

APPLICATION REPORT – OUT/355495/25
Planning Committee – 21st October 2026

Registration Date: 23rd December 2025
Ward: Royton South

Application Reference: OUT/355495/25
Type of Application: Outline

Proposal: Residential development for up to 37 affordable dwellings with access considered (all other matters reserved).

Location: Land To the Rear Of 69 Broadway, Royton, OL2 5DD

Case Officer: Sophie Leech
Applicant: Oakmere Homes Ltd
Agent: Mr Gareth Salthouse – Emery Planning

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is referred to Planning Committee for determination as the application constitutes Major Development of 20 or more residential units.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 It is recommended that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in this report, and that the Assistant Director Planning & Development shall be authorised to issue the decision.
- 2.2 The application is recommended for approval, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement securing:
- 100% affordable housing provision;
 - Highway improvement works;
 - Biodiversity Net Gain habitat management plan;
 - Public open space provision; and
 - Off-site tree planting.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

- 3.1 The application site comprises a parcel of undeveloped land located to the rear of No. 69 Broadway, Royton. The site is bounded by established residential development to the north, south and east. To the north, the site adjoins bungalow development on Savoy Drive. To the south, residential properties are located on Grosvenor Way, Westbury Way, Mayfair Drive and Strand Way, which predominantly comprise bungalow development. Immediately to the south of No. 69 Broadway is a small terrace of two-storey dwellings known as Palace Gardens.
- 3.2 To the west of the site lies the A663 Broadway, a principal strategic highway subject to a 40mph speed limit.

- 3.3 The topography of the site is generally flat and low-lying and the site is identified on the Local Plan Proposals Map as forming part of a Green Corridor and Link. In addition, the site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3, indicating that parts of the land are subject to varying levels of flood risk. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, with the A663 forming a significant physical boundary along the site's western edge.

4. THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The proposal is for the erection of up to 37 no. affordable dwellings (Use Class C3), together with associated infrastructure such as an access road, turning points and green infrastructure. 100% of the proposed dwellings will be provided as affordable houses and managed by a Registered Provider (RP). This outline application is for consideration of the principal of the proposed development and access only. All other detailed matters such as appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved and would be subject to a reserved matters application in the future.
- 4.2 Notwithstanding this, the indicative plans provided with the application propose that the houses would be laid out in linear format to reflect the nature of the site and the character of the built form in the surrounding area. The scheme would include areas of open space and landscape enhancements.
- 4.3 The scale, appearance and layout of the individual dwellings would be reserved for future approval. However, the applicant has indicated that the scheme is likely to comprise a mix of predominately 2-2.5-storey detached and semi-detached family dwellings and the mix would be 3-bedroom and 4-bedroom with each dwelling benefiting from driveways and private gardens.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

- 5.1 None

6. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

- 6.1 The adopted Development Plan for Oldham consists of several documents, most notably the Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (known as the Local Plan) and the Places for Everyone (PfE) Joint Plan which was adopted in March 2024.
- 6.2 The following policies are considered relevant to the determination of this application:

Oldham Local Plan policies:

- Policy 1 - Climate Change and Sustainable Development;
- Policy 3 - An Address of Choice;
- Policy 9 - Local Environment;
- Policy 11 - Housing;
- Policy 19 - Water and Flooding;
- Policy 21 - Natural Environmental Assets;
- Policy 23 - Open Spaces and Sport.

Places for Everyone policies:

- JP-S1 - Sustainable Development;
- JP-S2 - Carbon and Energy;
- JP-S4 - Flood Risk and Water Environment;
- 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-P1 - Sustainable Places;
- JP-G7 - Trees and Woodland
- JP-G8 - A Net Gain to Biodiversity and Geodiversity;
- JP-C8 - Transport Requirements for New Development;
- JP-D2 - Developer Contributions.

National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026)

7. CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTEE	FORMAL RESPONSE
Environmental Health	Formal response received. No objections to the proposal. Conditions required for Construction Management Plan, landfill gas and ground contamination.
Highways	Formal response received. No objections, subject to details as listed in the conditions.
Drainage / LLFA	Formal response received. No objections, subject to conditions required as detailed in consultation response.
Environment Agency	Formal response received. No objections to the proposal, subject to conditions provided within the consultation response relating to drainage plans.
Canal & Rivers Trust	Formal response received. No comments to make on the proposal.
United Utilities	Formal response received. Objection on basis of no information on connection to their asset, however, recommends a condition if approval of application is made relating to details of drainage/connection to their asset.
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	Formal response received. No objections to submitted ecological or biodiversity information. Conditions required for HMMP, BNG off site contributions and bat/bird boxes.
Arboricultural Officer	Formal response received. No objections to additional trees being removed, however the 2:1 tree replacement needs to be confirmed and the split between onsite and offsite confirmed.

Transport for Greater Manchester	Formal response received. No objections, subject to comments relating to crash data and recommendation that speed limit is reduced from 40mph to 30mph.
National Highways	Formal response received. No objections.
Planning Policy	Formal response received. No objections, subject to public open space contribution for existing or new provision within the borough.

8. PUBLICITY AND THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

- 8.1 In accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, the application has been advertised by neighbour notification letters.
- 8.2 In response, at the time of writing this report, 38 objections have been received along with 2 letters of support.
- 8.3 It is also noted that multiple objectors have submitted a significant number of comments during the determination of the application using the same addresses so the system counts this as 1 objection, although all comments are considered.
- 8.4 The objections received raise the following principal concerns:

Principle of Development and Policy Conflict

- The site is allocated as a Green Corridor and Link within the adopted Local Plan.
- Development is considered contrary to the purpose of this designation.
- Concerns that the site should remain undeveloped as open land and wildlife habitat.

Loss of Green Infrastructure, Open Space and Landscape Character

- Loss of an undeveloped green area between Royton and Chadderton.
- Harm to the character, openness and visual appearance of the area.
- Loss of a wildlife corridor and green infrastructure network.
- Concerns regarding urbanisation of the site.

Ecology and Biodiversity

- Concerns regarding bats, birds, deer, foxes, newts and other wildlife.
- Loss of habitat resulting from site clearance.
- Concerns regarding ecological surveys and Biodiversity Net Gain.
- Requests for additional biodiversity enhancements, including swift bricks.

Flood Risk, Drainage and Culvert Infrastructure

- Parts of the site are within or adjacent to Flood Zones 2 and 3.
- Concerns regarding surface water flooding and increased runoff.
- Presence of a culverted watercourse beneath the site.

- Questions regarding the location, condition, capacity and maintenance of the culvert.
- Concerns regarding climate change impacts and future flood resilience.
- Concerns that development could increase flood risk on and off site.

Land Contamination, Landfill and Ground Stability

- Concerns that the site comprises historic made ground and former landfill.
- Alleged demolition waste and asbestos-containing materials on site.
- Concerns regarding ground gases.
- Concerns about subsidence, settlement and foundation requirements.
- Concerns on lack of survey information submitted.
- Concerns regarding implications for future residents and construction workers.

