

Ward: Whitefield + Unsworth - Unsworth

Item 01

Applicant: Mr E Taylor

Location: Pilsworth Fisheries, Moss Hall Road, Bury

Proposal: Erection of single storey building containing cafe, bait shop and bailiffs accommodation

Application Ref: 54304/Full

Target Date: 26/10/2011

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Description

The application site concerns a piece of land relating to an existing reservoir and recreation area that is used for angling and by walkers. The area is open and within the Green Belt, Area of Special Landscape and the reservoir is a Grade B Site of Biological Importance.

The site is on a platform of land approximately 5.5m above the reservoir to the east. There is planting and a hedgerow along the north and eastern boundary of the site and a variety of grassland and shrubbery planted around the area. Vehicular access to the reservoir is via an unmade lane from Moss Hall Road and leads to an extensive car park. The track continues through a palisade double gate and the raised area of land to which this proposal relates.

The application is for the erection of a single storey building to provide facilities in connection with the Fisheries. It would be 16.5m long, 8m wide and 5.9m high with a pitched gable roof. It would have a random stone frontage and rendered blockwork to the side elevations with a slate roof. Internally, the building would comprise toilets, cafe and bait shop, as well as an equipment store and office. In addition, an area in the roof space would be utilised for overnight accommodation for a bailiff.

The application is supported by a Design and Access Statement and Habitat Survey.

Relevant Planning History

50161 - Construction of new banking and islands reusing inert materials, footpath and platforms - Approved 23/10/2008.

Publicity

16 letters sent to properties at The Bungalow, 1,2,3, Pilsworth Cottages; The Three Arrows Inn, Windsor Gardens, Higher Barn Farm, Coal Pits farm, Higher Barn Cottage, 1,2,3,4,5 The Boskins, Whiptree Cottage, all Moss Hall Road.

Site notice posted 15/9/2011.

One letter of objection from No 12 Clarence Avenue, Whitefield received which raises the following issues:

- The building is in the most elevated and scenic position and would be clearly seen from the public footpath and lake and would be visually disruptive;
- The site is in Green Belt and designated River Valley and would be in conflict with policy that protects its open character;
- Has consideration been given to disabled access;
- There are no other properties in the area and therefore the application form is contradictory to state that a stone exterior would be in keeping with other properties;
- Should the building be divided into use classes A3, A1, B1(a) and B8 instead of as a D2 leisure use;
- Not clear whether there would be any staff;
- Opening hours are not known;
- Permission was refused in the 1970's for the siting of caravans and therefore this

- permanent structure should be refused;
- The building and septic tank would be on land not used for building;
- Approval would set a precedent for the future;
- Are the facilities solely for the use by anglers or walkers also;
- Footpath No 2 would require some diversion and where it forms part of the track could become dangerous for users if there were an increase in traffic;
- This area of Pilsworth is considered to be a "Green buffer zone" and is gradually being eroded from all sides by other businesses which detracts from people visiting the area;
- Intensification of the access track would be hazardous to users;
- Are the 40 proposed parking spaces adequate and disabled spaces identified;
- Clarification of the position of the septic tank;
- Is the fisheries a business on the Contemporary Trade Directory as stated in the Desk Study;
- If approved, there should be a condition that no work be undertaken outside the period from September to March.

The objector has been informed of the Planning Control Committee meeting.

Consultations

Wildlife Officer - No objection subject to measures to improve ecological potential of the land, and a condition to control Himalayan balsam.

Traffic Section - No objection.

Drainage Section - No objection.

Environmental Health Contaminated Land - No objection subject to conditions.

Public Rights of Way Officer - The proposal would be in close proximity to Public Footpath No 2 and clearly shown on plan in relation to the proposed building.

Baddac Access Officer - Clarification sought of accessibility of the building given the difference in levels and consideration of disabled parking provision. A revised plan has since been submitted to show disabled parking provided adjacent to the site and level access to the building.

Environment Agency - No objection subject to conditions to submit details of a buffer zone, drainage scheme and treatment of contaminated land.

Designforsecurity - No objections subject to advisory relating to security of the building and its immediate area and mitigation measures.

United Utilities (Water and Waste) - No comments received to date.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

OL1	Green Belt
MW1	Protection of Mineral Resources
EN9/1	Special Landscape Areas
OL5/2	Development in River Valleys
EN6/4	Wildlife Links and Corridors
PPS23	PPS23 Planning and Pollution Control
EN9	Landscape
EN6	Conservation of the Natural Environment
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
HT5/1	Access For Those with Special Needs
PPS1	PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS9	PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
EN6/2	Sites of Nature Conservation Interest LNR's
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
EN7	Pollution Control
OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN8/2	Woodland and Tree Planting
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/5	Waste Water Management

Issues and Analysis

Policies - OL1/2 - New Buildings in the Green Belt - The construction of new buildings is inappropriate development unless for one or more purposes including agriculture and forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation.

EN9/1 - Special Landscape Areas - Development will be required to be sympathetic to its surroundings in terms of its visual impact. Unduly obtrusive development will not be permitted and high standards of design and landscaping will be expected.

EN6/4 - Wildlife Links - seeks to ensure that new development within or adjacent to identified links or corridors contributes to their effectiveness through the design, landscaping and siting of development proposals and mitigation works, where appropriate.

EN6/2 - Sites of Nature Conservation Interest - seeks to protect the nature conservation interests of sites of particular ecological significance. Proposals should consider the need to establish "buffer zones" where development could have an impact on such protected sites.

SPD 8 - New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt contains additional guidance to ensure development is appropriate with the aim to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and to keep built development to a scale consistent with requirements of the outdoor recreational activity. Design, siting, scale and materials will be taken into careful consideration and assessed on individual merits.

Background Information - Planning application reference 50161 was approved in 2008 for the construction of new banking and islands reusing inert materials, a footpath and platforms. As part of the application, an ecology report was submitted which considered the impact of the development relating to wildlife and the natural environment. The report identified the need for a toilet/washroom and shop which could support both angling and overnight stay requirements. On health and safety and environmental grounds, these were considered necessary. A bailiff's flat was also considered appropriate to provide a 24 hour staff presence on site for security reasons (para 3.6).

Principle - Pilsworth Fisheries is an established business catering for anglers, many who fish for long periods of time. The proposed development would enable the business to be brought up to date to provide toilets, cafe and bait shop as well as an equipment store for the safe storage of tools, and an office. An area within the roof space would be used for the bailiffs accommodation for on site monitoring and security.

The facilities and accommodation would all be contained within one single storey building, close to the Lake and utilising the existing car park and access road.

The provision of essential facilities associated with an outdoor recreation use is an appropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposed development would be of a minimum scale consistent with the requirements of the fisheries site and associated activity. However, its impact on the openness of the Green Belt needs to be assessed and is covered below.

As such, the proposal is in compliance with the principles of Policy OL1/2 and SPD 8. Acceptability of the proposals would be determined by the siting, design and appearance of the building and its relationship to the surrounding area.

Siting and visual impact - In the context of the surrounding area, the building would be sited in an elevated position overlooking the lake. A levels plan shows that the building would be approximately 5.5m above the car park, and although it would be visible from the south and west, it would be single storey in height and sat on a level plateau of land. It would be partly screened by existing mature trees and bushes to the north and east which would mitigate its visual impact on the surrounding landscape. Additional landscaping is also proposed which would further screen the building from view.

With a footprint of 132 sq m, and overall height of 5.9m the building would be the minimum size needed in order to provide an essential facility and would not be unduly prominent or obtrusive in the proposed location. Consideration has been given to the sensitivity of the surrounding area, particularly with regard to Conservation interests and the Green Belt, and the building has been sited with thought to these factors.

As such, the proposal is considered not to compromise the openness of the Green Belt or Special landscape Area and would comply with OL1/2, EN9/1 and EN6/2.

Design and appearance - The building would be modest in design, being rectangular in form, single storey in height and with a pitched roof. It would be constructed of a random stone front facade, with rendered blockwork and timber cladding on the side and rear elevations and a slate roof. Whilst there are no other buildings in close proximity these materials are commonly used for buildings associated with an outdoor recreation sport in countryside areas as they are regarded as being sympathetic and congruent to their surroundings.

As such, the proposal complies with OL1/2 - New Buildings in the Green Belt, EN9/1 - Special Landscape Areas and SPD 8 - New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt.

Drainage - The septic tank would be located 7m to the north of the proposed building, and would be installed underground, with an inspection chamber being the only visible aspect of the tank. The Drainage Engineer has raised no objection to the proposal and would comply with UDP Policy EN7/5 - Waste Water Management.

