighbouring sheltered housing complex, with habitable room windows, is below the above standard of 21m. However, given the nature of the use of both buildings, and considering that a two-storey extension has previously been accepted in this location, it is not considered that a substantive objection could be maintained to this relationship.

The current application proposes a two-storey extension which would be sited within close proximity of the shared boundary with the complex at Springfield Close. However, it is considered that, by virtue of the scale and massing of the structure, the scheme would not lead to an overbearing impact on the garden amenity area of the adjoining property or create any significant overshadowing.

The adjacent dwellinghouse to the northwest (no. 45 Gooden Street) contains single windows at ground and first floor levels to its respective south and east facing elevations. The property's principal windows are located in its west facing elevation onto Gooden Street and its garden is enclosed to the north of the building. Given the oblique relationship, it is not considered that the proposed extension would have any undue impact by virtue of overlooking or overbearing impact. Although the neighbouring property contains a single ground floor window facing directly onto the gardens of the application property, and the resident is concerned about occupiers of

the care home having views into no. 45 when using the garden space, it is noted that this is an existing relationship, and the garden is available to use by residents at the present time. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the Officer's Report for application 12/56254/FUL (relating to the initial three-storey extension) concluded that the impact would be acceptable in respect of the impact on no. 45 Gooden Street and there has been no material change in circumstances to deviate from this conclusion.

Highways

The site plan indicates that 13 spaces (7 spaces exist at present) would be created by virtue of the proposed alterations to the arrangement of the front curtilage with the removal of two trees. The proposed access and parking arrangement alterations were approved under application 12/56254/FUL. However, that application included an additional 20 bedrooms, which on top of the original accommodation of 16 bedrooms created a total of 36 bedrooms in total, with nine car parking spaces required to be provided on site.

The current application proposes a total of 56 bedrooms on site. The expected parking provision for care and nursing homes is for 1 parking space per 4 beds. This would constitute a total required parking provision of 14 spaces. As noted above, the application proposes an additional 6 spaces within the front curtilage, which would create a total of 13 spaces. Consultation has been carried out with the Council's Highways Officer who considers that as there was insufficient justification to support the lack of spaces, they could not support the application. However, this consultation response was in reference to the original proposal of 60 bedrooms.

Within the Design and Access Statement, the applicant explains that the nearby care home, Holly Bank, is within their ownership and that access can be provided to this car park for overflow parking. A footpath is provided between the two car parks for ease of access. Whilst it is not normally considered adequate for car parking to be provided in an area outside of the red line boundary, in this instance, due to the shortfall of only one space, it is acceptable.

With regards to other matters, the Highways Officer does not consider that the proposed development would have a negative impact upon road safety if parking standards were increased to meet standards set in the UDP. The development is located A6046-Manchester Road which is a major bus route providing sustainable transport alternatives to car travel for staff and visitors of the proposed development. The level of traffic the development would generate would not create a significant negative impact upon the existing local highway network.

No new access to the highway will be created by this development, with the re-configured driveway meeting Manchester Road at the same point as at present. The existing access is considered sufficient to serve a development of the size and nature proposed. No concerns are raised regarding refuse collection from the site and the application proposal would not impact upon the highways layout.

In light of the above analysis, it is not considered that the proposed development would conflict with the relevant requirements of Policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy or the National Planning Policy Framework.

Unstable Land/Coal Mining Risk

The application site lies within the Coal Mining Development Referral area, and as such, the proposal was forwarded to the Coal Authority for consultation. They have confirmed that the site lies within a Development High Risk Area. A coal mining risk assessment report has been provided which recommends intrusive site investigations works to establish ground conditions and suitable remediation. The

Coal Authority raised no objection to the proposal subject to an appropriate planning condition being included to secure these remediation works..

Subject to application of the recommended conditions it is considered that there would be no conflict with Policies G9 and DM1 of the Core Strategy or the National Planning Policy Framework with respect to providing a safe environment for residential development.

