

BURY METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

22 January 2008

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Item:01 LAND OPPOSITE 2A BRIDGEFIELD DRIVE, BURY, BL9 7PE Application No. 48893
OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF ONE DETACHED 3 STOREY DWELLING

Nothing further to report

Item:02 LAND ADJACENT TO 298 & 300 ROCHDALE OLD ROAD, BURY Application No. 49231
CREATION OF PARKING SPACE AND VEHICULAR ACCESS FROM ROCHDALE OLD ROAD

Nothing further to report.

Item:03 BURY COLLEGE, MARKET STREET, BURY Application No. 49216
TEMPORARY USE OF THE BURY COLLEGE CAMPUS CAR PARK FOR WEEKEND SHOPPERS, FOR A PERIOD OF THREE YEARS

Nothing further to report.

Item:04 THE LODGE, WALMERSLEY ROAD, BURY BL9 6QF Application No. 49254
2 STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING OFFICE BUILDING

A letter with comments has been received from 30 Derby Court. The resident has no objections to the siting as the extension is on the Mosely Avenue side of the building rather than the Lowes Road side where it would have affected outlook and possibly light to her property. She also states that it is important that the building materials used would be in keeping with the stone presentation of the Lodge, otherwise she would object as it would negatively change the environment of the location of the building.

The Drainage Team has commented that it has no objections.

Environmental Health recommend a condition concerning contaminated land mitigation.

Add the following condition:

7. If during any works on site, contamination is suspected or found, or contamination is caused, the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately. Where required, a suitable risk assessment shall be carried out and/or any remedial action shall be carried out in accordance to an agreed process and within agreed time scales to the approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason. To secure the satisfactory development of the site in terms of human health and the wider environment and pursuant to Planning Policy Statement 23 - Planning and Pollution Control.

**Item:05 OLD HOLTS FARM ROADING BROOK ROAD HARWOOD BOLTON BL2
4JD Application No. 48865**
RETENTION OF PORTAKABIN OFFICES; ERECTION OF MACHINE STORE /
GARAGE AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING.

Additional photographs of site attached.

Item:06 HIGHFIELD COURT, GLEBELANDS ROAD, PRESTWICH, M25 1WE
Application No. 49263
ADDITIONAL GARAGE TO EXISTING ROW OF 3 GARAGES & RELOCATION OF
BIN STORE

Publicity

A letter of support has been received from the occupiers of No. 45 Glebelands Road, which has raised the following issues:

- The proposal is in keeping with the surrounding area

Two letters of objection have been received from solicitors acting on behalf of the occupier of No. 33 Glebelands Road and the occupier of No. 1 Highfield Court, which and have raised the following issues:

- The occupier of No. 33 has had continued uninterrupted use of the land at Highfield Court for parking and moving for over 20 years and has never been prevented from using the land
- Impact of the proposal upon the possible redevelopment of the adjacent property (No. 33 Glebelands Road)

The dispute relating to the right of access across the driveway, which leads from Glebelands Road to the boundary with No. 33 Glebelands Road is a private legal matter between the residents of the adjacent properties and the occupiers of Highfield Court and is not a material planning consideration. To date, no application has been received in connection with the adjacent site.

Item:07 1ST FLOOR,16 CHURCH STREET WEST, RADCLIFFE, M26 9SQ
Application No. 49246
CHANGE OF USE FROM OFFICE TO PRIVATE HIRE BOOKING OFFICE

Nothing further to report.

Item:08 FOLD MILL, BRADLEY LANE, BRADLEY FOLD, RADCLIFFE, BL2 6RR
Application No. 48411
INSTALLATION OF ROLLER SHUTTER DOORS, CREATION OF BUNDS AND
RELOCATION OF ENTRANCE GATE & FENCE (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION)

An objection has been received from Peel Holdings who are the owners of the unmade track. They state that they have not given permission for its use nor consulted as to its proposed use by the applicant. In addition, they express concern that, as an adjacent landowner, they have not received the requisite notification.