Ecology - The proposed development lies adjacent to the Pilsworth Fisheries Grade B SBI. It is however, located on an area of land of minor ecological importance, being on disturbed ground and vegetated with widespread short perennial and tall herb species. There are therefore no ecological reasons why the project should not be approved. The proposal does however, offer an opportunity for improving the ecological potential of the land adjacent to the SBI through appropriate landscaping. There is also the potential to incorporate bat friendly features in to the new build given the potential of the open water habitat as a bat foraging habitat and the lack of structures near to the reservoir that could act as potential roost sites.

A condition has therefore been included which requires the applicant to submit a landscaping scheme including the timing of implementation, together with details of a scheme for the provision and management of a buffer zone along side the Brightley Brook, should the development be approved.

As such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and complies with UDP Policies EN6 - Conservation of the Natural Environment, EN9 - Landscape and PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Development and PPS9 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.

Access and parking - The site would be accessed from the track off Moss Hall Road which leads to the existing car park for up to 40 vehicles for the fisheries. The building could be accessed from two approaches. One via a walkway from the car park and the other via a continuation of the vehicular access track. There is an existing palisade gate which currently restricts access to the development area, and it is intended this would be managed by the on - site bailiff.

The proposed leisure facilities are intended to be for the benefit of the existing site users with only a small increase in the number of users and vehicular traffic anticipated. As such, the existing parking facilities and access to the site are considered to be sufficient to support the proposed development.

Disabled access - The site sits above the lake with access dictated by the difference in

levels of about 5.5m from the car park to the proposed building, which would make it relatively difficult for wheelchair users and ambulant disabled people to access. It is therefore proposed to provide 2 disabled parking spaces to the east of the building which would facilitate access to this area, or allow for a drop off and pick system.

The building would be accessed via two ramps on either side of the decked area which would provide level access into the cafe and shop, as well as the provision of disabled toilets. It is considered that these details have sufficiently addressed the needs of disabled persons using the facility and are considered to comply with HT5/1 - Access for Those with Special Needs.

Waste - Refuse would be collected by a private waste management contractor at regular intervals, although there are no details of the frequency or management of the collections. As such, a condition has been included requiring submission of a waste management scheme prior to the building first being brought into use.

Public footpath - There is a public footpath No 2 which runs to the east of the application site, close to where the building would be positioned. A plan has been submitted which shows that there is sufficient room for the footpath to run along the rear of the building without the need for it being diverted.

Response to objector - The siting of a permanent building compared to caravans would be significantly different in appearance, scale, area and layout as well as an appropriate use in the Green Belt. This fundamental difference is why the development is considered to be compliant with planning policies OL1/2 and SPD 8.

Any future proposals would be assessed on their own merits and in consideration of relevant planning policy at the time, as such the development would not set a precedent. The proposed use falls within Class D2 as determined in the Use Class Order 1987 and as amended, and covers the main primary use of the building. Each use is ancillary to the overall planning unit and are not considered to be separate or separable uses. All other objections have been covered in the above report.

Summary of reasons for Recommendation

Permission should be granted having regard to the policies and proposals listed and the reason(s) for granting permissions can be summarised as follows;-

The proposed development will not harm the openness of the Green Belt or Area of Special Landscape, nor affect the character of the surrounding area. There would be no impact on residential amenity nor adversely affect highway safety issues.

There are no other material considerations that outweigh this finding.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Conditions/ Reasons

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 Town & Country Planning Act 1990.
2. This decision relates to drawings SLW/PF/ET/01; SLW/PF/ET/02; SLW/PF/ET/03; SLW/PF/ET/04a; SLW/PF/ET/04b; SLW/PF/ET/04c; Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey dated 1st June 2011; Design and Access Statement and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan listed below.
3. Any soil or soil forming materials brought to site for use in garden areas, soft

landscaping, filling and level raising shall be tested for contamination and suitability for use on site. Proposals for contamination testing including testing schedules, sampling frequencies and allowable contaminant concentrations (as determined by appropriate risk assessment) and source material information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any soil or soil forming materials being brought onto site, and;

The approved contamination testing shall then be carried out and validatory evidence (soil descriptions, laboratory certificates, photographs etc) submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development being brought into use.

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

4. 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 timescales 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.

5. No development shall commence unless and until a landscaping scheme and details of measures to enhance the development site for biodiversity in keeping with its location adjacent to the SBI, including a timetable for implementation, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. It shall be implemented not later than 12 months from the date the building(s) is first brought into use; and any trees or shrubs removed, dying or becoming severely damaged or becoming severely diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of a similar size or species to those originally required to be planted to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason. To secure the satisfactory development of the site and in the interests of visual amenity pursuant to Policy EN6 - Conservation of the Natural Environment, EN6/3 - Features of Ecological Value and EN8/2 – Woodland and Tree Planting of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and PPS9 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.

6. No vegetation clearance shall be carried out on site between 1st March and 31st August inclusive in any year unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason. Pursuant to PPS9 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation and For the Protection of Nesting Birds, Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981.

7. Full details of a scheme for the control of Himalayan balsam should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be implemented prior to the commencement of any earthworks on site.

Reason. To ensure that the site is free from Himalayan Balsam in the interest of UDP Policy EN9 - Landscape.

8. No development including any land preparation works shall commence unless and until a scheme for the provision and management of a buffer zone alongside the Brightley Brook has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and any subsequent amendments shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The scheme shall include:

- plans showing the extent of the buffer zone, particularly during construction,
- details of retained or new soft landscaping, including planting schedule largely based on native species,

- details demonstrating how the buffer zone will be protected during development,
- details as to how this site, upon construction completion, will be encompassed in the overall management plan of the Pilsworth Fishery site,
- details of any footpaths, fencing, lighting etc. that is sensitive to the adjoining conservation value of the site.

Reason. To meet the present and future needs of the natural environment pursuant to Unitary Development plan Policy EN6/3 - Features of Ecological Value.

Development that encroaches on watercourses has a potentially severe impact on their ecological value. This is contrary to government policy in Planning Policy Statement 1 and Planning Policy Statement 9 and to the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. Land alongside watercourses and wetlands are particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected. Article 10 of the Habitats Directive also stresses the importance of natural networks of linked corridors to allow movement of species between suitable habitats, and promote the expansion of biodiversity. Such networks may also help wildlife adapt to climate change.

9. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to dispose of foul and surface water has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved and be available for use prior to the building first being brought into use.
Reason. To protect the water environment as geological maps indicate the site is located over a Secondary A aquifer pursuant to PPS 23 Planning and Pollution Control.
10. The development to which this approval relates shall be used as a cafe, bait shop, toilet provision and bailiffs accommodation only and for no other purposes unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure the building and its uses are appropriate development pursuant to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policy OL1/2 - New Buildings in the Green Belt and Supplementary Planning Document 8 - New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt.
11. The car parking indicated for the disabled parking spaces on the approved plans shall be surfaced, demarcated and made available for use prior to the building hereby approved being brought into use.
Reason. To ensure adequate off street car parking provision in the interests of road safety pursuant to policy HT2/4 - Car Parking and New Development and HT5/1 - Access for those with Special Needs of the Bury Unitary Development Plan.
12. Samples of the materials to be used in the external elevations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced.
Reason. In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policy OL1/2 - New Buildings in the Green Belt, EN9/1 - Special Landscape Areas and Supplementary Planning Document 8 - New Buildings and Associated Development.
13. Details of a waste management plan to include a timetable for the collection of waste from the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing, prior to the building first being brought into use. The approved scheme only shall be implemented unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason. In the interests of pollution control and to safeguard the amenities of the surrounding environment pursuant to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN7 - Pollution Control and EN6 - Conservation of the Natural Environment.
14. The bailiffs accommodation hereby approved shall not be used as a family residence or any other use within Class C3 of The Town and Country Planning

(Use Classes) Order 1987 and subsequently amended, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason. To safeguard the character of the Green Belt and to ensure against inappropriate development in the Green Belt in accordance with Bury Unitary Development Plan Policy OL1 - Green Belt, Supplementary Planning Document 8 - New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt and PPG2 - Green Belts.

For further information on the application please contact **Jennie Townsend** on **0161 253-5320**

Ward: Radcliffe - East

Item 02

Applicant: Mr Philip Hood

Location: 18 Bury Street, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 2QB

Proposal: Change of use of land at side to form extension to domestic garden: Erection of 1.2 metre high/railings at front with access at side and erection of 2.2 metre high fence/gate at side (retrospective)

Application Ref: 54307/Full

Target Date: 26/10/2011

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Description

The application relates to a two storey house that has recently been extended to the side and rear. The land to the side comprises part of an unmade access track leading from Bury Street to land at the rear of a row of terraced houses 28 - 38 Bury Street. Radcliffe Hall Primary school is across Bury Street and land to the rear is the former Radcliffe Paper Mill site.