Highway Safety, Access and Traffic Generation

- Objections to the proposed access from Broadway.
- Concerns regarding visibility and highway safety.
- Existing congestion on Broadway, particularly during school drop-off and pick-up periods.
- Impact of traffic associated with Oldham Athletic; retail uses and future Sports Town proposals.
- Increased vehicle movements and cumulative impacts on the local highway network.
- Concerns regarding pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access.
- Existing parking issues on Broadway and surrounding residential streets.
- Concerns regarding overspill parking associated with the development.
- Existing problems associated with school-related parking.

Character, Appearance and Density

- Concerns that the proposed development would be out of character with existing surrounding bungalow development.
- Objections to the potential for two and three-storey dwellings.
- Arguments that building heights should be limited to bungalows or dormer bungalows.
- Concerns that the scale and density of development would represent over development.

Residential Amenity

- Loss of privacy through overlooking.
- Loss of light and overshadowing.
- Overbearing impact on neighbouring bungalows.
- Increased noise and disturbance from future residents.
- Loss of outlook and openness.
- Requirement for bungalow development.

Construction Impacts

- Construction traffic.
- Noise, dust and vibration.
- Potential impacts arising from piling and ground engineering works.
- Potential damage to neighbouring properties.

Infrastructure Capacity

- Concerns regarding capacity of local schools, GP surgeries, dentists and other community facilities.
- Concerns regarding utility infrastructure including drainage, water supply and electricity.

Support received:

The two letters of support state that:

- Additional housing is required in the Borough.
- The site is currently underutilised.
- The ecological value of the site is limited.
- Traffic impacts have been overstated.
- Technical matters such as flooding, contamination and drainage can be addressed through planning conditions and further investigation.
- The development would make an efficient use of land.
- The development would bring investment into the area.

8.5 Matters raised above will be covered in subsequent sections of this report.

ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSAL

9. PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

- 9.1 The application seeks approval for development of an existing parcel of undeveloped land for residential development.
- 9.2 The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (August 2026) contains a suite of National Decision-Making Policies (NDMPs) which form a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Central to these policies is the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which seeks to support development proposals that accord with the Development Plan and the relevant NDMPs.
- 9.3 Policy S3 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development) establishes that planning permission should be granted without delay where proposals comply with both the Development Plan and the decision-making policies of the Framework.
- 9.4 Section 1a of Policy S3 states that Policy S4 in the Framework should be applied when considering development proposals within settlements. Policy S4 (Principle of development within settlements) 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 this Framework.
- 9.5 In applying Policy S4, the circumstances in which the benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include (but are not restricted to) situations where the development proposal would:
- a. Have a substantial adverse impact in relation to:

- i) The allocation or safeguarding of land or buildings for particular uses in the development plan, unless there is no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the allocated use, or there is evidence that the safeguarding is no longer appropriate; or
 - ii) The application of the policies in this Framework for existing recreational land and facilities (HC7), Local Green Space (HC8), areas of particular importance for biodiversity and geodiversity (N6), Protected Landscapes (N4) and development within residential curtilages (L2(1)(d)).
- b. Involve the whole or partial loss of undeveloped land which is used for a cemetery or burial ground; or for water storage and/or flood risk management (unless suitable compensatory provision is made that does not increase the risk of flooding either on or off-site); or
 - c. Fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.

LOSS OF GREEN CORRIDOR AND LINK

- 9.6 The proposed development site is designated as Green Corridor and Link – Long Clough Broadway, Royton – within the council's current adopted Local Plan.
- 9.7 Long Clough Green Corridor has previously featured in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Assessments as land not suitable for development due to its private ownership, i.e., the site was never previously proposed for development by the owner, and so was presumed as unavailable for development.
- 9.8 The site is not within the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and does not have any recreational routes or Public Rights of Way passing through the site. The Local Plan paragraph 6.134 states "Development proposals on sites affecting green corridors and links, including recreational routes, will be permitted where they do not dissect the open land corridor into sections or harm the potential for wildlife or people's access and enjoyment of the corridor."
- 9.9 It is noted that the site's Green Corridor designation has been subject to scrutiny through the development plan process. During the inquiry into the Unitary Development Plan in 2005, the Local Plan Inspector recommended that the site be allocated for housing and concluded that there was insufficient justification for its inclusion within the Green Corridor network. Whilst the Council ultimately chose not to accept that recommendation and retained the designation, at that time there was no identified need to release additional land for housing development.
- 9.10 The circumstances that informed that decision have changed significantly over the intervening 20 years. National and local planning policy now place substantial weight on boosting the supply of housing, including affordable housing, and the need for additional housing delivery is considerably greater than at the time the UDP was adopted.
- 9.11 Furthermore, the Inspector's conclusions regarding the limited Green Corridor value of the site remain relevant. The site is physically separated from other areas of open land by Broadway, a major highway corridor, which limits its function as a continuous ecological and recreational link. Whilst the development would result in the loss of a

section of designated Green Corridor, the extent to which the site contributes towards the wider objectives of the designation is limited.

- 9.12 Consequently, significant weight is afforded to the delivery of 37 affordable dwellings on a sustainable site within the urban area, together with the substantial social benefits arising from addressing identified housing needs. When considered alongside the site's limited Green Corridor function and the historic conclusions of the UDP Inspector, it is considered that the material considerations in favour of the development outweigh the conflict with Policy 6 and that a departure from the development plan is justified in this instance.
- 9.13 In addition, the site is privately owned and has remained in private ownership throughout the lifetime of the adopted Local Plan since its adoption in 2011. Consequently, it has not functioned as publicly accessible open space and does not provide a recreational resource for the wider community. The development would therefore not result in the loss of any publicly accessible amenity space or the severance of established public access routes.
- 9.14 The site is also not considered to perform a critical role within the wider green infrastructure network. Existing green infrastructure connections and ecological corridors within the surrounding area would remain available and functional, and the development would not result in the fragmentation of the wider network. As such, whilst there would be a loss of undeveloped land within the designated corridor, the proposal would not undermine the overall strategic function of the Green Corridor and Link designation.
- 9.15 In addition, the site's inclusion within the Green Corridor and Link designation is proposed to be removed through the emerging new Local Plan. Whilst only limited weight can be attributed to emerging policy at this stage, the new Local Plan is currently at examination and so the proposed change is a material consideration and reflects a recognition that the site's designation up until now no longer accurately reflects its ownership, function or contribution to the objectives of the green infrastructure network.
- 9.16 Ecological matters have been thoroughly assessed through the submission of appropriate survey work. The findings have been considered by Greater Manchester Ecology Unit, who have raised no objection to the principle of the development. The scheme incorporates ecological mitigation and enhancement measures and would ensure that biodiversity interests are appropriately safeguarded. Furthermore, the proposal includes areas of landscaping and green infrastructure which would contribute towards the environmental quality of the development and provide opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. Subject to the recommended mitigation and enhancement measures, the proposal is not considered to give rise to unacceptable ecological impacts.
- 9.17 The proposal would deliver 37 dwellings comprising 100% affordable housing, representing a significant public benefit. The provision of affordable housing directly responds to an identified and pressing housing need within the Borough and attracts substantial weight in favour of the development. The site is located in a sustainable location, with future residents having access to existing services, facilities, employment opportunities and public transport, reducing the need to travel by private car and supporting sustainable patterns of development.
- 9.18 Overall, some conflict with Policy 6 is acknowledged insofar as development is proposed on land currently designated as a Green Corridor and Link. However, the site makes a limited contribution to the amenity, recreational and strategic connectivity

functions that the designation seeks to protect, owing to its long-standing private ownership, lack of public accessibility and limited role within the wider green infrastructure network. The absence of objection from the Council's Ecology Unit, the proposed ecological mitigation and enhancement measures, the retention and provision of landscaping and green infrastructure within the scheme, and the proposed removal of the designation through the emerging Local Plan all serve to substantially reduce the weight that should be attributed to the policy conflict.

