

Appendix 1

Revised Local List for Validation of Planning Applications – Schedule of Comments and Proposed Changes

Name/Organisation	Comments Summary	Response	Proposed changes to SCI
RBC Development Management	<p>a) Recommend additional requirement for submission of a Vibration Impact Assessment for proposed residential development within close proximity of existing constraints which may impact on the amenity of future residents by way of vibration e.g. heavy industry, quarries, land-fill sites or railway lines, with reference to BS 6472-1:2008.</p> <p>b) Insert a note within the ‘Plans and Drawings’ Section of the National Information Requirements to clarify, in the event of a departure from the recommended scales specified, that plans should regardless be drafted to a recognised scale e.g. not 1:34.</p> <p>c) The ‘Detail and Further Advice’ with respect to the required ‘Green Belt/Protected Open Land Assessment’ should include reference to a requirement to submit existing and proposed footprint, floorspace and volume calculations.</p> <p>d) In light of the launch of District Level Licensing for Great Crested Newt in Greater Manchester, reference to the online guidance provided by the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit should be inserted into the following relevant sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Biodiversity Statement ii. Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Extended Phase I Survey) iii. Ecological Appraisal (Phase II Survey) 	The Local List is to be updated to incorporate the recommended amendments.	The Local List is to be updated to incorporate the recommended amendments.

Name/Organisation	Comments Summary	Response	Proposed changes to SCI
Natural England	Natural England does not consider that this Local List for Validation of Planning Applications poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.	No changes necessary	No changes necessary
Coal Authority	<p>Pleased that the List refers to the Coal Mining Risk Assessment. Recommends the following wording and links:</p> <p>Planning applications: Coal Mining Risk Assessments https://www.gov.uk/guidance/planning-applications-coal-mining-risk-assessments</p> <p>Pre-application Planning and Technical Advice Service - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pre-application-advice-for-developing-on-the-coalfield/pre-application-planning-and-technical-advice-for-proposals-within-the-development-high-risk-area-on-the-coalfield</p>	The Local List is to be updated to incorporate the recommended amendments.	The Local List is to be updated to incorporate the recommended amendments.

Name/Organisation	Comments Summary	Response	Proposed changes to SCI
Peak and Northern Footpaths Society	<p>We recognise that the Application Form includes a question as to whether the proposed development will require changes to public rights of way (PRoW). However we can see no reference in the consultation document requiring applicants to identify any PRoW crossing or passing close to the development site and to provide clear statements about how they propose to protect those PRoW during and after development and regarding any boundary or surfacing treatments proposed, and the effect on the amenity value of the PRoW.</p> <p>We would not necessarily expect to see a separate item in the Local List, but we believe it is important for advice on information requirements regarding PRoW at least to be included at an appropriate place under 'Detail and further advice'.</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss this matter further if that would help.</p>	<p>Recommend no change to the Local List. Public Rights of Way are a known constraint on the Council's GIS mapping tool.</p> <p>Information pertaining to protection of PROWs is covered under separate legislation.</p>	<p>Recommend no change to the Local List. Public Rights of Way are a known constraint on the Council's GIS mapping tool.</p> <p>Information pertaining to protection of PROWs is covered under separate legislation.</p>
Highway England	Confirm that Highways England has no objection to the proposed changes.	No changes necessary	No changes necessary

<p>Sport England</p>	<p>1. Currently has a generic Open Space Assessment requirement but Sport England would recommend a separate Sports Impact Assessment that looks at the impact of development on existing indoor and outdoor sports facilities, land and buildings as these are not covered in the generic open space typology, with the exception of playing fields.</p> <p>2. This should look at the impact of a sports facility that would be lost to development, and/or the impact on existing sports facilities where a development generates additional demand for sport.</p> <p>3. Planning Practice Guidance (Open Space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space) signposts LPA and developers to Sport England guidance on how to assess the need for sports and recreation facilities; and recommends LPA's consult Sport England on any development of 300 dwellings or more.</p> <p>5. Policy Driver Paragraph 96 and 97 of the NPPF.</p> <p>6. Table columns:</p> <p>a. Type of application - Any development that affects an indoor or outdoor sports facility including playing field. Any development of 300 dwellings or more.</p> <p>b. Legislative/Policy Driver - para 96 and 97 of the NPPF</p> <p>c. Detail and further advice - Sport England Playing Fields Policy and Planning for Sport Guidance https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport</p> <p>Sport England Strategic Planning Tools (Playing Pitch Calculator and Sports Facilities Calculator) on Active Places. https://www.activeplacespower.com</p> <p>Rochdale Council Playing Pitch Strategy and Indoor Built Facilities Strategy</p>	<p>The Local List is to be updated to incorporate the recommended amendments.</p>	<p>The Local List is to be updated to incorporate the recommended amendments.</p>
----------------------	--	---	---

Name/Organisation	Comments Summary	Response	Proposed changes to SCI
Planning Agent	All ok. What you do need is a protocol/commitment to validate applications within a reasonable timescale. Every application I submit takes an age. Other LPAs can do it in a day or two. Why not Rochdale?	No changes to the Local List necessary	No changes to the Local List necessary

DRAFT