The proposal falls into two distinct elements. Firstly, it is proposed to extend the side garden area over part of the existing unmade access road to the side of the applicant's house and define the boundary by the retention/erection of a 2.1m high timber panel fence. The fence would splay out to allow a wider passing point at the head of the access road. At its narrowest point the driveway would be 3.4m wide although this includes a strip of concrete flags approx 600mm wide adjacent to the gable of No.28 Bury Street.

At the front of the house a brick wall and railings, 1.2m high, would run around the front garden and driveway. Vehicular access would be to the side via the unmade access road.

Relevant Planning History

51032 - Two storey extension at side and rear; porch - approved 31/03/2009

Enforcement ref:11/0323 - Change of use of land to residential and fence - This application was received as a result of enforcement action 05/09/2011

Publicity

The following neighbours notified by letters dated 31/08/2011 and 12/10/2011.

12, 14, 16, 28, 30 and 32 Bury Street and Radcliffe Hall Primary School Bury Street.

Objections have been received from 28, 30, 34, 36 and 38 Bury Street and are summarised below:

- The extension of the curtilage to the side would make the access road too narrow and would cause problems for larger vehicles, including the emergency services.
- The reduction in width of the access would make it difficult to access a proposed garage to the rear of No.28 Bury Street and other garage plots to the rear of No.32.
- Neighbours to the south have had unrestricted access along the driveway for over 50 years.
- Narrowing the access road would reduce safety to the side and on Bury Street which has a history of traffic accidents.
- If permission is granted, there could be more cars parked on the road which would increase safety concerns opposite a primary school.

All objectors have been notified of the Planning Control Committee.

Consultations

Traffic Section - No objection subject to conditions.

Environmental Health - No objection.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design

H2/3 Extensions and Alterations

H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development

SPD6 Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

Issues and Analysis

Use - The site is within an established residential area and as such the principle of the change of use of the land is considered to be acceptable subject to there being sufficient room for vehicles to access the area to the rear of 28 - 38 Bury Street.

Highway Safety - The main issue with the proposal is the width and suitability of the access track between the applicant's house at No.18 and the neighbour at No.28 Bury Street. The access track is not adopted but allows neighbours to access the area to the rear which is used for parking. The access track, at the Bury Street end would be 5m wide and this is considered sufficient to allow cars to pass. Further up the track, the width would be reduced to 3.4m which would allow a car to access the parking area at the rear.

Visual Amenity - Given that the timber panelled fence would be set back from Bury Street and the proposed wall and railings around the front garden/parking area would be 1.2m high, there are not considered to be any concerns with regard to visual amenity. In this respect the proposal is acceptable and complies with UDP Policy EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design.

Objections - Whilst the existing access track would be narrowed, it would still allow access for cars. The wider section of the track at the Bury Road and the proposed splay in the fencing would allow a passing point without detriment to road safety. Emergency vehicles could access the neighbours via the front. Larger vehicles may not have ready access without removing the panelled fencing, however this is not an unusual situation and would not be considered a valid reason to refuse the application.

Summary of reasons for Recommendation

Permission should be granted having regard to the policies and proposals listed and the reason(s) for granting permissions can be summarised as follows:-

The proposed fence would allow access to the area to the rear without detriment to road safety, visual or residential amenity. There are no other material considerations that outweigh this finding.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Conditions/ Reasons

1. This decision relates to the drawings received on 12/10/2011 and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan listed below.
2. The external finishing materials for the proposed boundary wall hereby approved shall match those of the existing dwelling.
Reason. In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of Bury Unitary Development Plan.
3. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until

the alterations to splay the fence line adjacent to the existing extension indicated on the approved plan have been implemented in full to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To minimise the standing and turning movements of vehicles on the highway in the interests of road safety.

4. There shall be no direct means of vehicular access between the site and Bury Street.

Reason: To ensure good highway design in the interests of road safety.

5. The proposed parking area at the front of the property shall be constructed of permeable/porous materials as set out in the Dept of Communities and Local Government publication "Guidance on the Permeable Surfacing of Front Gardens".

Reason. To secure the satisfactory development of the site pursuant to Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and PPS25 - Flood Risk and Development

For further information on the application please contact **Tom Beirne** on **0161 253 5361**

Ward: Radcliffe - West

Item 03

Applicant: Mrs OShaughnessy

Location: Land at the rear 9-11 Wood Street, Radcliffe, Manchester M26 1DX

Proposal: Erection of two garage(s)

Application Ref: 54379/Full

Target Date: 11/11/2011

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Description

The application relates to a former garage site to the rear of houses fronting Wood Street. The site is within the Green Belt and there is a public footpath running past the site.

The two timber built garages that were on the site have been demolished and the land cleared. There is a double garage to the north and a single garage to the south of the site. Between the site and the rear wall of properties fronting Wood Street is an unmade track allowing access to the rear of 1 - 23 Wood Street.

The new garages would be in the same position as the former timber ones recently demolished albeit slightly smaller in footprint. The larger garage would measure L4.4 x W3.6 x H2.6. The smaller garage/store would measure L4.4 x W2.4 x H2.4. Both would be constructed of pebble dashed concrete panels with steel sheet roofing.

Relevant Planning History

None relevant.

Publicity

Immediate neighbours at 1-23 (odd) Wood Street and 110 - 124 Ringley Road West notified by letter dated 16/09/2011. One objection received on behalf of the owner of 9 Wood Street. Concerns are summarised below

- Through traffic to larger vehicles would be restricted along the rear access track.

The objector has been notified of the Planning Control Committee.

Consultations

Traffic - No objection.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

OL1/2 New Buildings in the Green Belt

OL5/2 Development in River Valleys

HT2/4 Car Parking and New Development

SPD8 DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt

Issues and Analysis

Use - The use of the site for garaging has been well established by the previous timber garages, although these have been recently demolished. The test of acceptability therefore is whether the replacement garages would harm the visual amenity and openness of the Green Belt.

Visual Amenity and Green Belt - The proposed garages would be modest in size and of a similar scale to those previously demolished. Set between two existing garages, there would be no serious impact on the openness of the Green Belt or visual amenity of the area. The proposal is considered to be acceptable and complies with UDP Policies EN1/1 Visual

Amenity, EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design and OL1/2 New Buildings in the Green Belt.

Residential Amenity - Given the size and location of the garages across the access track at the rear, there are no residential amenity issues arising from the proposal.

Highways - The garages are in the same place and no larger than those recently demolished. As such they would not obstruct access down the existing unmade track to the rear of Wood Street. The public footpath running past the site is unaffected by the proposal. The application is therefore acceptable in respect to highway safety and complies with UDP Policy HT2/4 Car Parking and New Development.

Objection - The concern about the garages obstructing the existing access track running along the back of Wood Street has been addressed above and is not considered a valid reason to refuse the application.

Summary of reasons for Recommendation

Permission should be granted having regard to the policies and proposals listed and the reason(s) for granting permissions can be summarised as follows;-

The siting of two garages in this location would not be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt, visual amenity or highway safety. The site is well established garage site and complies with UDP Policies listed. There are no other material considerations that outweigh this finding.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Conditions/ Reasons

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 Town & Country Planning Act 1990.
2. This decision relates to drawings numbered AS327-02 and 03 and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan listed below.
3. Samples of the materials to be used in the external elevations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced.
Reason. In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of Bury Unitary Development Plan.

For further information on the application please contact **Tom Beirne** on **0161 253 5361**

Ward: Bury West - Church

Item 04

Applicant: Mr Michael Glover

Location: Wellington Barracks, Bolton Road, Bury, BL8 2PL

Proposal: Variation of condition no. 6 of planning permission 50548 - 'The approved memorial feature including any information and interpretation boards shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timings; and within three years of the dismantling of the Lutyens Memorial and no later than 31/01/2012'.

Application Ref: 54428/Full

Target Date: 02/12/2011

Recommendation: Approve

Description

In 2009, the Council granted both Listed Building Consent and planning permission relating to the dismantling, repairing and relocation of the Lutyens Memorial, which was sited at the Fusiliers site on Bolton Road in Bury and to allow it to be relocated to the former Sparrow Park, next to the new Fusiliers Museum in Bury Town Centre.

The Lutyens Memorial is a Grade II Listed Monument and was part of a commemorative collection dedicated to 13,642 soldiers who had died during the First World War, 1285 soldiers from the Second World War and 102 soldiers from more modern conflicts.