- 9.19 When balanced against these considerations, the delivery of 37 affordable homes in a sustainable location constitutes a significant social and economic benefit. It is therefore considered that the limited harm arising from the loss of part of the designated Green Corridor and Link is clearly outweighed by the substantial public benefits of the proposal. The development is therefore considered acceptable when assessed against the development plan as a whole and the wider objectives of sustainable development.

10. ACCESS & HIGHWAY SAFETY

- 10.1 Policy 9 of the Oldham Local Plan seeks to ensure that development has an acceptable impact on highway safety and pollution. Policy JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Development) of the PfE Joint Plan requires development to be located and designed to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use, reduce reliance on the private car and support the creation of sustainable communities. Similarly, Policy TR3: Locating development in sustainable locations of the NPPF (2026) promotes development in sustainable locations that are well connected to existing transport infrastructure, provide genuine travel choices and avoid unacceptable impacts on highway safety and network capacity.
- 10.2 This application is submitted in outline with only the means of access for consideration at this stage. All other detailed matters, namely appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, are reserved for subsequent approval. As such, the application seeks to establish the principle of residential development on the site together with the acceptability of the proposed access arrangements onto Broadway. Detailed matters relating to the layout and design of the development, including the internal road network, parking provision, landscaping and other site-specific details, would be considered through a future reserved matters application.
- 10.3 The Local Highways Authority has reviewed the proposals and raises no objection in principle, subject to planning conditions and a Section 106 contribution. The site occupies a sustainable location within the urban area, with access to public transport services and a range of local amenities, schools, employment opportunities and community facilities within reasonable walking and cycling distance. The proposed vehicular access would be taken from the A663 Broadway, a principal route through the borough which serves surrounding residential areas and key destinations, including a large secondary school and the Oldham Athletic football stadium.
- 10.4 The Highways Authority advises that satisfactory visibility can be achieved in both directions from the proposed access and notes that there is an acceptable highway safety record along this section of Broadway. Whilst Broadway experiences relatively high traffic volumes, the Highways Authority is satisfied that the access can be accommodated safely. To further support the safe operation of the highway network, a reduction in the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph in the vicinity of the site is recommended, secured through a Section 106 contribution of £8,000 to fund the necessary Traffic Regulation Order, road markings and signage.

- 10.5 Given that only access is under consideration, the illustrative internal layout submitted is not for approval. All highway design matters internal to the site, including gradients, visibility splays, servicing arrangements, parking provision, cycle storage and highway drainage, can be appropriately addressed at the reserved matters stage through planning conditions.

Transport for Greater Manchester Comments

- 10.6 TfGM Highways have reviewed the Transport Statement (TS) and have the following comments:

The analysis of the accident data indicates that there are no clusters of incidents within the study area. One fatal incident has occurred in the 5-year study period, with no other incidents documented. The fatal incident occurred approximately 100m to the west of the site at the junction of Broadway/Hilbre Avenue. TfGM would suggest that if consent is granted, the speed limit on Broadway is reduced to 30mph beyond the junction with Hilbre Avenue. The road is currently 40mph but turns to 30mph speed limit approximately 100m east of the site. With the addition of the new development access, 3 priority junctions would exist within a 200m distance along the 40mph speed limit road of Broadway. Reducing this speed to 30mph will provide a safer environment for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians.

- 10.7 Overall, the proposal would deliver 100% affordable housing in a sustainable and accessible location, making effective use of existing transport infrastructure and providing future residents with realistic opportunities to travel by walking, cycling and public transport. The Local Highways Authority is satisfied that suitable access can be achieved and raises no objection to the principle of the development. Subject to the recommended conditions and planning obligations, the development is considered to accord with Policy 9 of the Oldham Local Plan, Policy JP-C8 of the Places for Everyone Plan and Policy TR3 of the NPPF (2026) and would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the operation of the local highway network.

11. DRAINAGE AND FLOOD RISK

- 11.1 Policy 19 (Water and Flooding) of the Local Plan states that the council will ensure development does not result in unacceptable flood risk or drainage problems by directing development away from areas at risk of flooding, and protecting and improving existing flood defences, water resources and quality, and that development proposals must carry out and pass the Sequential Test and, where necessary, the Exception Test, and be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment.
- 11.2 Policy JP-S4 (Flood Risk and the Water Environment) of PfE requires designing development so as to minimise the impacts of current and future flood risk, including retrofitting or relocating existing developments, infrastructure and places to increase resilience to flooding and expects developments to manage surface water run-off through sustainable drainage systems and as close to source as possible.
- 11.3 Policy F2: Planning for effective flood risk management of the NPPF (2026) states that:

Development plans should take a risk-based approach when identifying suitable locations for development, taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change. They should do this, and manage any residual risk, by:

- a. *Applying the sequential test in policy F5 and, where relevant, policy F6;*
 - b. *Safeguarding land that is, or is likely to be, required for current or future flood management;*
 - c. *Using opportunities provided by new development and improvements in green and other infrastructure to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding (making as much use as possible of natural flood management techniques as part of an integrated approach to flood risk management); and*
 - d. *Where climate change is expected to increase flood risk so that some existing development may not be sustainable in the long-term, seeking opportunities to relocate development, including housing, to more sustainable locations.*
- 11.4 Policy F5: The sequential test of the NPPF (2026) states the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Where the test applies, development proposals should not be located in areas at risk of flooding where alternative sites, appropriate for the development, are reasonably available in areas with a lower risk of flooding.
- 11.5 Policy F6: Development in areas at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea of the NPPF (2026) states in areas falling within flood zones 2, 3a, or 3b (as defined in Annex F, table 1):
- a. *Development proposals should be refused if the use is incompatible with the risk from river or sea flooding, as set out in Annex F, table 3; and*
 - b. *In certain other circumstances set out in Annex F, table 3, in addition to satisfying the sequential test in policy F5 where applicable, development will only be appropriate where an 'exception test' is satisfied. The exception test involves demonstrating that the development would meet all the following criteria:*
 - i. *Provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk;*
 - ii. *Be safe for its anticipated lifetime in accordance with policy F7; and*
 - iii. *Not increase flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, reduce flood risk overall.*
- 11.6 Based on table 3 in Annex F of the NPPF, this development site would not need to satisfy an Exception Test.

