

Public Document Pack

AGENDA FOR

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE



Contact: Michael Cunliffe
Direct Line: 0161 253 5399
E-mail: m.cunliffe@bury.gov.uk
Website: www.bury.gov.uk

To: All Members of Planning Control Committee

Councillors : G McGill (Chair), C Boles, D Duncalfe,
U Farooq, J Harris, M Hayes, B Ibrahim, D Quinn,
G Staples-Jones, D Vernon and M Walsh

Dear Member/Colleague

Planning Control Committee

You are invited to attend a meeting of the Planning Control Committee which will be held as follows:-

Date:	Tuesday, 22 July 2025
Place:	Council Chamber, Bury Town Hall
Time:	7.00 pm
Briefing Facilities:	If Opposition Members and Co-opted Members require briefing on any particular item on the Agenda, the appropriate Director/Senior Officer originating the related report should be contacted.

AGENDA

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS *(Pages 3 - 8)*

Reports attached.

BURY COUNCIL
DEPARTMENT FOR BUSINESS, GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE
PLANNING SERVICES

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

22 July 2025

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Item:01 St Stephens C of E Primary School, Colville Drive, Bury, BL8 2DX
Application No. 71738

Erection of new 2.4m high boundary fencing and access gates

Extension of Time - Yes - 25/7/25

Nothing further to report

Item:02 Bury Interchange and land bounded by Pyramid Park/East Lancashire railway line, Knowsley Place/Duke Street, Bury, BL9 0EJ Application No. 71834

Full planning application for the infill of the existing underpass, engineering works (including remediation works; foundation/piling works; and other associated engineering works) to recontour the land within Pyramid Park to tie into existing levels, the construction of a fully accessible pedestrian bridge structure (including alterations to Metrolink-related infrastructure) across the existing Metrolink line to allow access between Knowsley Place, the Metrolink platform (via lift and stairs) and Pyramid Park; improvements to the existing Metrolink platforms and canopies; construction of a new sloped footpath with stairs within Pyramid Park site from bridge; hard/soft landscaping; and associated drainage and lighting schemes.

Extension of Time - Yes 5/9/25

Conditions

Condition 2 - Approved Plans - amended to revise the Proposed Platform Complete GA Plan from P04 to P05 and add Proposed Site Plan with Topographical Survey 16012-HBA-BRY-ZZZ-D-AR-080021 P02.

Condition 6 amended to read:

Prior to the commencement of development (except demolition and site clearance), details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage schemes must include:

- (i) An investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This investigation shall include evidence of an assessment of ground conditions and the potential for infiltration of surface water in accordance with BRE365;
- (ii) A restricted rate of discharge of surface water agreed with the local planning authority (if it is agreed that infiltration is discounted by the investigations);
- (iii) levels of the proposed drainage systems including proposed ground and finished floor levels in AOD;
- (iv) Incorporate mitigation measures to manage the risk of sewer surcharge where applicable; and
- (v) Full details of any proposed reconfiguration of the attenuation tank adjacent to 3KP / Premier Inn, including updated capacity assessment

The scheme shall be in accordance with the principles outlined in the "Phase 1 - Southern Access Footbridge & Metrolink Platform Flood Risk Assessment" must be based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance and be designed in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or subsequent revisions of it. This must include assessment of potential SuDS options for surface water drainage with appropriate calculations and test results to support the chosen solution.

Design details should comply with guidance contained in the Greater Manchester's Sustainable Drainage Design Guide, March 25. Consultation with United Utilities should be undertaken to assess mitigations to reduce impacts on the combined sewer system which the system ultimately outfalls to.

Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the drainage schemes shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason. To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution pursuant to PfE Policy JP-S4 and chapter 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change of the NPPF.

Condition 23 amended to read:

Details/Samples of the materials to be used in the external elevations, together with details of their manufacturer, type/colour and size, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development (excluding demolition, site preparation and remediation work) is commenced. Only the approved materials shall be used for the construction of the development.

Reason. No material samples have been submitted and are required in the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory development pursuant to UDP Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design

Condition 24 added to read:

Upon first public use of the approved bridge, a survey of drop-off and pick up activity along Knowsley Street (in the vicinity of the Duke Street junction) shall be undertaken. The methodology comprising the length of time, scope and extent of the survey shall be first agreed prior to the facility becoming operable. The results of the survey shall be submitted to the LPA as shall be set out in the methodology.

Reason. To secure the satisfactory development of the site in highway terms and mitigate any potential drop-off and pick-up activities that may be created on the adopted highway pursuant to Policies EN1/2, JP-C5 and JP-C8.