Following the granting of planning permission and Listed Building Consent, the monument has been restored, relocated and since been re-listed. Conditions were attached to the Listed Building consent concerning the refurbishment. However, condition 6 of 50548 required that a programme of timing relating to a lasting memorial feature be approved by the Council and be implemented within 6 months from the date that the monument is dismantled.

Whilst drawings, interpretation boards and memorial scheme was submitted and approved, the works were not carried out. However, following the receipt of additional funding a revised scheme has now come forward and is in the process of being implemented on the recreational land immediately next to the former Lutyens Memorial site.

This application relates to the variance of condition 6 to Listed Building Consent application 50548 to reflect the intention to create the long lasting memorial feature required under the original consent and to also lawfully permit the work to be carried out under the terms of the granting of Listed Building Consent.

Relevant Planning History

50549 - Erection Of War Memorial for Lancashire Fusiliers at Sparrow Park, Bury - Approved 24/12/2008

50548 - Listed Building Consent for the dismantling of the Lutyens Memorial at Wellington Barracks, Bolton Road - Approved - 30/01/2009

Publicity

Letters to 34 addresses were sent to on Bexley Drive, Orpington Drive, Reigate Close, Bexley Drive, Buller Mews, Bolton Road, Wellington Barracks on 10/10/2011. A press notice was published in the Bury Times on 13 October 2011. As a result of this publicity 1 letter of objection has been received from 3 Buller Mews who objects to the application on the grounds that the applicant made an agreement to landscape the gardens within 6 months of the memorial move and now seems to want to leave the old site to deteriorate and become

an eyesore. The move was long fought and the Memorial Garden was a crumb of comfort to the objectors. The Fusiliers must NOT ride roughshod over residents.

The objector has been notified on the Planning Control meeting date.

Consultations

Conservation Officer - No objections.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

EN2/3	Listed Buildings
RT1/1	Protection of Recreation Provision in the Urban Area
EN1/1	Visual Amenity
EN1/7	Throughroutes and Gateways
PPS5	PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment

Issues and Analysis

Policies - The former memorial garden to the former barracks is not protected recreational land within the urban area as defined under UDP Policy RT1/1 but the intended lasting memorial site is. The policy states that development will not be allowed where it would result in the loss of existing provisions, recreational space within settlements, indoor facilities or other unidentified recreation provision unless there is an enhancement of the recreational land, or where there is a clear over supply of such land or land is suitably compensated for. However, there is no allocation to the land subject to this application.

EN1/3 - Landscaping Provision ensures that incidental open spaces positively contribute to areas and that carefully considered landscape works can provide an attractive environment. The wider settings of development should be considered and attention should be paid to the retention of existing trees, hedges and other ecological features.

EN1/7 - Throughroutes and Gateways states that the Council is concerned to improve the quality of development along throughroutes and at gateways, and will require new proposals fronting major throughroutes and at the identified gateways to display a high standard of design and landscaping.

Background - The site is a heritage asset as described within PPS5. The land historically formed the curtilage of the Wellington Barracks and remnants of the entrance way into the barracks are still on site today. The original position of the Lutyens Memorial was in fact on the land subject to the proposals and as such, the chosen location for the proposals more accurately reflects the military past and historical connections with the former memorial than the former location of the monument.

The need for leaving a lasting memorial on the Bolton Road site is not only reflective of the former historical use of the site, but also to pay homage to the many Fusiliers and family members' ashes that have been laid there. As such, the proposals that have come forward are in response to these issues.

The proposals themselves in planning terms, are landscape enhancement works rather than formal development and as such, planning permission is not required for this work to be carried out. However the submission of this application and approval of it would remedy a current breach of the Listed Building Consent, requiring the lasting memorial.

The Scheme - Stone setts would be replaced where they previously formed the entrance into the barracks; a gravel path and former guardhouse footprint would be created; 6 x 1m high posts would protrude from the ground representing fallen Fusiliers; a timber feature depicting the former gates would be installed; existing trees would be retained with new ornamental trees planted; a grassed area would be formed and an obelisk would be installed and an etched lectern with an image of the former barracks that once stood on the site. These measures are intended to represent the heritage of the site.

The three years within the description builds into the proposals a period of time since the granting of the original Listed Building Consent and a contingency period to completion. Therefore the works must be carried out by 30/01/2012. Some works have already commenced on site and it is expected that in the event of the proposals being accepted, the works would be completed on time.

The proposals comprise landscape enhancement of an area of protected recreational land and would bring the former derelict land into a beneficial use with a high degree of landscaping value, thus complying with policy RT1/1, EN1/3 and EN1/7.

Response to Objector - The owners of the former Barracks site are still responsible for the site and have a duty to maintain the site and keep it from deteriorating. The site has been sold to a private developer and currently there are no formal future proposals for the former Wellington Barracks site. Should any proposals come forward they would need to be treated on their own merits and any deteriorating site issues would have to be looked at should they occur. This should not fetter consideration of the application under consideration now.

It is accepted that the original scheme has not been implemented. However, the proposals submitted to provide the lasting memorial were located in such a position that the site entrance would have been closed off, rendering the site inaccessible. The site owners felt that this location was not a sustainable one. The revised proposals would not only provide a workable and long lasting tribute to Fusiliers connected with the town, but would also bring an incidental piece of land into beneficial use, which in its design, has historic relevance with its former use.

Summary of reasons for Recommendation

Permission should be granted having regard to the policies and proposals listed and the reason(s) for granting permissions can be summarised as follows; The proposals would ensure that a lasting Memorial is in place on the site that has historical relevance to the original use of the site and also to the former Lutyens Memorial. The proposals would comply with Unitary Development Plan Policies and there are no other material considerations that outweigh this finding.

Recommendation: Approve

Conditions/ Reasons

1. The approved memorial feature including any information and interpretation boards shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timings; and within three years of the dismantling of the Lutyens Memorial and no later than 31/01/2012.
Reason - The development is retrospective and to remedy an existing breach of Listed Building Consent pursuant to Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
2. This decision relates to drawings numbered 108140/01 - Landscape Proposals and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan listed below.

For further information on the application please contact **Dave Marno** on **0161 253 5291**

Ward: Whitefield + Unsworth - Pilkington Park

Item 05

Applicant: Oak Lodge Care & Nursing Home

Location: Whitefield House, Pinfold Lane, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 7JS

Proposal: Variation of condition no. 1 of planning permission 53354 (Conservation Area Consent) to extend the time limit for the demolition of the existing facade to be completed

Application Ref: 54450/Full

Target Date: 09/11/2011

Recommendation: Refuse

Description

The former Whitefield Town Hall is located within an area of parkland within the All Saints Conservation Area. The property was formerly used by the Council but was sold to the current owner of the site in 1991. The building is not listed but is on the Council's draft Local List. In addition to this, the Council's management plan for the Conservation Area, which was designated in March 2004, highlights the site and the building to be of importance within the development of the Conservation Area and should, if possible, be targeted for improvement, maintenance and retention.

Since the original sale of the property, there has been a planning permission granted for a 50 bed nursing home, which has not been developed out and overtime, the property has since fallen into a state of disrepair and fail structurally. In the summer of 2010, the property suffered a significant partial of collapse on its easterly elevation resulting in the building requiring a substantial amount of demolition. At that time Building Control required the erection of fencing to ensure public safety in the vicinity of the derelict building.

In November 2010, two applications were submitted for the former Whitefield Town Hall.

- Application 53353 – Planning Permission for the erection of a 60 bed care home including car parking and landscaping
- Application 53354 – Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the former Whitefield Town Hall

Both applications were presented to the Planning Committee for determination and a site visit was carried out by the Committee prior to making the decision.

The applicant's planning case was that *"the remaining demolition be linked to the redevelopment of the site for which a new scheme is in the process of being compiled and has asked that the remaining building be retained until such time that a planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment of the site."*

Planning permission was granted and the conditions required the new development to start within 3 years of the approval date (from 15/3/11).

The application for Conservation Area consent sought -

- To regularise the demolition that had already been carried out prior to the application following the partial collapse of the building; and
- To allow the demolition of the remainder of the building as the site is within a Conservation Area. This would facilitate the redevelopment go ahead on a cleared site.

The Conservation Area Consent was granted by the Committee and included a number of conditions. Importantly, condition 1 stated -

"The demolition of the remaining building must be completed not later than six months from the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and to preserve the character of the parkland, the setting and wider Conservation Area pursuant to Unitary Development Plan Policy EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas."

The reason for this condition was that the remainder of the building was such that, whilst not imminently dangerous to members of the public using the parkland (due to the double row of fencing that has been erected around the site), the building was in danger of further collapse and represented a significant intrusion within the parkland and was considered to be detrimental to visual amenities of the Conservation Area as it stood in a ruinous state.