Conclusion

Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that the LPA take a balanced judgement on determining applications which directly affect non-designated heritage assets. It is considered that the proposals will create a less than substantial harm to the non-designated heritage asset. The benefits of the application proposal are recognised by the LPA, namely in the provision of increased capacity for housing for the elderly. The extension would not conflict with the conservation of the heritage asset and would also be compliant with other development plan policies, including with regard to the impact on neighbouring land uses and highways. It is therefore considered that, on balance, the recommendation be for grant of permission subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION – Grant subject to conditions

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:

   - Location Plan
   - Proposed site plan – Drawing number HH01/0218/03
   - Proposed ground and first floor plans – Drawing number HH02/0219/02
   - Proposed elevations – Drawing number HH02/0219/01

   The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved drawings.

   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the reason for decision as detailed below on this decision notice.

3. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application, no above ground works shall take place until samples or full details of all materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension (including those used in the construction of any windows and doors) 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. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.

   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. No development shall take place until an intrusive site investigation and risk assessment (in addition to any assessment provided with the planning

application) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall investigate the nature and extent of any coal mining legacy issues on the site (whether or not it originates on the site). The assessment shall be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development takes place. The submitted report shall include:

i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of coal mining legacy issues

ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- human health,
- property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland, and service lines and pipes,
- adjoining land,
- groundwaters and surface waters,
- ecological systems,
- archaeological sites and ancient monuments;

iii) where unacceptable risks are identified, an appraisal of remedial options and proposal of the preferred option(s) to form a remediation strategy for the site.

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

Reason: To prevent the impact of any coal mining legacy potential and pollution of the water environment and to ensure the safe development of the site in the interests of the amenity of future occupiers in accordance with Policy G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, saved Policy EM/8 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: This application proposes to develop on a Coal Mining Development High Risk Area. This condition would ensure safe development of the site in the interest of future occupiers, and to prevent any adverse risk.

5. Prior to the commencement of any development, a surface water drainage scheme, based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) with evidence of an assessment of the site conditions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

   The surface water drainage scheme must be in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacement national standards and unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no surface water shall discharge to the public sewerage system either directly or indirectly.

   Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution. This condition is imposed in light of policies within the National Planning Policy Framework.

   Reason for pre-commencement condition: This application proposes to develop the site. This condition would ensure appropriate drainage of the site in the interest of future occupiers.

6. The six additional car parking spaces indicated on drawing no. HH01/0218/03 shall be marked out in accordance with the details shown before the extension hereby approved is first occupied, and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure that the care home is served by adequate off-road parking facilities following its enlargement in the interests of highway safety in accordance with the requirements of Policy T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. Before the extension hereby approved is first occupied, the realigned access drive indicated on drawing no. HH01/0218/03 shall be constructed in accordance with a specification which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The duly constructed access drive shall be retained as such thereafter.

   Reason: In order to facilitate safe and convenient access for vehicle traffic at the site and to ensure that the access drive is constructed to an appropriate standard in accordance with the requirements of Policy T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. Prior to first occupation the applicant shall set out a visibility splay of 43m x 2.4m at the site access. This Visibility Splay shall be free of visual obstruction and retained thereafter.

   Reason – In order to facilitate safe and convenient access for vehicle traffic at the site and to ensure that the access drive is constructed to an appropriate standard in accordance with the requirements of Policy T2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. No site preparation, delivery of materials or construction works, other than quiet internal building operations such as plastering and electrical installation, shall take place other than between 08:00 hours and 18:00 hours Monday-Friday and between 08:00 hours and 13:00 on Saturdays.

   Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of occupiers of surrounding properties during the course of construction of the development and to limit the potential for unacceptable noise and disturbance at unsocial hours in accordance with the requirements of Policies DM1, P3 and G9 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems, at least to the exit point(s) from the site. The drainage connection details shall be approved by United Utilities.

    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.

Procedure Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

Notes for Applicant:

Report Author Kirsty Nicholls