Regarding the point made about not receiving the requisite notification a notification letter about the receipt of the application was forwarded to Peel Holdings by the Department on 21st November 2007. However, the applicant was not under any

obligation to serve notice on Peel Holdings as a land owner regarding the making of the application as the application land does not include any part of their track. None of the three developments for which the application is being made are outside the mill boundary.

Item:09 SUNNY BANK, ARTHUR LANE, AINSWORTH, BL2 5PN Application No. 48715
FORMATION OF GATED ACCESS TO AGRICULTURAL LAND/STABLES

Nothing further to report

Item:10 39 BURY OLD ROAD, AINSWORTH, BOLTON, BL2 5PF Application No. 48822
CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL BUILDING TO DOG BOARDING KENNELS

Nothing further to report.

Item:11 FORMER BANKFIELD MILL, HARPER FOLD ROAD, RADCLIFFE
Application No. 49296
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - 18 UNITS

Consultations

Waste Management - No objections

Landscape Practice - No objections, subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to tree protection measures, replacement planting and a landscaping plan.

Fire Officer – No objections

Policy - The site already benefits from a planning permission for 18 units and there is no conflict with the housing restrictions because of this.

The number of units would warrant the provision of affordable housing under normal circumstances but as the applicant is simply looking to amend the details of the scheme and has the fall back position of implementing an inferior scheme, it is accepted that no affordable housing provision will be sought as part of this application.

Publicity

One letter has been received from the occupiers of No. 3 Far Hey Close, which has raised the following issues:

- The land was originally unclaimed, until the mill owner fenced this off and claimed it as his own after ten years
- Object to the loss of wildlife and trees, which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order
- The proposal would lead to a reduced quality of life through overcrowding and a lack of privacy
- Impact of additional traffic in the area.

Issues & Analysis

A tree survey report was submitted with the application, which identified 17 trees on the site, 8 of which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The tree report states that trees T4 and T5 (both protected by the TPO) should be removed as they are diseased and potentially unsafe and trees T2 (protected by the TPO), G1 and T17 would have to be removed in order to accommodate the development. The only

protected tree to be removed in order to accommodate the proposed development is T2, which is of low amenity value and has a low life expectancy. The Landscape Practice has no objections to this tree being removed, subject to the tree being replaced and this would be secured via a condition. The remaining trees (T17 and G1) are not worthy of protection and it is considered that their removal would not be detrimental to the amenity of local residents.

Trees T4 and T5 (both protected by TPO) may have to be removed as they are diseased and potentially unsafe, but their removal is not required to facilitate the proposed development. Therefore, the removal of these trees would be subject to a TPO application.

The conditions recommended by the Landscape Practice are numbered 4, 5, 6 and 7 in the original committee report.

Item:12 WHITTLES FARM, TURTON ROAD, TOTTINGTON, BL8 3QQ Application No. 48944
REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING SEPTIC TANK WITH KLARGESTER BIODISC SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

Publicity

A letter of objection has been received from solicitors acting on behalf of the occupiers of Whittles Farm, which has raised the following issues:

- The installation guidelines for a septic tank are enclosed. The manufacturers suggest that the tank should be sited a minimum of 15 metres from any dwelling and note that 25 metres is suggested in the regulations.
- The proposed tank would be located adjacent to a dwelling
- The occupiers of Whittles Farm do not want the tank on site.

The proposed sewage treatment plant would be located in the same position as the existing tank, which is 5 metres from Whittles Farm. Currently, there is unsatisfactory treatment of the sewage before effluent is released into the watercourse.

Environmental Health has been involved for a number of years, including the serving of a notice under Section 59 of the Building Act 1984, due to the unsatisfactory drainage arrangement and requiring repair or replacement of the tank. This has expired and the provisions of the Act enable the local authority to carry out the necessary works in default.

It is acknowledged that the manufacturers guidelines recommend that the tank should be located a minimum of 15 metres from a dwelling and there is a minimum distance from residential dwellings for new installations. However, the proposal involves the replacement of an existing septic tank and providing the replacement is no closer to the dwelling it is deemed acceptable under the Building Regulations. Environmental Health have enquired about relocating the tank to a minimum of 15 metres away from the dwelling but the objector has refused permission