The applicant did not carry out the demolition within the 6 months. The current application is therefore seeking to vary the time limit for demolition and is supported with a statement that the remaining demolition be tied to a Transfer of the Land, which was shown to be required within the planning permission for a 60 bed nursing home redevelopment (53353).

Relevant Planning History

49732 - Single storey extension at the rear - Approve with Conditions 09/05/2008.

34524 - Extensions to former Whitefield Town Hall and change of use of building to form a 50 bed residential care home - Approved - 7/7/99.

42809 - Renewal of consent 24524 for Extensions to former Whitefield Town Hall and change of use of building to form a 50 bed residential care home - Refused 23/8/04 for the following reasons -

- The proposed development would be detrimental to the character of the building to be retained and the Pinfold Lane Conservation Area by reason of its height, size and design.
- The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information in terms of the extent of demolition and remedial measures to protect the remaining structure to enable them to be properly assessed.
- The proposed development requires the demolition of a building, which may provide a habitat potential for roosting bats and other protected species. The application does not provide a full assessment of any ecological potential and as such the proposal would conflict with Planning Policy Guidance Note 9 - Nature Conservation.

53080 - Conservation area consent for demolition of building with recording, removal and storage of south facade - Withdrawn by Applicant 08/11/2010.

53353 - 60 No. bed care home with ancillary clinic/rehabilitation facilities, car parking and landscaping - Committee Minded to Approve 15/03/2011 - Decision issued following the signing of the Planning Agreement 18/05/2011.

53354 - Conservation area consent for demolition of building with recording, removal and storage of south facade (resubmission) - Approved 15/3/2011.

Publicity

Letters were sent to 33 addresses on 26/09/2011 including - Pinfold Lane, The Uplands, Bury New Road, Parklands and Gardner Road. A site notice was erected on the site on 27 September 2011 and a press notice in the Bury Times, Radcliffe Times and Prestwich and Whitefield Guide on 6th October 2011.

As a result of this publicity there have been 2 objections received from Prestwich and Whitefield Heritage Society and 4 Pinfold Lane. Points raised include:

- This company have stalled and procrastinated for years. To extend their time allowed will lead to the deterioration of the facade a condition for there planning permission
- The developer should not be allowed to let the facade deteriorate any further. Planning

permission was granted in March 2011 to demolish and store the facade and he should be forced to adhere to that timescale NOT move the goalposts again

Objectors have been notified of the date of the Planning Committee meeting.

Consultations

Conservation Officer - Objects - None of the issues raised in the applicant's supporting statement (land matters, planned single contract for demolition and new build, any delay in Council actions, and creation of new access) restrict the applicant's ability to fully implement approval 53354. The variation put forward, relying on completion of a land transfer, could in practice mean that the CAC is never implemented. In view of the existing approvals for the site, and their respective conditions, the current dilapidation of the structure is harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to leave the building for an unquantified period of time would risk the further deterioration and loss of those parts of the building fabric worth retaining.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

PPS5	PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment
PPS9	PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
EN2/1	Character of Conservation Areas
EN2/2	Conservation Area Control
RT1/1	Protection of Recreation Provision in the Urban Area

Issues and Analysis

Policies - Unitary Development Plan Policy EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas states that the Council will take action as appropriate to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Borough's Conservation Areas and will be especially concerned with encouraging and, where appropriate, implementing measures to:

- Retain, replace and restore features of historical and architectural interest;
- Retain and enhance existing landscape features including trees, parks and gardens;
- Initiate and promote environmental improvement/enhancement schemes such as landscaping, refurbishment of street furniture, traffic management and pedestrian schemes;
- Remove dereliction and bring unused land or buildings back into beneficial use;
- Prepare and promote design guidelines to ensure sympathetic development.

Background - It was considered as part of the previous approval for Conservation Area consent that the retention of the derelict building in its poor state would not be in the best interests of the wider amenity of the area. In terms of retention, given the obvious weakening and failure of the front facade, the removal of supporting structure behind the facade and the amount of work required to retain and repair it, very little of the historic fabric would in fact be left.

The applicant had confirmed that the facade could not be retained due to structural failure and as such little original fabric was left. The structural survey submitted as part of the application and confirmed this. On this basis, the immediacy of the 6 month consent would ensure that the impact upon the Conservation Area would be minimised by the swift removal of the ruinous building and that the removal would not prejudice the reconstruction of the 60 bed nursing/care scheme at some future point and furthermore, the proposals sought that the materials would be retained, cleaned and reused in the future redevelopment of the care home scheme 53353, which was also approved. The report therefore accepted that Conservation Area Consent should be granted and materials stored pursuant to Unitary Development Plan Policy EN2/1.

Timing of Implementation Considerations - The applicant sought to tie the total demolition of the remainder of the building to the redevelopment of the site, so that one single contract can be issued to remove the building and then continue with a redevelopment of the site. This current application is seeking to tie the land transfer to the

process this time as opposed to a single contract.

There would still be no guarantee of implementing the approved planning permission and equally redevelopment it could be carried out at any time within 3 years. and there is no guarantee that works would be let in a single contract, it was considered that the removal of the dereliction was important and to allow the site clearance regardless of any redevelopment proposals to take away the impact it has upon the Conservation Area.

The applicant is seeking to tie the demolition to a land transaction. The planning position is clear and remains so as it was when the matter was reported to the Planning Committee in March 2011. Nothing in a planning sense has changed.

It is accepted that the applicant is in negotiations about the transfer of the land. However to acquiesce to this current application would commit the Council to sell the land in order to have the derelict remains of the building removed. This is neither required nor considered to be acceptable from a planning perspective.

It is clear that the demolition is an entirely separable act to any other land transactions or redevelopment proposals that may or may not occur. A grant of a planning permission does not provide a certainty that it will be carried out. This is a developer's choice, once permission is granted and the decision to redevelop can be guided by many external factors such as land assembly or finance for example.

To grant the Conservation Area Consent extension of time would effectively leave the building in a ruinous state until such time that the land transaction occurs. There is no guarantee that this transaction will occur and the request to tie these matters would leave the Council in a position by *having* to transfer land to remove a building, irrespective of any views that it must take on board from the public in deciding whether or not to release the land. Secondly, there is no guarantee that the land transaction will take place soon. As such there is an unknown period of time that the remnants will remain on site, detracting from the Conservation Area and parkland.

The issues were made very clear in the report to Committee for applications 53353 and 53354 and the decision to grant the permission and consent with the conditions were allowed the demolition to occur unfettered from any redevelopment or other factors. The condition meant that the dilapidated and partly demolished building could be removed (and the owner intends to store and clean the remnants of the façade to re-use) within what was considered to be a reasonable time. The current application as submitted must be considered on its own merits and there is no reason why the Local Planning Authority (LPA) should put the Council (and effectively its public) in an unacceptable and compromised position. The refusal of the application proposals would also mean that there would be a need for enforcement proceedings to require compliance through a breach of condition notice. There would be no right of appeal against this action and the adjudicating body for the action would be the Magistrates' Court.

It is feasible that the applicant may agree to a variation (extension of time) for a further, but limited timescale to carry out the demolition works. This process would provide further time for the whole process that the applicant is seeking, but is actually beyond the scope of the application being sought. Notwithstanding this, should the LPA run with such a proposal, it could find itself in the same position again further down the line. As such, there will be little to gain unless the demolition *is* actually done irrespective of any land transfer.

Conclusion

Given the above it is considered that the application be refused as the proposal is clearly against planning policy aims and that enforcement proceedings take place in contravention of the Conservation Area Consent conditions due to the harm caused upon the Conservation Area by the dilapidated state of the building, which would have to be sought through the courts.

Summary of reasons for Recommendation

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions/ Reasons

1. The extension of time for demolition would result in the retention of a dilapidated and ruinous structure within the All Saints Conservation Area and as such the approval of such a scheme on the basis as applied for would be harmful and seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the All Saints Conservation Area and would therefore be contrary to Unitary Development Plan Policies EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas.

For further information on the application please contact **Dave Marno** on **0161 253 5291**

Ward: Prestwich - St Mary's

Item 06

Applicant: The Parochial Church Council of St. Mary

Location: St. Mary's Church, Church Lane, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1AN

Proposal: Retrospective application for non-illuminated church notice board (resubmission)

Application Ref: 54458/Advertisement

Target Date: 10/11/2011

Recommendation: Refuse

Description

The application concerns St Mary's Church which is an impressive Grade I Listed Building located at the end of Church Lane in Prestwich and within St Mary's Conservation Area. Church Lane comprises mainly residential properties, with The Church Inn public house, a Grade II Listed Building opposite, and the rectory immediately adjacent to the east. There is a stone wall and black and gold railings to the front entrance to the churchyard.