Sequential Test

- 11.7 A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (FRA), prepared by Thomas Consulting, has been submitted with the planning application. The site was identified by the Environment Agency as Flood Zone 1 up until early 2025 when it was changed such that part of the site is now shown as Flood Zone 2. An area in Flood Zone 3a lies directly to the east of the site, associated with the adjacent pond.
- 11.8 As part of the site sits within Flood Zone 2, in accordance with Policy 19, JP-S4 and NPPF Section 18 (Managing flood risk and coastal change) the applicant has carried out a sequential test. The Sequential Test covers 11 wards in the east, west, north and

central area, in accordance with advice given by the Council. These areas were chosen as they are closest to the site and provide existing land outside the Green Belt.

11.9 The Sequential Test is intended to steer development to areas at the lowest risk of flooding. Where a site is located in an area at risk of flooding, the applicant must demonstrate that there are no reasonably available alternative sites in areas of lower flood risk that could accommodate the proposed development.

11.10 To be considered sequentially preferable, a site should be suitable, available and viable and must be at a lower level of flood risk. Given that the Environment Agency (EA) maps show part of the site falls within Flood Zone 2, the Sequential Test for the purposes of Policy 19, JP-S4 and Section 18 of the NPPF has been undertaken. However, through the FRA, it is established that the site is at low risk of fluvial flooding (i.e. Flood Zone 1) when taking into account site-specific considerations.

11.11 Furthermore, when referring to sequential tests, NPPF policy F5 states:

2. The sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, other than for: ...

b. Sites where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates clearly that:

i. No built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future (having regard to potential changes in flood risk)

11.12 The applicant's Flood Risk Assessment, and further investigation during the course of the application, has demonstrated that the risk of flooding on this site is low. The comments of the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority support this position, and they have no objections to the development proposal subject to the imposition of certain conditions on any permission to be granted.

11.13 In addition, this application is an outline planning application, with details of layout to still be determined in a subsequent reserved matters planning application. As such, it is sufficient for this outline application to be able to demonstrate that residential development can take place on the site without involving built development or potentially vulnerable elements of the development in the area of the site most at-risk of flooding (i.e. adjacent to the pond that lies to the east of the site).

11.14 Based on the indicative layout provided to support this application, this would appear to be the case. However, it would be for the subsequent reserved matters application to provide the necessary information to ensure that what is being developed adjacent to the pond to the east of the site would not be a vulnerable use and would not be impacted by any potential for flooding in the future.

Culvert and Ordinary Watercourse Considerations

11.15 Concerns were raised through objections regarding whether the applicant had excavated and investigated the correct location and depth of the culverted watercourse. In response, the applicant confirmed that site investigations had been undertaken across the full width of the site upstream of Manhole 10 at the appropriate invert levels. These investigations found no evidence of a watercourse passing through the site from upstream. In addition, survey work was undertaken beyond the site boundary, including the lifting of manholes and visual inspections upstream, which

similarly identified no evidence of a watercourse. On this basis, the submitted information is considered sufficient to demonstrate the likely route and extent of the culverted watercourse, and no evidence has been identified to indicate that it extends through the development site as previously suggested.

- 11.16 Concerns were raised regarding the applicant's conclusion that the culverted watercourse is abandoned beyond the point identified on the submitted plans. In response, the applicant advised that a Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) survey was undertaken across the site, which did not identify any of the assumed culvert routes shown on Environment Agency or United Utilities mapping. This was supplemented by further site investigations undertaken following periods of prolonged and heavy rainfall, during which no evidence was identified of a watercourse flowing through the site upstream of Manhole 10. The investigations confirmed that the only connection entering Manhole 10 comprises a surface water drainage connection serving the adjacent residential development. The findings of the surveys and investigation work, therefore, indicate that there is no evidence of an active watercourse or culvert continuing through the site beyond the point identified by the applicant.
- 11.17 Concerns were raised regarding the condition and capacity of the culverted watercourse beneath Broadway, which is proposed to receive surface water discharge from the development. The applicant advises that this section of culvert lies outside the application site and that its condition will be fully assessed as part of the detailed drainage strategy required by condition. The submitted drainage strategy is intended to establish the principle of surface water discharge in accordance with local and national drainage policy, with detailed design matters to be secured through the planning process.
- 11.18 The applicant further notes that there is no evidence to suggest failure or collapse of the culvert within or adjacent to the site. No ground depressions have been identified within the site which might indicate structural failure, nor is there evidence of significant volumes of standing water upstream that would suggest a blockage within the culvert system. Subject to the submission and approval of the detailed drainage strategy and associated investigations, it is considered that the matter can be satisfactorily addressed through planning conditions.

Climate Change and Future Flood Resilience

- 11.19 In relation to climate change resilience, the submitted Drainage Strategy incorporates appropriate climate change allowances in the hydraulic modelling and design of the proposed surface water drainage system. The strategy demonstrates that the drainage network has been designed to accommodate the 1 in 30-year rainfall event plus a 40% climate change allowance and the 1 in 100-year rainfall event plus a 45% climate change allowance. The Lead Local Flood Authority has reviewed the submitted information and raised no objection to the development in principle, subject to conditions requiring the submission of a detailed drainage scheme. It is therefore considered that appropriate regard has been given to the potential impacts of climate change on flood risk and surface water management.
- 11.20 Concerns were raised regarding encrustation identified within sections of the culvert network and the potential implications for the section of culvert beneath Broadway, particularly in relation to its ability to accommodate additional surface water flows and the potential consequences of structural failure. The applicant advises that the condition and capacity of the culvert beneath Broadway will be assessed as part of the detailed drainage strategy, as this is a requirement from the LLFA and will form part of a planning condition.

- 11.21 The applicant further notes that the culvert passes beneath an adopted highway and, as such, it would be expected that appropriate inspection, monitoring and maintenance regimes are undertaken by the relevant highway authority to identify and address any deterioration or structural issues. In addition, the culvert was reportedly inspected as part of the arrangements associated with the approval of surface water discharge from the adjacent David Wilson Homes development.
- 11.22 Detailed assessment of the culvert's condition, capacity and any necessary remedial measures will form part of the detailed drainage submissions required by condition and will be subject to review by the Lead Local Flood Authority. The LLFA has reviewed the information submitted with the application and raises no objection to the development in principle, subject to the recommended drainage conditions. Consequently, it is considered that this matter can be satisfactorily addressed through the planning process and does not warrant the refusal of planning permission.
- 11.23 Concerns were raised as to whether new drainage infrastructure associated with adjacent residential development may have been installed across the application site and subsequently connected into the historic culvert, potentially leaving parts of the original culvert network still operational elsewhere within the site.
- 11.24 In response, the applicant advises that there is no evidence to indicate that new pipes have been laid across the site. Based on the available information and historic records, it is understood that the existing culvert was originally constructed to convey surface water from the former mill. Following demolition of the mill, the adjacent residential development connected into the existing drainage system for the disposal of surface water, an arrangement that was agreed with United Utilities. The investigations undertaken by the applicant have identified no evidence to suggest that the historic culvert remains operational elsewhere within the site or that additional, unrecorded drainage infrastructure exists within the application site.
- 11.25 The submitted information has been reviewed by the Lead Local Flood Authority, which raises no objection to the development in principle, subject to conditions requiring further drainage investigations and the submission of a detailed drainage strategy. It is therefore considered that this matter can be satisfactorily addressed through the recommended planning conditions.

Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) comments

- 11.26 The Council's Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and drainage information and raise no objections to the proposal in principle. Following the removal of the Environment Agency's objection, the LLFA is satisfied that the development can proceed subject to the imposition of appropriately worded planning conditions.
- 11.27 Whilst the LLFA has raised concerns regarding the existing Main River infrastructure, principally the unresolved hydraulic interaction between the Main River network and the Monarch Angling Pond, it is satisfied that the applicant has undertaken appropriate investigations to support the outline planning application in relation to flood risk and drainage.
- 11.28 The submitted masterplan and outline drainage strategy demonstrate that no built development or other vulnerable elements of the proposed scheme would be located within areas currently identified as being at risk of flooding, including Flood Zone 2. The LLFA also notes that the existing drainage network beyond the application site

boundary is in poor condition and contributes to the current constraints associated with blockages and surcharging.

- 11.29 The LLFA considers that the outstanding matters can be addressed through appropriately worded planning conditions. These conditions will secure further investigation of the below-ground drainage network and establish the extent, if any, of flood risk associated with the existing infrastructure. Accordingly, the LLFA raises no objection to the proposed development and has recommended a series of planning conditions to be imposed should planning permission be granted.

Environment Agency comments

- 11.30 The Environment Agency has been consulted on the application and raises no objection to the proposed development subject to the imposition of a planning condition requiring compliance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (Ref. TC-FRA-LV0130-25-01 Rev01 dated 12 December 2025) and associated mitigation measures.
- 11.31 Subject to their recommended conditions, the Environment Agency is satisfied that the development can be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Given the absence of any objection from the statutory consultee and the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, it is considered that the proposal accords with the flood risk objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant local planning policies. Consequently, flood risk does not provide a reason to withhold planning permission in this instance.

United Utilities comments

- 11.32 However, it is acknowledged that this application is submitted in outline form with only access for consideration at this stage, with all other matters reserved for future approval.
- 11.33 In recognition of the outline nature of the proposal, United Utilities have confirmed that their concerns can be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of appropriately worded planning conditions requiring the submission and approval of detailed foul and surface water drainage schemes at the reserved matters stage. The Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency have similarly recommended conditions relating to flood risk, drainage infrastructure and sustainable drainage measures.
- 11.34 These conditions will ensure that a comprehensive drainage strategy is prepared and agreed prior to the commencement of development, demonstrating that foul and surface water can be managed safely, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and in accordance with the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (2025). Subject to the recommended conditions, it is considered that drainage, flood risk and wastewater disposal matters can be satisfactorily addressed and do not weigh against the proposal.

12. LAND CONTAMINATION AND GROUND CONDITIONS

- 12.1 A significant number of representations raise concerns regarding the condition of the land. The site is located within 250m of a former landfill site and is identified as Radon Class 1 (lowest classification for radon gas). Objectors have raised concerns that the site may contain former landfill deposits, demolition waste and asbestos-containing materials, together with concerns relating to ground gases, land stability, subsidence, potential risks to human health and the environment, and the level of information

submitted in support of the application. These concerns are acknowledged and have been carefully considered as part of the assessment of the proposal.

- 12.2 The Council's Contaminated Land Officer has reviewed the submitted Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study Report and raises no objection to the current report findings. The report identifies historical land uses including woodland and a refuse heap within the north-eastern corner of the site during the 1950s, together with the subsequent culverting of Long Clough. The study also identifies the potential presence of made ground and recommends a programme of intrusive site investigation and ground gas monitoring.
- 12.3 In addition, the Officer has confirmed that the submitted Phase 1 assessment is acceptable at this stage and provides an appropriate preliminary assessment of potential contamination risks. However, given the site's history and the potential presence of made ground, former landfill deposits and the culvert beneath the site, a detailed Phase 2 site investigation, including ground contamination and ground gas assessment, will be required by planning condition should permission be granted.
- 12.4 The Environment Agency has similarly reviewed the proposals and advises that the site's historic land uses may present contamination risks which could affect human health, controlled waters, groundwater and surface water environments if not appropriately investigated and remediated. The Environment Agency has confirmed that the development would be acceptable subject to the imposition of planning conditions requiring a detailed land contamination management strategy, investigation of any unsuspected contamination encountered during development, and appropriate remediation and validation measures where necessary.
- 12.5 Several objectors have specifically requested that a Phase 2A investigation be undertaken prior to determination of the application. In response, Environmental Health officers have advised that the purpose of the submitted Phase 1 assessment is to identify potential contamination risks and determine whether further investigation is required. The submitted report has fulfilled that purpose and concludes that a Phase 2 intrusive investigation should be carried out should planning permission be granted. Environmental Health officers concur with this approach and advise that any planning permission would be subject to conditions requiring detailed site investigations, remediation measures where necessary, and validation reporting to demonstrate that the site is suitable for its intended use and does not pose unacceptable risks to future occupants, nearby residents, controlled waters or the wider environment.
- 12.6 Having regard to the advice received from the Council's Contaminated Land Officer and the Environment Agency, it is considered that the submitted Phase 1 assessment provides sufficient information to determine the outline application. The potential contamination risks identified can be appropriately addressed through the imposition of planning conditions requiring further site investigation, remediation and verification works prior to development proceeding.
- 12.7 Lastly, the Council does not hold a Phase 2A Contaminated Land Register, as referred to in some objections. Environmental Health Officers have advised that the planning process provides an appropriate mechanism for investigating and addressing potential contamination issues by the use of planning conditions. Should planning permission be granted, a Phase 2 intrusive site investigation and any necessary remediation strategy would be required to ensure the site is suitable for its intended use. Environmental Health have further advised that, if planning permission is not granted and the site is not brought forward for development, the site would be considered separately under

the Council's contaminated land regime based on available evidence and prioritised accordingly.