Item:03 Ivy House, Bolton Road West, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL0 9RW Application No. 71963

Variation of condition no.2 (approved plans) on planning permission 65114 (1 no. dwelling):

Amendments to previously approved dwelling and garage - size, position and external alterations

Extension of Time - No - Decision due - 4 August 2025.

Publicity

2 letters have been received, which has raised the following issues:

- The content of my objection regarding the plans is still valid.
- Concerned that the permission will continue to be infringed and the terrace will be back to being the full garage roof.
- We were misled to believe it would be the size of a bungalow but what has been built significantly exceeds what was approved.
- The rooftop terrace overlooks my garden and will generate noise pollution and background chatter will make it difficult to relax.
- No visible enforcement action has been taken.
- Is the height and rooftop structure in breach of the approved permission?
- If a breach has occurred, what actions will be taken?
- Request a clear timeline to when this matter will be resolved.

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

Response to objectors

- If the applicant deviates from the approved plans, a complaint should be made to the enforcement team who will investigate and if necessary, take action.
- The plans for the previous application confirmed that the property would be single storey to the front and 2 storey at the rear.
- The rooftop terrace above the garage would be the same size as the rooftop terrace previously approved. The previously approved balcony at first floor level has been deleted, representing an improvement in the relationship between the proposed development and the objector's property.
- Enforcement action has resulted in the submission of 2 applications (including this one) to address the breaches identified.

Item:04 65 Windsor Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0DB Application No.

71520

Change of use from shop to restaurant and the retention of extract flue and AC unit

Extension of Time - Agreed.

Relevant Places for Everyone Policies:

JP-J1 - Economic Growth

JP-P1 - Sustainable Places

JP-S1- Sustainable Development

A neighbour has commented on the flue...

A silencer has been installed on the flue, but while the noise is slightly reduced, it remains clearly audible from my doorway, garden, and living room. As the flue is located directly in front of the only entrance to my home and next to my window, there is no way to avoid the odours, heat, and noise it emits—especially now during summer when windows must remain open. I have effectively lost use of that window due to this.

I must reiterate that this setup continues to severely affect our residential amenity, living conditions, and overall quality of life. As others have rightly pointed out, even with modern extraction systems, strong smells and emissions still permeate the surrounding area, compromising air quality and the comfort of neighbouring residents. This affects me to an even greater degree, as my property is less than half a metre away.

The flue is enormous and overbearing situated directly outside my only door. Every time I step into my garden or walk into my house, I'm confronted by its noise, odour, and industrial appearance, impacting my visual amenity. It constantly blows out heat and cooking fumes - making it impossible to enjoy or even use the garden or even open the window in this hot weather. It's affecting our quality of life, our health (causing allergies), and our peace of mind.

What adds to the frustration is that this flue was initially proposed to be at the rear. My concerns as far back as January, they appear to have been overlooked in favour of convenience for the applicant.

I am not objecting to the presence of a flue but to its current location. It must be repositioned to the rear of the property, where its impact on residents would be significantly reduced.

Further comments from Licensing - New Eagle, 65 Windsor Road had applied for a temporary events notice to allow a temporary extension of their licensing hours for Parklife weekend - 13/14/15 June. However due to representations from Greater Manchester Police and Environmental Health, this was refused.

The alcohol licence allows for the sale of alcohol until 20.30 hours with the premises to be closed by 21.00 hours 7 days a week.

We attended at 21.10 on Friday 13th and the premises was still open with people sat inside and on the tables under the canopy at the front of the premises. We spoke to staff and we were informed that they had stopped selling alcohol at 20.30 but people were finishing drinks. The member of staff was told that people had to be gone and the premises closed by 21.00. Whilst there we noticed some activity taking place at the rear of the premises, therefore we planned to return on the Saturday evening with GMP.

On Saturday we attended again around 21.10 alongside the Bury Divisional Licensing Officer and the Rochdale Divisional Licensing Officer from GMP. The premises was still open to walk into but with no customers inside or sat at the front. However there were a number of people to the rear where tables and chairs have been put outside with a canopy overhead and a building to the rear of this, where this is a pool table and a large television. When asked what was happening the member of staff told us that this area is nothing to do with him and belongs to the landlord who uses it for his friends. They told us that they have nothing to do with them, they don't provide them with drinks and they just use the cafe to walk in and out of to get to the rear. However the people outside had drinks and whilst we were there one came inside and asked "to settle his tab".

The member of staff was told that there could be no access through the licensed area as this should be closed by 21.00 and as there is a side entrance to the rear people accessing and exiting should use this. They were told to shut the doors of the café.

Whilst there they telephoned the landlord who told us that this is his land and nothing to do with the café. We explained to the member of staff that this could cause them issues as to the public this will look like their café is still open and attract complaints which could have implications for their planning / licence.

This page is intentionally left blank