The application seeks express consent to regularise a noticeboard which has been erected without advertisement consent. The noticeboard is of aluminium construction and has a clipped frame to enable information to be changed. The sign is 1.45m in height x 2.5m wide and set 1.5m from the ground. The colour of the text and background are shades of blue and purple tones. The font and layout is a more modern approach than previously used.

The noticeboard is a replacement and is located immediately behind the boundary wall which fronts onto Church Lane.

Relevant Planning History

50900 - Listed building consent for repair works to existing churchyard retaining wall - Approve with Conditions 26/03/2009

53748 - Non-illuminated noticeboard (retrospective) - Refused 23/06/2011

Publicity

12 letters sent to properties at The Rectory, 36,36A,38,39,40, The Church Inn, Church lane; 32 Brentwood Court, Lowther Road; 20 Gardner Road, 18 St Mary's Road; 5 York Avenue; 63 Glebelands Road on 22/9/2011.

Six letters of objection received from No 18 St Mary's Road, 5 York Avenue, 32, Brentwood Court, 39 Church Lane, 26 Gardener Road and the Prestwich and Whitefield Heritage Society which raises the following issues:

- Totally unsuitable and not in keeping with St Mary's Conservation Area, a Grade I Listed Church, the Grade II listed wall, Church Inn and No 38 Church Lane;
- The previous noticeboard was black timber and much less obtrusive;
- The graphics design methods used to produce the board are the same for large supermarkets and road signs. These methods are at total variance when used to produce signage positioned within a medieval environment;
- Not suitable in size, colour or choice of materials;
- This proposal is for a garish, bright noticeboard totally unsuitable for its location.

One letter of support received from No 63 Glebelands Road with the following comments:

- It is an important and necessary way of finding out about church information and the design is excellent and fits in with the area;
- The display panel is more weather proof.

Those who have expressed an interest have been informed of the Planning Control Committee meeting.

Consultations

Conservation Officer - Recommends refusal. The noticeboard has a detrimental impact on the setting of the Listed Building and the appearance of the Conservation Area due to its inappropriate colour and design and relationship to the wall.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

EN2	Conservation and Listed Buildings
EN2/1	Character of Conservation Areas
EN2/2	Conservation Area Control
EN2/3	Listed Buildings
OL1	Green Belt
OL5/2	Development in River Valleys
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN1/9	Advertisements
PPS5	PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment
PPG19	PPG19 - Outdoor Advertisement Control

Issues and Analysis

Background to the application - In 2008, the church sought to replace their black painted wooden noticeboard - believed to have been put up in the late 1980's or early 1990's - as it was becoming increasingly dilapidated and shabby.

The proposed noticeboard was chosen due to its durability and ability to change information easily. The Church were not aware that advertisement consent was required and were invited to apply for permission. The application was refused in June 2011 by virtue of its inappropriate design, appearance and colour and adverse impact on the setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings and detrimental impact on the Conservation Area.

Due to an administrative error, the applicant was misinformed of the timescale of their right to appeal the refusal. By way of amending this, the applicant was invited to resubmit the same scheme, thereby re-opening an option to appeal, which is under consideration here.

Policies - Part 1, paragraph 3 of the Control of Advertisement Regulations 2007 states that a Local Planning Authority shall consider applications for Advertisements in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan as far as they are material, and any other relevant factors.

PPG19 - Outdoor Advertisement Control, states the display of outdoor advertisements can only be considered in the interests of amenity and public safety. In assessing an advert's impact on amenity, LPA's should have regard to its effects on the appearance of the building or on visual amenity in the immediate neighbourhood where it is to be displayed. The relevant considerations for this purpose are the local characteristics of the neighbourhood, including scenic, historic, architectural or cultural features, which contribute to the distinctive character of the locality. The presence of listed buildings or a designated conservation area will be relevant considerations.

PPG 19 also states that it is reasonable to expect that more exacting standards of control will prevail in Conservation Areas and that special care is essential to ensure that any advertisement displayed on or close to, a listed building or scheduled monument does not detract from the integrity of the building's design, historical character or structure, and does not spoil or compromise its setting.

In the consideration of amenity, Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies provide suitable and relevant matters concerning amenity by which to assist in judging the proposal.

Unitary Development Plan Policies EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas and EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control - seek to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and are concerned with preserving or enhancing the special

character with regards to factors including bulk, height, materials, colour, design and detailing of new proposals.

EN2/3 - Seeks to safeguard the setting of Listed Buildings by not permitting works, alterations or changes of use which would have a detrimental effect on their historical or architectural character and features.

EN1/9 - Advertisements - seeks to control advertisements in the interests of amenity and public safety in order to enhance the quality of the Borough's environment, with regards to the following considerations:

- the characteristics of the local neighbourhood including scenic, historic, architectural and cultural features;
- the scale and massing of existing buildings and structures;
- the nature of the predominant land use in the locality;
- the presence of Listed Buildings or Conservation Areas;
- any proposals for land use change;
- with reference to the countryside, landscape quality and character;
- the effect on transport and safety of pedestrians.

PPS 5 - Planning for the Historic Environment seeks to conserve the historic environment and its heritage assets. Local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of new development in making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. The consideration of design should include scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and use. There should be presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets, and the more significant the designated heritage asset, the greater the presumption in favour conservation should be. Loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, including Grade I and II* Listed buildings should be wholly exceptional.

PPS 5 also states that where the application would lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance, amongst other considerations, LPA's should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated it is necessary to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss or the nature of the heritage asset.

The main considerations of the application are the impacts of the noticeboard on setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings and St Mary's Conservation Area.

Impact on Listed Buildings - St Mary's Church is a Grade I Listed Building and categorised as a building of exceptional interest. It is the only surviving physical evidence of the medieval period in Prestwich. The tower was built in the late 15th Century on the site of what is thought to have been an Anglo Saxon place of worship and the main body of the church rebuilt in the early 16th Century. The Church is considered to be one of the most important Listed Buildings in the Borough.

Noticeboards are not uncommon in church localities and there is evidence there has been a noticeboard to the entrance of St Mary's Church grounds for a number of decades.

The previous noticeboard was a black painted structure with gold lettering which was understated and related well to the black and gold entrance railings as well as the setting of the church.

The proposed noticeboard is modern and contemporary in its design, layout, appearance and particularly strident in colour, and retains non of the traditional elements which would be expected within such a particularly sensitive area. In comparison to the previous noticeboard, the proposal is much more intrusive in its design and colour and has no connection to or reflection of the historic fabric of the adjacent Listed Buildings, particularly in relation to the Church. The noticeboard is in a sensitive location within the churchyard and of particular prominence appearing to "sit" on top of the stone wall, part of which is

Grade II Listed. It is also visually imposing when viewed against the backdrop of the war memorial, which is a Grade II Listed structure.

As such, the design and appearance of the noticeboard is considered to be harmful to the historic fabric of St Mary's Church and the adjacent Listed Buildings and structures, and contrary to UDP Policy EN2/2 - Listed Buildings and PPS5 - Planning for the Historic Environment.

Impact on the Conservation Area - The St Mary's Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, 2009, identifies Church Lane as a key street within the Conservation Area, and the medieval core of the settlement. The Appraisal recommends that Church Lane be the subject of enhancement schemes aimed at fully realising their architectural and historic qualities with their potential to enhance the conservation area.

The noticeboard faces directly up Church Lane and its position directly behind the stone boundary wall results in a particularly prominent and visible structure when viewed from the street. Its prominence within the Conservation Area is further exacerbated and enhanced by its appearance, design and colour, which assumes no relationship to its environment or respects the sensitivity of the area. Consequently, the noticeboard appears to "stand alone" within the Conservation Area.

As such, the noticeboard neither preserves or enhances the character of the Conservation Area and contrary to UDP Policies EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas and EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control.

This application is not accompanied by any supporting documentation or information. However, the previously refused application did put forward a case. It did not deal with the sensitivity of the Conservation Area or the adjacent Listed Buildings and was mainly based on the legibility and layout of board design which did not address any heritage or siting issues.

The case was also supported by examples of other recent church noticeboards erected in the Borough, although these are not as visually challenging as proposed and have a more traditional feel to them.

Other considerations - This application is accompanied by reasonable evidence to give cause to consider the notice board has deemed consent.

Under Class 13, (Schedule 3, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007) an advertisement would benefit from deemed consent if the sign has been continually displayed on the site for the preceding 10 years and there has been no material increase in the extent to which the site has been used for the display of the advertisement(s); or there has been no material alteration in the manner in which it has been so used. It does not permit substantial increase in the extent, or alteration in the manner, of the use of the site or the display of the advertisement.