13. ARBORICULTURE

- 13.1 A Tree Impact Assessment and Tree Constraints Plan have been submitted with the application. Policy JP-G7 requires the replacement of any trees lost as a result of development at a ratio of 2:1. The submitted Tree Impact Assessment and Tree Constraints Plan identify the removal of 31 individual trees, 14 groups of trees and 2 hedgerows to facilitate the proposed development. It is acknowledged that a number of trees were removed from the site prior to the submission of the application. Whilst this is regrettable, those works took place outside the scope of the current planning application and, as the trees were not subject to a Tree Preservation Order and were not located within a Conservation Area, their removal and replacement is not required and does not form part of the assessment of this proposal.
- 13.2 The Council's Arboricultural Officer has reviewed the submitted arboricultural information and raises no objection to the extent of tree and hedgerow loss identified within the submitted documents. At this stage, landscaping is a reserved matter and therefore the final layout, species selection and extent of replacement planting have not yet been determined. Consequently, it is not currently possible to accurately quantify the number of replacement trees that can be accommodated within the site or the extent of any off-site planting contribution that may be required to satisfy the requirements of Policy JP-G7.
- 13.3 Whilst initial discussions anticipated that replacement planting may need to be secured primarily through off-site contributions, the introduction of Policy N3 (Trees in New Development) within the revised NPPF places greater emphasis on the incorporation of tree planting within development sites, including the provision of tree-lined streets where appropriate. As a result, it is considered likely that a significant proportion of the required replacement planting can be accommodated on-site through the detailed landscaping scheme submitted at the Reserved Matters stage.
- 13.4 The Reserved Matters application for landscaping will therefore be required to demonstrate compliance with Policy JP-G7 through the provision of replacement tree planting at the requisite 2:1 ratio, identifying the extent of planting to be delivered on-site and, where necessary, any additional off-site planting or financial contribution required to achieve full policy compliance. Furthermore, Policy N3 provides for the long-term establishment and maintenance of newly planted trees, ensuring that replacement landscaping is not only delivered but appropriately managed and retained for the benefit of the development and wider area.
- 13.5 Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would result in an acceptable level of tree and hedgerow loss, considering the submitted arboricultural evidence and the absence of objection from the Council's Arboricultural Officer. Subject to the submission of a detailed landscaping scheme at Reserved Matters stage, together with appropriate planning conditions and obligations to secure replacement planting and its long-term management, the development is capable of achieving compliance with Policy JP-G7 and the requirements of NPPF Policy N3. Accordingly, no objection is raised on arboricultural or landscaping grounds at this outline stage.

14. ECOLOGY

- 14.1 The application has been supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) which concludes that the site provides some suitability for nesting birds, hedgehogs and amphibians. Objectors' representations also share photographs and videos of wildlife on site. The PEA report recommends the implementation of appropriate Reasonable Avoidance Measures during construction to ensure these species are protected from harm.
- 14.2 The assessment also identifies that the site contains habitat with potential suitability for badger foraging and sett creation. Whilst no badger setts were recorded within the application site during the survey work records indicate badger activity within neighbouring land to the south. Given the absence of any identified setts on site, the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) considers no further surveys or protected species licences are considered necessary at this stage.
- 14.3 GMEU raises no objection to the development in principle, subject to conditions requiring the submission and implementation of a Reasonable Avoidance Measures Method Statement covering badgers, nesting birds, hedgehogs and amphibians. In addition, a pre-commencement badger survey is recommended to be undertaken no more than three months prior to the commencement of development in order to identify any new evidence of badger activity or sett creation, reflecting the mobile nature of the species.
- 14.4 Subject to the recommended conditions, it is considered that the proposal would adequately safeguard protected and notable species and would not result in unacceptable ecological impacts. Consequently, the development is considered acceptable in ecological terms.

15. BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

- 15.1 Policy N2: Improving the natural environment of the NPPF (2026) requires development to contribute positively to the natural environment and support nature's recovery. It seeks opportunities for areas to be conserved and enhanced and seeks to minimise any adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs. Development proposals should incorporate integrated nest boxes (commonly known as swift bricks) into their construction unless there are compelling technical reasons which prevent their use or would make them ineffective.
- 15.2 In addition, the effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development may not begin unless a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and the planning authority has approved the plan.
- 15.3 GMEU has reviewed the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment and raises no objection to the findings as set out in the report. The applicant submitted a revised assessment on their request and GMEU confirm this assessment more accurately reflects the baseline ecological value of the site, including the condition of habitats prior to degradation and the presence of the culverted watercourse.
- 15.4 The assessment concludes that the development will require the purchase of both habitat units and watercourse units from an off-site provider to achieve the mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. GMEU advises that such units should be secured within the Oldham Local Planning Authority area or the Manchester Pennine Fringe National

Character Area in the first instance, before considering adjacent Local Planning Authority areas or National Character Areas where necessary.

- 15.5 Should planning permission be granted, the statutory Biodiversity Gain Condition would apply. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant would therefore be required to submit a Biodiversity Gain Plan demonstrating how a minimum 10% net gain will be achieved. This would include a final biodiversity metric calculation together with evidence that the required habitat and watercourse units have been secured and allocated to the development.
- 15.6 GMEU advises that the on-site habitat enhancements proposed as part of the scheme are considered significant and should be secured through a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) to ensure their long-term establishment, management and monitoring. This can be secured through either a planning condition or legal agreement.
- 15.7 In addition to meeting the statutory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements, the proposal provides opportunities for biodiversity enhancement on site. GMEU recommends the incorporation of features such as integrated bat and bird boxes within the proposed dwellings and the provision of gaps within boundary treatments to facilitate the movement of hedgehogs and maintain habitat connectivity across the site. These measures can be secured by planning condition.
- 15.8 Subject to compliance with the statutory Biodiversity Gain Condition and the recommended planning conditions securing habitat enhancement, management and monitoring measures, it is considered that the proposal would deliver a measurable biodiversity net gain and would accord with local and national planning policies relating to biodiversity conservation and enhancement.
- 15.9 As such, it is considered that the proposal complies with Local Plan Policy 21 and PFE Policy JP-G8.

16. ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY

- 16.1 Policy JP-S2 (Carbon and Energy) requires new development to promote the retrofitting of existing buildings with measures to improve energy efficiency and generate renewable and low carbon energy, heating and cooling. The policy states that development proposals should set out how this has been achieved in an energy statement in accordance with the energy hierarchy.
- 16.2 A condition will be included on the decision for this energy statement to be provided prior to occupation of the first apartment. This will ensure that the development has sought to maximise reductions in carbon emissions in line with relevant policy targets within the Greater Manchester Net Zero Guidance.

17. PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

- 17.1 The NPPF requires new residential development to provide high-quality, accessible open space that promotes health, wellbeing, and sustainable communities. Equally, Policy 23 (Open Space) states that “all residential developments should contribute towards the provision of new or enhanced open space, unless it can be demonstrated by the developer that it is not financially viable for the development proposal or that this is neither practicable nor desirable. The Council will have regard to the proposed development and the open space surpluses and deficiencies in the area to determine

whether on-site or off-site new provision, enhanced existing provision or a financial contribution will be required”.

- 17.2 To address the above, the proposed development would generate additional demand for open space and recreational facilities and, in accordance with Policy 23, is therefore required to contribute towards the provision or enhancement of such facilities.
- 17.3 The Council's Principal Greenspace and Cemeteries Manager has identified the existing play area at the junction of Broadway and Oldham Road, Royton, as an appropriate location for investment. Whilst this facility is located within Royton North rather than Royton South, it is in close proximity to the application site and is considered to serve future residents of the development. The requested contribution of £14,798.84 could be used towards improvements to the facility, including upgraded play equipment, the installation of outdoor gym equipment and/or improvements to safety surfacing.
- 17.4 Subject to the securing of this contribution through a Section 106 Agreement, the proposal would make an appropriate contribution towards enhancing existing open space provision within the locality and would accord with the requirements of Policy 23 of the Local Plan and the objectives of the NPPF in promoting healthy and sustainable communities.