Notwithstanding this, the application is seeking express consent and as such should be assessed against the policies above.

In conclusion, the noticeboard is considered to be seriously harmful to the setting of St Mary's Church and its boundary wall, and the Church Inn, and seriously detrimental to the character and appearance of the St Mary's Conservation Area. As such, it is recommended this application for express consent be refused for the reasons stated above.

In light of the evidence submitted by the applicant that the noticeboard benefits from deemed consent, the appropriate method to remove the noticeboard is through discontinuance action. The Local Planning Authority therefore seeks the removal of the noticeboard via a Discontinuance Notice.

Summary of reasons for Recommendation

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions/ Reasons

1. The development introduces a discordant and visually obtrusive feature into the St Mary's Conservation Area which would be seriously detrimental to the character of the St Mary's Conservation Area. The proposal therefore conflict with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan: EN2/1 Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 Conservation Area Control, EN1/9 - Advertisements and PPS5 - Planning for the Historic Environment.
2. The noticeboard has an adverse impact on the setting of St Mary's Church Grade Listed I Building, and its boundary wall, and The Church Inn Grade II Listed Building, by virtue of its inappropriate design, appearance and colour. The proposal therefore conflict with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan: EN2/3 Listed Buildings, EN1/9 - Advertisements and PPS5 - Planning for the Historic Environment.

For further information on the application please contact **Jennie Townsend** on **0161 253-5320**

Ward: Bury West - Elton

Item 07

Applicant: Ms Heather Standbridge

Location: 49 Westcombe Drive, Bury, BL8 1DN

Proposal: Change of use of garage conversion from residential to dog grooming use for a temporary period of 3 years

Application Ref: 54460/Full

Target Date: 17/11/2011

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Description

The site is a garage that has been converted to a habitable room attached to a semi-detached house on a residential estate. It has a large window to the front and door and small obscure glazed window in the side and runs into a utility room at the rear. There is a drive to the front with parking for 2 cars and a narrow domestic path to the rear garden alongside the converted garage. The adjacent detached neighbouring property is a similar semi detached house with drive to the front and attached garage with one obscure glazed window in the side.

The application is for a temporary change of use of the converted garage to a dog grooming business for a period of 3 years. The hours of operation proposed would be Monday to Friday 10.00hrs - 15.00hrs. Clients would be booked on an appointment only basis and due to the grooming process it is anticipated that there would be a maximum of 3 clients per day.

The business would be run by the applicants' daughter who would be the sole employee and is resident at the property.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Publicity

19 notification letters were sent on 23/09/11 to addresses at 32-46, 41-47 & 51-55 Westcombe Drive, 33 & 35 Woodbank drive and 66 & 68 Bankhouse Road and 3 responses have been received.

- The occupier of 38 Westcombe Drive requested confirmation that there would be no dogs staying overnight.
- An anonymous letter from a resident of Westcombe Drive raises concerns over conditions in the deeds stating a business cannot be run from the property and that they cannot accept there will be no inconvenience by customer cars.
- The occupier of 40 Westcombe Drive opposite does not consider the proposal would have any adverse impact on the area at all.

The representees have been notified of the Planning Control Committee meeting.

Consultations

Borough Engineer (Drainage Section) - No comments received.

Environmental Health (Pollution Control) - Recommend a condition for soundproofing.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

H3/1 Assessing Non-Conforming Uses

Issues and Analysis

Principle – UDP Policy H3/1 – Assessing Non-Conforming Uses states that proposals should be assessed on their impact on the residential area with regard to residential amenity, noise and smells, visual intrusion, traffic generation and parking and hours of operation.

Residential amenity – The use would be confined to the attached garage which has been converted to Building Regulation Standards. The closest neighbouring property has its garage and drive adjacent and therefore it is not considered that the dog grooming use would cause any serious impact on their amenity or that there would be any significant increase in noise level above a general residential use. As the garage has already been converted no condition for soundproofing is proposed. Access to the business will be via the existing at the front of the garage and as such it is considered that there will be no material impact on the neighbours residential amenity.

Visual amenity – The converted garage has a residential appearance and the supporting statement with the application confirms there will be no advertising on the property. As such there will be no impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Car parking and traffic generation – The property has a two car drive and it is intended for one space to be used by the household during the day. Clients would be booked on an appointment basis and requested to park on the drive. Westcombe Drive has no parking restrictions on either side and given the limited number of clients and hours of operation it is considered that there is adequate parking provision and the use would not result in any significant traffic generation.

Operation of the business – The use is requested for a temporary period to enable a client base to be built up and if successful a permanent business premises would be sought. The temporary permission would allow the garage to be returned to a residential use at the end of the three year period or a new application submitted to allow further assessment. A condition is also recommended for the restriction of the use to the named person within the application.

The proposal would comply with UDP Policy H3/1 – Assessing Non-Conforming Uses with the recommended conditions on hours, operation and period of consent.

Response to objection – The applicant has confirmed there will be no dogs staying overnight.

The restrictions within the deeds are not a planning matter. However the applicant has clarified that the permission for business use may be granted by the landlord or the lease could be purchased.

Summary of reasons for Recommendation

Permission should be granted having regard to the policies and proposals listed and the reason(s) for granting permissions can be summarised as follows;-

The proposed use of the garage for a dog grooming business is limited in scale and will not have a material impact on the character of the area or the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.

There are no other material considerations that outweigh this finding.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Conditions/ Reasons

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

2. This decision relates to the drawings received on 22 September 2011 and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan listed below.
3. The use hereby permitted by this consent as a dog grooming business shall be carried on only by the named person in the application, Jasmine Standbridge, and only whilst a resident at 49 Westcombe Drive. No other person shall be employed in relation to the dog grooming business.
Reason: The proposed use is not in accord with the character of the area and permission has only been granted given the particular circumstances of the applicant and to conform with Unitary Development Plan Policy H3/1 - Assessing Non-conforming Uses
4. The use hereby permitted by this consent for a dog grooming business shall be for a limited period, being a period of 3 years from the date of this decision after which it shall cease forthwith unless the written approval of the Local Planning Authority has been obtained for a longer period.
Reason: The proposed use is not in accord with the character of the area and permission has only been granted given the particular circumstances of the applicant and to conform with Unitary Development Plan Policy H3/1 - Assessing Non-conforming Uses
5. The hours of operation of the dog grooming business, including 'drop-off' and 'pick-up' of animals, hereby approved shall be confined to the following hours:-

10:00hrs – 15:00hrs Monday to Friday

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation and to conform with Unitary Development Plan Policy H3/1 - Assessing Non-conforming Uses.

For further information on the application please contact **Jane Langan** on **0161 253 5316**

Ward: Whitefield + Unsworth - Besses

Item 08

Applicant: Architectural Services

Location: Shuttle Centre, Albert Road, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 8NH

Proposal: Change of use from local community/youth centre to educational centre (Class D1);
Provision of 3 metre mesh fence and gate around playground (resubmission)

Application Ref: 54491/Full

Target Date: 24/11/2011

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Description

The Shuttle Centre is situated on the corner of Albert Road and Hazel Road. Currently vacant, the single storey building was formerly a youth and community centre. It has a vehicular and pedestrian entrance from Albert Road leading to a car park and turning area within the eastern half of the site. The main entrance into the building is on the east elevation. The site surrounded on three sides by housing and across Albert Road to the north is the playing field of St Michael's Primary School.

The proposal has two distinct elements:

- The change of use of the centre from its youth/community function to an educational centre. The local authority Children's Services have decided to relocate the small Pupil Learning Centre for primary aged children with behavioural and learning difficulties to the Shuttle Centre to take advantage of its under used capacity and youth facilities. The unit, which has approximately 10 pupils and two teaching staff, is currently housed in Whitefield Primary School.
- The erection of a green 3m high steel 'weld mesh' fence to form a playground (19.2m by 9.7m) on the eastern side of the building and enclosing the entrance. Access into the playground, and hence into the building, would be via a single controlled access gate.

Relevant Planning History

54371 - Provision of fencing to encompass a new playground area - Withdrawn by Applicant 26/09/2011

Publicity

Immediate neighbours at 38 - 71 Hazel Road, 4 and 6 Edward Drive, 2 Billberry Close and St Michaels Primary School Ribble Drive notified by letters dated 29/9/2011 and 24/10/2011.

One objection from 2 Billberry Close whose concerns are summarised below:

- Not enough residents have been notified.
- The proposed fence is higher than that normally allowed in the area.
- Increase in traffic.
- The use of the centre is costly and expenditure cannot be justified.
- All pupils should attract similar funding. This proposal is part of a system which penalises the majority of better behaved pupils.
- The Shuttle Centre should be sold to raise income to benefit all pupils and reduce costs to the taxpayer.
- His fence was damaged by the previous users of the centre. Are the Council going to repair it or increase its height to screen it from the site.

The resident at 4 Edwards Drive raised a number of site management issues such as the

state of existing fencing and trees and these have been forwarded onto Children's Services.

All those commenting have been notified of the Planning Control Committee.

Consultations

designforsecurity - No objection.

Environmental Health - No objection.

Baddac Access - No objection subject to improved disabled access.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design

EN1/5 Crime Prevention

HT2/4 Car Parking and New Development

HT5/1 Access For Those with Special Needs

CF2 Education Land and Buildings

Issues and Analysis

Use - Whilst still youth based, the proposal would alter the primary purpose of the centre from leisure to education. There would be two main differences in the use of the building.

- The opening times with the centre being open during normal school hours - 7.30am to 4.30pm, as opposed to the evening/ nighttime opening of the youth centre.
- There would be the additional use of the playground at break times.

Given its limited number of pupils and daytime opening, the proposed educational centre would be an acceptable new use for the building within this residential area. It would also improve existing educational facilities within the area and would comply with UDP Policy CF2 Education Land and Buildings.

Visual Amenity - The main difference externally would be erection of the weld mesh fencing around the proposed playground. Whilst this would, at a height of 3m, be higher than what would normally be seen in the area, it is set within the site rather than along the frontage or forming a boundary with neighbours, thus mitigating its visual impact. This element of the proposal, would on balance be acceptable and comply with UDP Policy EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design.

Residential Amenity - The nature of the proposed use would mean that whilst there would be some noise from the playground during break times, there would be less potential for noise disturbance in the evening. Given the limited numbers of pupils attending the centre and the fact that they would be supervised at all times, noise would be controlled and not excessive. In this respect the proposal is acceptable and complies with UDP Policies EN7/2 Noise Pollution and H3/1 Assessing Non-conforming Uses.

Access and Parking - The existing access would not change and the car parking capacity would be reduced from 12 to 6 spaces (including 1 disabled space). Given the scale and nature of the new use, the smaller parking capacity would be acceptable and would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

Objections - Given the nature of the proposal, it is considered that the number of neighbours notified has been sufficient. It is also noted that the proposal was reported in the Prestwich and Whitefield Guide on 6th October.

The fence, at 3m, is higher than most boundary fencing to educational establishments. The extra height is considered necessary for the extra care needs required to prevent children climbing over and running onto nearby busy roads. It is noted that the fence is not on the boundary and is set well back into the site and away from the back of the public footpath, thereby mitigating the impact of the additional height.

The concerns regarding the cost of the proposal and funding in general are not specific planning matters, but strategic issues for Children's Services and the wider Council.

The damage done to boundary fencing when the site operated as a youth centre is a site management issue and may well be addressed when the site and building is refurbished. It is not an issue that should affect this particular proposal.

Summary of reasons for Recommendation

Permission should be granted having regard to the policies and proposals listed and the reason for granting permissions can be summarised as follows:-

The proposed education centre will help improve educational provision within the area without detriment to visual or residential amenity or highway safety. The proposal is considered acceptable and complies with UDP Policies listed. There are no other material considerations that outweigh this finding.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Conditions/ Reasons

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 Town & Country Planning Act 1990.
2. This decision relates to drawings numbered KB/01 11607/02 and 03 (Revised) and KB11607 (Existing) and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan listed below.
3. The car parking indicated on the approved plans shall be demarcated and made available for use prior to the education centre hereby approved being brought into use.
Reason. To ensure adequate off street car parking provision in the interests of road safety pursuant to UDP policies HT2/4 - Car Parking and New Development and HT5/1 – Access for those with Special Needs.

For further information on the application please contact **Tom Beirne** on **0161 253 5361**

Ward: Radcliffe - West

Item 09

Applicant: Miss Nicola Handley

Location: 3 Beechfield Avenue, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 1FN

Proposal: Single storey rear extension and alterations to change the use of dwelling into two maisonettes

Application Ref: 54502/Full

Target Date: 06/12/2011

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Description

The application relates to a two storey red brick semi-detached house on a residential cul-de-sac of similar properties. Most of the houses are served by on-street parking although the attached neighbour has off street parking with the front garden. The front garden is grassed with a walkway down the side of the property.

It is proposed to convert the property into two self-contained 1-bed flats and extend out the the rear at the ground floor. Two car parking spaces would be provided within the front garden area. Access to the upper flat would be from the front entrance whilst the access to the ground floor would be via a new door on the side elevation.

The single storey rear extension would project out almost 3m and run across the width of the rear elevation. It would have a mono-pitched roof and constructed in red brick and tile to match the existing house.

Relevant Planning History

54253 - (2 Beechfield Ave) Conversion of house to 2No. flats with off-street parking, single storey extension at rear - Approved 20/09/2011.

Publicity

The following neighbours were notified by letter dated 01/10/2011. 29-33(odd) Hollinhurst Road, 1-12 Beechfield Avenue.

One objection from the occupier of 10 Beechfield Avenue which is summarised as:

The parking problems on the road will be made worse by the additional dwelling created.

The objector has been notified of the Planning Control Committee meeting.

Consultations

Traffic Section - No objection.

Unitary Development Plan and Policies

H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
H2/3	Extensions and Alterations
H2/4	Conversions
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD15	Residential Conversions

Issues and Analysis

Principle - The principle of creating two 1-bed flats within the 2-bed house is considered to be acceptable particularly given that the number of bedrooms would not increase. The

Planning Control Committee approved a similar proposal at No.2 Beechfiled Avenue at its meeting on 20/09/2011. The proposal complies with UDP Policy H1/2 in this respect.

Traffic and Parking - The parking provision for the existing two bed house would not be so significantly different than two small 1-bed flats, with off-road parking, to warrant refusing the proposal. The two parking spaces within the front garden area would mean that, in allowing for access, there would be one space lost on the road, in front of the property. There would therefore be a net increase of one space and with the dropping of the kerb, it may be that the road may be more accessible to the other residents. Given the size of the flats, two off-street parking spaces is considered acceptable and complies with UDP Policies H2/2 and HT2/4 relating to parking.

Visual Amenity - The main visual impact would be from the single storey extension at the rear and the creation of two parking spaces in the front garden.

With regard to the extension, it is considered acceptable given it would not project more than 3m beyond the rear elevation and be finished in materials to match the existing house. The creation of the parking spaces would not have a serious impact on the amenity or character of the streetscape. Indeed it is noted that the adjacent property has a parking space within the front garden. The proposal is considered to comply with UDP Policies with regard to visual amenity.

Residential Amenity - It is not considered that the use of the building would raise any serious residential amenity issues as it remains residential. The extension at the rear is single storey and projects out less than 3m from the rear elevation and should not affect the attached neighbour at No.1. As such the proposal is acceptable in terms of residential amenity and complies with UDP Policy in this respect.

Objections - The issue of parking has been addressed in the appropriate section of this report.

Summary of reasons for Recommendation

Permission should be granted having regard to the policies and proposals listed and the reason(s) for granting permissions can be summarised as follows;-

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in that it would not have a seriously detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area or residential amenity of neighbours. The proposed off-street parking provision is considered acceptable. The proposal complies with UDP policies and guidance listed. There are no other material considerations that outweigh this finding.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Conditions/ Reasons

1. The development must be begun not later than five years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 Town & Country Planning Act 1990.
2. This decision relates to drawings numbered 001 and the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the drawings hereby approved.
Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of design pursuant to policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan listed below.
3. The external finishing materials for the proposal hereby approved shall match those of the existing building.
Reason. In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory

development pursuant to Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of Bury Unitary Development Plan.

4. The proposed parking area at the front of the property shall be constructed of permeable/porous materials as set out in the Dept of Communities and Local Government publication "Guidance on the Permeable Surfacing of Front Gardens".
Reason. To secure the satisfactory development of the site pursuant to Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design of the Bury Unitary Development Plan and PPS25 - Flood Risk and Development

5. The proposed two car driveway shall be a minimum of 5m in length measured from the back of the adopted footway and shall be surfaced, demarcated and made available for use prior to the conversion of the two flats hereby approved being brought into use.
Reasons: To allow adequate space to maintain vehicles clear of the highway in the interests of road safety pursuant to UDP Policy H2/4 Car Parking and New Development..

For further information on the application please contact **Tom Beirne** on **0161 253 5361**