18. OTHER MATTERS

18.1 *Construction Impacts*

- 18.2 Objectors raise concerns regarding the potential impacts arising during the construction phase of the development. These concerns include increased construction traffic on the local highway network, noise, dust and vibration associated with building works, potential impacts from piling and ground engineering operations, and the risk of damage to neighbouring properties. Construction-related impacts would be temporary in nature and can be managed through appropriate construction management and environmental controls where necessary.

18.3 *Infrastructure Capacity*

- 18.4 Concerns have been raised regarding the capacity of local infrastructure and community services, including GP surgeries, dentists, schools and other public facilities. Whilst these concerns are noted, there is no specific requirement within either local or national planning policy for residential developments of this nature to provide additional GP or dental facilities. The provision, funding and operation of healthcare services are matters for the relevant healthcare providers and national and local government bodies.

- 18.5 With regard to other infrastructure, including drainage, water supply and electricity networks, the relevant statutory consultees and utility providers have been consulted as part of the application process. Subject to the recommended planning conditions and any necessary connections or upgrades secured through separate statutory regimes, there is no evidence to demonstrate that the development would result in unacceptable impacts on infrastructure capacity. Accordingly, these matters do not weigh against the proposal.

18.6 *Bungalow Development*

- 18.7 Several representations have requested that any development on the site be restricted to bungalows only, citing the predominance of bungalow development within the surrounding area. Whilst these comments are noted, the current application is submitted in outline form with access as the only matter for consideration. Matters relating to the scale, appearance, layout and design of the development are reserved for future determination through a Reserved Matters application.
- 18.8 As such, the Council is not in a position at this stage to assess the detailed form, height or appearance of the proposed dwellings, nor is it considered reasonable or necessary to impose a condition requiring bungalow development only. The acceptability of the proposed building types, heights and their relationship with neighbouring properties and the character of the surrounding area will be fully assessed at the Reserved Matters stage when detailed plans are submitted. Consequently, this issue is not material to the determination of the current access-only outline application.

19. CONCLUSION

- 19.1 The application seeks outline planning permission for the development of the site for residential purposes, with access to be determined at this stage and all other matters reserved for subsequent approval.
- 19.2 The proposal would deliver 37 dwellings, all of which would be provided as affordable housing. The provision of affordable homes attracts substantial weight in favour of the development, particularly having regard to the identified and ongoing need for affordable housing within the Borough. The site is located within the urban area and in a sustainable location, with convenient access to public transport, local services, schools, employment opportunities and community facilities.
- 19.3 The proposal does involve development on land currently designated as a Green Corridor and Link under Policy 6 of the Oldham Local Plan and the resulting loss of a section of undeveloped land is acknowledged. However, for the reasons set out within this report, the site makes a limited contribution to the wider objectives of the designation. The site is privately owned, not publicly accessible and performs a restricted recreational and ecological connectivity function. Furthermore, the Council's Ecology advisers raise no objection to the proposal, appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures can be secured, and the site's designation is proposed to be removed through the emerging Local Plan. Whilst conflict with Policy 6 is identified, the degree of harm arising from that conflict is considered limited.
- 19.4 The proposal has been subject to detailed technical assessment by the Council's consultees, the Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority, United Utilities, Greater Manchester Ecology Unit, the Local Highway Authority and the Council's Arboricultural and Contaminated Land Officers. No significant objections have been raised by these consultees that would justify refusal of the application. Where further information or mitigation is required, these matters can be appropriately secured through planning conditions and legal obligations.
- 19.5 In relation to flood risk and drainage, extensive investigation has been undertaken during the course of the application. The Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority are satisfied that the principle of residential development is acceptable, subject to conditions requiring further drainage investigations, culvert assessments, detailed drainage design and flood mitigation measures. It has been demonstrated that residential development can be accommodated without locating vulnerable development within areas at highest risk of flooding.

- 19.6 Highway considerations have also been assessed, and it has been demonstrated that safe and suitable access can be achieved from Broadway. Subject to the recommended Section 106 contribution and planning conditions, the development would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the operation of the highway network.
- 19.7 Matters relating to contamination, ecology, biodiversity net gain, arboriculture, drainage, landscaping and sustainability can all be satisfactorily addressed through the recommended planning conditions and a Reserved Matters submission. The proposal is therefore capable of delivering a high-quality residential development that accords with the relevant requirements of national and local planning policy.
- 19.8 In accordance with Policy S4 of the NPPF (2026), development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by adverse effects. Having carefully considered all representations received, the technical evidence submitted, the consultation responses and the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and National Decision-Making Policies, it is concluded that the adverse effects associated with the development are limited and do not substantially outweigh the significant benefits arising from the delivery of 37 affordable homes in a sustainable location.
- 19.9 Overall, whilst the proposal represents a departure from Policy 6 of the Oldham Local Plan due to the loss of part of a designated Green Corridor and Link, material considerations indicate that an exception is justified in this case. The significant public benefits associated with delivering 100% affordable housing, together with the absence of technical objections and the ability to adequately mitigate identified impacts through conditions and planning obligations, outweigh the identified policy conflict.
- 19.10 It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with the Development Plan when read as a whole, together with the relevant National Decision-Making Policies contained within the NPPF (2026), and planning permission should be granted subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement and the conditions set out below.

20. CONDITIONS

1. All applications for reserved matters must be made within three years of the date of this decision notice and development must be commenced before the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved. REASON: In accordance with Section 92 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. Before any phase of the development hereby granted outline permission is commenced, approval shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority with respect to the reserved matters for: appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. REASON: In order to ensure the development is satisfactory and that details of all outstanding matters are submitted, in accordance with Section 92 (as amended) of the Town and Country Act 1990. The details are required prior to the commencement of development, because otherwise the development would not be lawful.
3. The development hereby approved shall be fully implemented in accordance with the Approved Details Schedule list on this decision notice. REASON - For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.

4. No development shall commence until such time as a scheme to ensure the development is flood resilient and has an appropriate managed surface water drainage system has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The following points shall be included in the forthcoming information:

- Ensure access and improvement/ maintenance of existing main river culvert.
- Ensure finished floor levels are set no lower than 160.25 metres above Ordnance Datum (AOD)
- No dwellings / development within 8m of a designated main river
- Improve the existing surface water / main river system
- In areas with critical drainage problems, surface water run-off generated by the 1 in 30-year storm shall be limited so that it will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site. And flooding will not be increased off-site.
- TG-LV0100-25-101 Rev 01 – “Drainage Strategy East” shows attenuation tank with an infill, but no overflow / outfall – this must be clarified and approved in writing by the LPA.
- A detailed CCTV must be undertaken of the EA main river, upstream of the site adjacent to the fishing pond. This should be a fully comprehensive CCTV survey, along with any excavation requirements to determine, the culvert’s orientation, construction, remedial work, and any recorded connections. Any remedial works must be undertaken in line with EA guidance (FRAP) and mimic the connection as current. Any proposal to reduce capacity, must be supported by hydraulic modelling and agreed with the EA.
- Downstream of “Broadway A63” the culvert is 95% blocked. This should clear down to “Water Mill Clough,” removing 900mm of accumulated silt / debris – this is subject to a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP).
- The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the scheme’s timing/phasing arrangements, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the LPA.

REASON - To ensure that there are no detrimental impacts to flood storage or flood flow routes, ensure the structural integrity of the existing and proposed culvert thereby reducing the risk of flooding and to reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future users and prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage and disposal of surface water from the site, having regard to Policy JP-S4 (Flood Risk and the Water Environment and the NPPF).

5. No development shall commence until a detailed pre-commencement CCTV survey and topographical survey of the existing culverted Environment Agency Main River to/from the open watercourse channel at Water Mill Clough has been undertaken to ensure complete drainage conveyance has been verified and that the proposed development will not adversely affect the Main River. The survey shall verify the full route, condition and identify any defects and unrecorded diversions. The CCTV survey shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CCTV survey should be accompanied by a detailed survey, to confirm position of the Main River. Any remedial works identified within Oldham Council Highways or Oldham Council land ownership shall be agreed with the LLFA and implemented before development proceeds. Any remedial work identified as part of the further investigations to the Angling Pond shall be agreed with the Environment Agency, LLFA and Monarch Angling. Any strategy should ensure that defects will be addressed without causing changes in pond water levels and silt levels

which will negatively impact current fish stocks. REASON - To establish the condition, connectivity and effective hydraulic capacity of the culverted watercourse before development relies upon it and to ensure that there are no detrimental impacts to the adoptable Highway (Broadway) having regard to Policy JP-S4 (Flood Risk and the Water Environment and the NPPF).

6. No development shall commence until detailed Surface Water Drainage proposals has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage proposals shall demonstrate that the surface water scheme has been designed in accordance with the drainage hierarchy:

1. Collected for non-potable use.
2. Infiltration to the ground, supported by site-specific BRE-365 infiltration testing and in accordance with LLFA testing requirements.
3. Discharge to a surface water body.
4. Discharge to a surface water sewer, highway drain or other surface water system.
5. Discharge to a public combined sewer.

The detailed surface water drainage scheme shall incorporate a Sustainable Drainage System designed in accordance with the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems and take account of relevant Greater Manchester Sustainable Drainage guidance and demonstrate how the proposed SuDS contribute to management of surface water flood risk, water quality, amenity and biodiversity. The approved drainage scheme shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved details. REASON - To ensure the drainage hierarchy is applied, and higher-priority options are not discounted without adequate evidence. To ensure relevant National and Regional SuDS guidance is incorporated having regard to Policy JP-S4 (Flood Risk and the Water Environment and the NPPF).

7. Prior to the development being brought into use, a surface water drainage verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall demonstrate that the approved detailed surface water drainage scheme has been constructed in accordance with the approved details. The report should include, but not limited to:

- An independent As-Built topographical survey (PDF and 3D CAD files to be submitted). The survey should detail dimensions, levels and inverts of all drainage infrastructure. The survey should confirm finished floor levels have been constructed above the modelled design flood level (including appropriate freeboard allowance) and exceedance flow routes have been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.
- Photographic evidence of construction of all drainage features, including any private drainage components, prior to backfilling. Photographs should include a suitable reference point.
- Surface water sewer air testing.

Any departures from the approved drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. REASON - To verify that the approved drainage system has been properly constructed before occupation having regard to Policy JP-S4 (Flood Risk and the Water Environment and the NPPF).

8. Prior to first occupation of the development, a surface water drainage management and maintenance document shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority. The management and maintenance report shall include a colour coded ownership and maintenance layout showing ownership, responsibility and adoption status of each drainage asset including existing and proposed within the development red line boundary. The approved management and maintenance strategy shall be managed, operated and maintained in accordance with the approved details for the lifetime of the development. REASON - To ensure appropriate long-term maintenance is secured having regard to Policy JP-S4 (Flood Risk and the Water Environment and the NPPF).

9. The submission of an application for the approval of reserved matters shall include details of:

- site levels and gradients;
- the internal road layout;
- parking and manoeuvring areas;
- secure cycle storage facilities;
- servicing arrangements for the development; and
- the means of draining roads, parking areas and other hard surfaced areas.

REASON - To ensure that satisfactory highway, parking and drainage arrangements are incorporated into the detailed design of the development in the interests of highway safety, sustainable travel and flood risk management having regard to Policy 9 of the Oldham Local Plan and Policy JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Development) of the Places for Everyone Plan (2024).

10. Before development commences the applicant shall submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) which details how any demolition and construction on site will be managed to control dust, noise and vibration so as not to cause health and nuisance issues to the existing occupiers of residential and commercial sites close to the development. The plan shall reference the Institute of Air Quality Management's latest guidance on the assessment of dust from construction and demolition. The CMP must be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences and unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority any mitigation in the agreed CMP shall be adhered to during any demolition or construction works. REASON - To prevent development that may result in unacceptable impacts on human health having regard to Policy 9 of the Oldham Local Plan.
11. No development shall commence unless and until a site investigation and assessment into landfill gas risk and ground contamination has been carried out and the consultant's written report and recommendation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Written approval from the Local Planning Authority will be required for any necessary programmed remedial measures and, on receipt of a satisfactory completion report, to discharge the condition. REASON - Prior approval of such details is necessary as they are fundamental to the initial site preparation works and in order to protect public safety as the site is located within 250 metres of a former landfill site having regard to Policy 9 of the Oldham Local Plan.
12. Prior to the residential occupation of any development plot a statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning Authority detailing how that building has been constructed to be consistent with the 2022 Part L of the Building Regulations and with the measures in TABLE 5.1 of Places for Everyone Policy JP-S2, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not practicable or financially viable. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. REASON - In order to secure a sustainable form of development having regard to Policy JP-H3 of the Places for Everyone Plan (2024).

13. Each dwelling hereby approved shall comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards and the development shall be built to the accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations, unless it is first demonstrated to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority that the specific site conditions make this impractical. REASON - To ensure a sustainable form of development having regard to the requirements of Policy JP-H3 of the Places for Everyone Plan (2024).
14. Any application for the approval of reserved matters in respect of the landscaping and/or layout of the development shall be accompanied by an updated Biodiversity Net Gain Metric and Biodiversity Net Gain Statement to demonstrate how the development will secure a 10% uplift relative to baseline conditions. Any on-site biodiversity will be subject to a 30-year Habitat Management and Maintenance Plan. REASON - To secure biodiversity improvement at the site in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 7A of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by the Environment Act 2021).

SITE LOCATION PLAN (NOT TO SCALE):

